



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, May 17, 1965 — Tuesday, June 22, 1965



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 17, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, May 17, 1965

Crown Agency Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, first reading	2959
Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued	2959
Recess, 6 o'clock	2985

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1965

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have as guests to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Glencoe public school, Glencoe; in the east gallery, Harley Central public school, Harley and Our Lady of Wisdom separate school, Scarborough.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CROWN AGENCY ACT

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Agency Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The sixteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (continued)

On vote 208:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think it was something like 12.30 when we were in a discussion of the vote on the emergency measures organization last week.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We are on a motion by the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), that items 4 and 5 of the vote 208 be struck out.

Mr. Thompson: I am speaking on that. I would like to raise some questions about the whole organization of EMO, as it is called. I think the first thing that any organization

would want to know, is what its purpose is. I have raised this in the past, for over six years, examining finances to pay expenditures for this organization, before the present hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) was even in the Legislature, and a previous Minister of Economics and Development had charge of this organization and at that time we were asking questions about the form of organization of EMO throughout the province. And he was assuring us that there was a voluntary army throughout the province. As I mentioned last week, after that Minister suggested that, the then Prime Minister, Hon. Mr. Frost, came in and said that the approach that would be used in a national emergency is to use the armed forces. Do not let us forget this.

Well, as I look at the role of the armed forces today, I think we all recognize that with the change of approach they are taking, surely there must be a change of responsibility on the part of EMO. But we have heard nothing with respect to EMO to indicate that they would have different terms of responsibility.

Is it in charge of a national emergency and of evacuation? Will it man the roads? Will it man the approaches for the evacuation of people out of cities, rescue, first aid, traffic control, monitoring damage, road clearance and so on?

As yet we have had no clear answer to this. I think it is very important that we should have a clear answer on what is the responsibility of EMO.

I would think that one of the necessary factors would be immediate rapid action if we had any emergency. I would think that there would be a clear knowledge who is in charge. I think through you, sir, that the hon. Attorney General has probably served in the military forces and he recognizes that in a national emergency it is so essential that there be someone in charge who can make decisions immediately and direct the forces.

Therefore, it is with some little disappointment, that in the case of the organization which comes under the hon. Attorney General's department and from whom we hoped there would be a clear, decisive voice

and a show of quick action, that we find that when my hon. friend from Downsview (Mr. Singer) raises three very simple questions about EMO, instead of replying almost within the next day we are still waiting for the answer.

I am referring to a question he raised, question 77. Will the hon. Attorney General advise if, in the event of a national emergency such as war, the residents of Metropolitan Toronto will be evacuated from said municipality?

Now surely if we had an efficient organization we would not be waiting three months to get the answer to this rather simple and fundamental question; but such is the case.

If so, the question goes on, where will the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto be evacuated to? We have waited three months to hear the answer to that.

If so, has there been any arrangement for the stockpiling of food for such evacuees? We have waited three months for that.

If so, what are these arrangements? If so, has there been any provision for shelter for such evacuees? If so, what are these arrangements?

If so, what arrangements have been made for evacuation of the following from Metropolitan Toronto: 1. School children; 2. Patients in hospitals; 3. Aged and infirm; 4. Persons in penal institutions.

I can only say that the delay we have had in getting a reply to these very fundamental questions is an indication that something is rotten in the state of EMO.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Now, sir, we may have this situation, and we have had this in the past, where we have been trying to establish if the hon. Attorney General's department has a responsibility for this elusive organization, EMO?

I was interested, again, in the series of questions that were asked by my friend, the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman. He asked: "Does the province of Ontario exercise any supervisory jurisdiction over expenditures made by the municipal emergency measures organizations in Ontario?" And the answer came back: "Yes."

I think it is important that we had that clarified because, sir, in the past when we saw the vagueness, when we saw the misinterpretations being given about this organization we began to wonder who was really responsible for it. But when it is clearly stated here that you have a jurisdiction over

EMO, then we say to the hon. Attorney General that he has a responsibility to be able to provide answers about its objective.

The interesting thing to me is that—if I could just take Metropolitan Toronto—we find we have a situation where the organizer of Metropolitan Toronto—or the director, or whatever title he goes under—is suggesting that they have formulated grand plans for evacuation, for shelter protection from nuclear strikes; yet the man in charge of the provincial area is not able to supply an answer.

I would like to look at the operation within Metropolitan Toronto, where the largest proportion of our people are living; and possibly this would be one of the real danger areas for a strike in the event of war. When you examine the operation—we do know that last year there was an accidental triggering of the alarm in Ottawa—we would assume that when an alarm goes off, if this organization has any efficiency and if they have done a job of informing the people, that when they hear an alarm they know how to move quickly in connection with the emergency.

But what we find is that no one, not even the government officers, were aware what this noise was all about. That, sir, would suggest to me that there is some inefficiency. There is something wrong in the state of EMO when an alarm goes off and even the government officers are wondering: what on earth is that noise going on over there?

In Toronto people would wonder what on earth was going on if there was any kind of an alarm—even in the form of an exercise—because as I understand it, there have really been very few exercises in Metropolitan Toronto, very few rehearsals by the emergency organization—it is mostly academic talk at the moment. There has been no practical exercise for the people of the city. Indeed if they had an exercise there would be real embarrassment because of the exposure of the whole inefficiency and confusion regarding the organization.

We are told that there are 14 dispersal routes from Metro Toronto; we are told that these dispersal routes are for the people to move out in their cars and head quickly toward the north and the east and the west. The public, however, has to guess how EMO plans it. They will not know where these routes are, because as I understand from another question which my hon. friend from Downsview asked, the signs which were bought several years ago are not out on the routes to indicate the dispersal routes; they are still in the vaults of police station No. 5.

If there is any practical purpose to paying for signs, it is the purpose of hammering them up to indicate the routes and not keeping them hidden like the gold in Fort Knox.

I would suggest, as well, that there is a very real question about these 14 dispersal routes. It is a very real question whether people, even in their cars, in the matter of an emergency would be able to get out through these 14 routes. That question would be in anyone's mind, even if they think of the traffic congestion that takes place at 5 o'clock. What on earth would happen on these 14 routes if there was a real emergency and the people were aware of it!

Apart from all kinds of other democratic questions, what happens to the people who have not got cars and who are left in the city? Apart from practical questions such as what about blocking people who might have to dive into the city. You always hear a vague kind of talk about this dispersal; you hear that there will be volunteers who will be directing the traffic—they have set up some kind of automated system for all the street signs. But I suggest the only test of whether this would be efficient would be if they have a rehearsal.

Now I am sure that the reply will be that they had two rehearsals. I understand there was one in the autumn of 1963, when a few policemen moved up to the dispersal routes in cars, with some direction from an RCAF aircraft. Again in 1964—and I can imagine that effort—the valiant little band of EMO personnel had a theoretical exercise with a couple of the dispersal units heading out some of these streets.

I suggest the government is surely not satisfied with this whole façade that is taking place. Let us come back to that flaw which the Metro EMO has formulated, sir. As I said before, grand plans for evacuation and shelter protection in the event of a nuclear strike; I am sure that the hon. Attorney General would agree with me that the plans are too vague in many areas and too impractical in many other areas. There has been no dissemination of knowledge, as the speaker before me suggested, no dissemination of information to the public; and there has been virtually no exercise on the operation to see if these plans would be effective.

This raises the very real question of whether this is really worthwhile expenditure. What about the director? I would say he is a man who must be able to live under a great deal of frustration. But even the poor director of this organization works under a committee,

as I understand, which is composed of members of Metro council and other elected officials. This committee does have the power to form policy and approve estimates, but it does not in fact exercise close scrutiny of the operations.

I want to come back again to the question of the hon. member for Downsview when he was asking about the operation and asking whose responsibility it was, whether it is a responsibility of the hon. Attorney General's department for the finances, and the answer is right there that it is.

I suggest, sir, that there are so many areas that are vague in this setup that it warrants either ridicule, or else real concern and apprehension that a government would permit this kind of money to be spent without taking concrete steps either to develop an organized functional pattern or else to abandon it.

Metro EMO has a plan, I understand, and this plan is a thick booklet of detailed instructions covering schools, fall-out hazards, dispersal warnings, etc. The contents of the plan have not been passed on to the civic and other officials whose task in a strike would be to implement them so that it could be assumed the designated responsible officials would be present in the event of a strike and not fleeing with their families. Even if the plans were familiar to the designated persons, such as the chief of police and so on, no measures have been generally taken to ensure those persons would have passed the information on to their departments.

Dispersal routes I have talked about already and shown what a farce that situation is.

We talk about shelters. The select committee on national defence in October, 1964, recommended that the shelter programme should be dropped. Metro EMO still includes shelters in its programme. It agrees that individual shelters have not been effectively adopted by the population and are impractical as a planned protection method. However, the Metro EMO published and distributed ineffectively a booklet *Industrial Defence Planning*, of which a large part is detailed specifications for shelters, contents of shelters, and so on. Metro EMO also speaks of vague plans for conducting fallout protection, measurements of school basements, and so on. It is uncertain whether these would be used for blast protection only or for fallout protection once the city has been demolished.

A fundamental defect with the plan—and I refer to the plan which has been written up—is that it presupposes voluntary dispersal. No provision in the absence of a full-scale mass shelter programme is made for persons

remaining. The plan only is effective if there is a mass evacuation. Yet how much notice would be given? Metro EMO presupposes an international crisis to give advance warning. This is fallacious. Of course there would be an international crisis, perhaps even declarations of a state of emergency.

But would the people of Canada or the people of Toronto disperse from their homes and flee unprepared to some unknown place in the countryside? Of course they would not. We had this situation in the Cuban crisis, for example. There was worry, and in some U.S. cities, in fact, there was panic. No North American city witnessed any dispersal. There would be no evacuation until the people were convinced that bombs were on the way. So the time of warning would only be a few hours at the most. And how effective would the Metro EMO plan be unless notice were given, with people unprepared and uneducated as they are?

EMO main control in Metro Toronto is a communication centre at 4938 Yonge Street. I want to say about this address, that this is in the demolition area, the danger area in Metro Toronto. The men who man the centre every day and every night at 4938 Yonge Street, in the event of an emergency are going to have to stay there and they may be the first casualties. I suppose for that reason they are very gallant men who are working at 4938 Yonge Street.

Let us have a look at the staff. Apparently they man it for 24 hours daily and they are made up of personnel who are hired from a protection agency. I understand at 8:30 every morning they are on the job, and what they do is make a radio check with all the EMO supplied radios held by the Metro fire departments. I may say this, they have done such an efficient job of calling up the different fire departments to know if their radios are in an efficient and working order, that at one time—and apparently not only one time, but several times—people have phoned EMO to know if there is a fire burning somewhere. One situation out in Scarborough is a real accomplishment, I think. In a sense they must have been terribly frustrated just picking up the phone at 8:30 to check all the radio hookups that they have, but on this occasion at a fire in Scarborough they got into their truck and headed out, and I presume they probably parked the truck beside or behind the police and the fire truck and they witnessed that fire there, a real fire.

We can be cynical or amusing about this but really there is a question about all the cost. They have not just got one truck, which the Minister agreed to pay for; there are

six trucks at, I understand, something like \$25,000 each. And what are these trucks doing? Surely there must be an overlapping of services. They cannot take over from the fire department; they are not the police. What are they doing with these trucks as they report down to 4938 Yonge Street? It may be that what they are doing is satisfying their boyhood ambition of chasing a fire truck, but we cannot afford to have that kind of thing paid out of public moneys.

Let us look at the training programme. Metro EMO training school is in Scarborough at Civic and Dennett roads and its purpose is to provide courses in first aid and rescue to municipal employees, farm and business men, and so on. Let us be blunt about it—this school should be closed. The school actually ran very few courses in 1964, and they may say they had a number of courses but the question is how long were these courses? They were for a very short duration.

It interests me that apparently they had a competition among all the people who took these courses in rescue work. The hon. Attorney General should be asking this sort question: How many teams were entered? How much time was spent in training them and not in training others? Why was the competition limited to EMO personnel? It would have been understandable, for example, if they had had the competition against the fire departments or some other team. How many completed the courses of 24 hours duration?

Could they not be more effectively taught by the St. John Ambulance? Do we realize that, for example, the army courses take 40 hours of duration? Yet for some reason the EMO people are thinking they can get people through in 24 hours.

Going into this whole question of presentations to schools, we see where the EMO people are suggesting they have distributed all kinds of books. It was pointed out by another speaker that they have distributed a great number of books, but the real test is, who read the books? How many of the teachers, for example, give a course in connection with civil defence? How many of the principals have used the assembly exercises before going into their classes, to explain the kind of rehearsal approach that should be taken? I would suggest that they are very few and I think the real test is that there are very few parents around this city who would have the slightest idea what EMO does.

But there are many who would know the word EMO, and this comes up to another aspect. One of the peculiar things about EMO

is that you see a big ad put up and billboards around the place saying something like, "EMO will take care of you." It sounds like a Conservative candidate in the middle of an election. It even has the name of the director on it. But it does not say how it will take care of you, or what it will do, or anything else. That is a mystery which seems to be also a mystery to the hon. Attorney General, otherwise he would have had an answer and we would not have to wait almost three months for the answer.

I could go into further areas, such as seminars. Metro EMO in the two years 1963-64 ran four seminars for businessmen. Why only four? These four seminars were for two evenings each, a total of eight evenings. Supposedly more than 90 firms were represented. Surely we would have to admit that if we are taking this thing seriously, this is a feeble, paltry effort, when we have so few of the total number of Toronto firms being represented. What is the result of the seminars? During the brief meetings there were discussions, but how many of the persons attending could now control their firms usefully and practically in the event of a nuclear strike? Remember, only a tiny fraction of firms were represented.

Volunteers! In 1960, Metro EMO had a list of approximately 17,000 names of persons who had offered their voluntary services. How many volunteers has EMO now?

One other thing in this sort of tragic opera is that apparently a fire destroyed some of their records. It seems ironical that it should be EMO where fire destroys the records, when one of the things they are supposed to do is to put out fires. But it destroyed their records, and Metro EMO claims the names were lost. Fortunately, duplicates were kept in a provincial EMO office.

But apart from those names on paper, how many of these volunteers are now trained and available? How many thousands of volunteers have actually turned up in Metro Toronto for at least one meeting or an exercise in the past year?

I think you will find there is only a handful of active volunteers, and most of them are either civic employees who do it as part of their job, or ham radio operators who get free radios for their efforts, which are minimal.

The 17,000 names of 1960 are probably now worthless through not being kept up to date with active volunteer lists. Further, there are very few volunteers active in Metro now because there is no activity in which to participate, except the fun of being a ham operator. Rather than depending on such an

elusive scheme as EMO's volunteer programme, civic departments should run their own programmes, which would then be properly planned and organized for practical control.

So it goes on as you look at this peculiar organization. But the thing I am concerned about is that we are spending public money on it year after year. It is something like comic opera.

Several years ago when we pressed for definite answers, the Minister then told us he could not give us definite answers because this was really a secret, almost a state secret. He did not want to disclose anything in case some foreign country might find out what we were doing in the way of preparation. Then the Prime Minister moved into the picture and he said, "All right we will show you what we are doing for ourselves." Some of us had the privilege of going on this picnic.

We were picked up by bus here, and we were told that this was the quick, decisive action to be taken in the event of any emergency or strike. We got in the bus and meandered to some army place, and we saw—at least I did—a real comic opera, with officers in uniform phoning and saying they thought there was fallout dust coming over in their area, and some fellow saying, "Well, you had better wait until after lunch because the commanding officer in this area will not be back until then." After we had gone through all that palaver, we got back in our bus and we drove home, feeling more insecure than when we started out. And I think we were.

As the hon. member for Woodbine says, "You were crazy if you went." Well, perhaps we were, but then I think that anyone who has a look at this organization gets a bit crazy from what he sees.

Public funds are being expended, and it is either a fraud or a fiction. The hon. Attorney General is new, and I have admired the way in which he has been handling these estimates, admitting where he felt he should be moving in to clean up the situation.

I understand also from a number of questions that my hon. friend raised, that action was taken even before his estimates came to the floor.

This is another place where we obviously have to have action. We do not want to feel that the government is putting out something as ludicrous as "The Pirates of Penzance." It is because of this, knowing that the hon. Attorney General is a man who makes decisions, that we have been so disappointed, especially when we ask only fundamental questions about this estimate—to where do

we all get evacuated, and what is the purpose of it? We have been waiting three months. That must indicate something! We feel sure, sir, that you will either have an adequate explanation about this organization, or else you will cancel the grant which is proposed for it.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, on Friday morning, I put certain questions to the hon. Minister which I presume that he plans to answer in due course.

I noticed in Saturday's paper that the local director of EMO has had his salary raised to \$13,900 annually, and this is the same man who said on February 12 that "there is a real conflict here as to who would be in charge and it could be disastrous if something happened." And he did not know just who was in charge.

In connection with this whole matter, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would inform us whether or not anything has happened in making plans for this particular building? Here we have what we consider the most important people in the province of Ontario, as far as EMO is concerned. We are voting a large part of their budget. We are sanctioning their existence. I have not been in this House very long, but while I sat on a municipal council, I was taken to EMO headquarters and I was shown the workings, just as, I understand, you went to Camp Borden some years ago, to see something of the provincial workings of this organization.

Since then, the organization has changed. But we were also told at that time that certain plans were being made, and the local suggestion was we build a fallout shelter, which has never been built, and that we man the machine guns to keep the citizens out, so civil servants could be saved. But are there plans, in case of disaster, to evacuate and to save these important people in this legislative assembly? Or are we simply to have a bell rung and then march out to meet the fallout at the front door in the usual way?

Whether or not it is important that these people be saved, I do not know, but certainly these people back in the corner—the civil servants—are far more important in the case of a disaster of this kind than we are. And certainly some plans should be made to ensure that they would be preserved for the ongoing functions of government, because they are the key people in this regard.

One further matter I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the ones I raised the other night. It is in connection

with the follow-up of these machines which have been bought. I made it clear then, and I reiterate again, I have no objection to public moneys being spent to build up fire fighting equipment in this province and across Canada, and I think the more efficient fire fighting equipment we have, the better. I have no objection to the federal government, or the provincial governments, sharing with the municipalities that kind of expenditure. But I do object to the kind of playing at toy soldiers that we have in order to get the fire fighting equipment.

One of the conditions of the granting of these bits of equipment is that the municipality agrees to enrol and train for fire emergency measures auxiliary fire fighters in excess of the normal peace-time requirements in municipalities; to serve the requirements of civil emergency in the area in accordance with the plans developed by the Ontario fire marshal.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, in the case of the various fire fighting facilities that have been provided, how many of these areas have provided for the implementation of the "G" part of these regulations—that is 4(G) of the conditions that are laid down. I wonder how many of the municipalities concerned have really carried out these instructions; or have they simply regarded this extra piece of equipment as sheer bonus?

I also would call to the attention of the hon. Minister, following up the statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the annual report of EMO in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. In that, following up what the hon. member for Dovercourt had to say, we have vague generalities, stories of exercises, stories of conferences, stories of co-operation. The Bell Telephone Company is mentioned together with the metropolitan police force and fire fighting force, pictures are shown here; but in no place is given the time and date of these conferences and schools and courses, and at no place is given the number of participants in these schools and courses.

There is a picture here, in one case, of a course and it shows, I think it is three or four people. Whether that is the total number of people taking the course, I do not know. We have here vague generalities, we have nothing tied down that is definite.

It is high time we had a statement from this government as to policy in connection with a sacred cow which seems designed more to give people a sense of security, to make people think that something is being done when it is not being done. It is

an organization which is set up simply to carry out the illusion that there is protection here, when as a matter of fact there is no such thing. This government should face that fact and give answers to some of these questions.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I want to add a word or two here. I do not know if the hon. Attorney General is aware of the report of the special committee on defence of the House of Commons, made to the House of Commons on October 1, 1964. That report is contained in No. 160 of the votes and proceedings of the House of Commons of Canada.

I commend that to the hon. Attorney General's attention because, starting at page 744 of that report, headed: "Chapter 3—Civil Emergency Planning."

This committee, which is an all-party committee as I understand it, thoroughly examines civil defence, points out a number of grave shortcomings and concludes with their recommendations. They are eight in number and I will read them:

1. Your committee therefore recommends that a federal-provincial meeting on emergency planning be held before the year end.

It is my understanding that no such meeting was held between October and the end of the year 1964.

Future meetings should be held at least annually in order to ensure continuing liaison between the two levels of government. Joint planning must be developed that recognizes clearly the responsibility of government at various levels.

I think that the tenor of the remarks in this debate made by my hon. leader, the hon. gentleman here to my left, has been that no one really is sure what this programme is designed to do. We have flurries; we have a shelter-building flurry; we have an evacuation flurry; we have a sign-painting flurry; we spend a lot of time in erecting sirens—no one yet is quite sure whether they work or not; or if they do work what is going to happen if they do go off?

Somewhere along the line we have to have some idea whether we are going anywhere on this. It has been my contention, Mr. Chairman, since I first sat on the Metro council in 1957, that to my mind there is not a greater waste of public money than the money that both this government has spent and the federal government has spent and the municipal governments have spent on so-called EMO planning.

I do not think that there is any planning. It may be that there is a role for EMO in emergency—floods, fires, and that sort of thing. But if that is the role, let us do that, and perhaps there are better ways of doing it through the fire departments or through the civil service of the municipalities and so on.

The role, in an emergency which would bring atom bombs to us, just completely escapes me, and I think that it escapes the knowledge of this House of Commons committee.

I continue:

2. That EMO national exercises be resumed and conducted on a regular basis.

As my hon. leader said, we tried to find out if there are exercises on a regular basis that mean anything and as far as we have been able to find out, there are no such exercises.

3. That the expenditure of funds for the current shelter programme be discontinued.

Now, whether the shelter programme still goes on or not, I do not know. If there is any continuing expenditure of funds, it is the opinion of this committee—and I share their opinion—that it is a waste of time.

One of the questions I addressed was whether there were plans for shelters in the new buildings that we are erecting across the way and the hon. Attorney General said he thought so. I happened to speak to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) who said that there were areas down in the basement that probably could be adapted at a great expenditure of moneys to be shelters. The hon. Minister recognizes—and I do not blame him—there is no point in asking the Treasury board for several hundred thousand extra dollars to build shelters in these buildings. The purpose of them escapes the hon. Minister and I think it escapes the rest of us. It certainly escapes the mind of this committee in Ottawa.

4. That research be carried forward so that techniques of providing home protection quickly with the materials at hand may be developed.

They refer to the study of public fallout shelters in Alberta, and say when it is completed that an:

—analysis be done based on the data it reveals as to the cost of providing fallout shelters across the country and the percentage of population that may be so protected.

In other words, they are suggesting that really there has been no basic study in this

at all. Are we going to be able to provide reasonable shelter by such a programme and how much is it going to cost?

6. That a decision be made concerning fallout protection. The public will not build shelters.

Which is the conclusion they have come to after this great expenditure of money.

It is financially impossible for the federal government to provide fallout shelters for the entire population. Therefore the government must decide, based on the cost revealed by the Alberta survey, whether or not it will provide protection for a portion of the population.

If that decision has to be made, which portion of the population do you pick? This would be a very interesting question. Is there going to be public money expended for this purpose or not and if so, on whom is it going to be spent, who will it benefit?

That public information programmes be instituted to provide basic information, that they should be on a periodic basis on television, radio and the press.

And then finally:

That consideration be given to regular testing of the alarm system in all communities across the country.

Well, not only that, I would think that consideration be given to impressing the people who live in the province what the alarm system really means.

We have a number of sirens around Metropolitan Toronto, there is one within a few blocks of where I live. Since it has been put up, which is a good three years ago, I do not think it has ever gone off. I would doubt, and one of the questions I directed to the hon. Attorney General, was whether they have ever been tested. He said that is a federal responsibility. I would doubt if there is anybody I could quickly find who could tell whether that siren is in working order.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What would happen if it did go off?

Mr. Singer: If it did go off, as the hon. member for Woodbine said, what does it mean? What does it mean to the people who can hear that siren? Where are they supposed to go, what are they supposed to do, what is the significance of it?

To my mind, sir, and I think it is implicit in this motion, the moneys that have been expended in this province and in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto by all three

levels of government over the past eight, 10, 12 years on EMO have been about as great a waste of public money as anything I have ever come in contact with. I would think that the time is now here that the hon. Attorney General should be able to say: "Our policy insofar as EMO is so-and-so and such-and-such. We have an evacuation policy; we have a shelter policy," or "We have neither of those, we have a warning policy." What do they mean; how will they work?

The suggestion that these signs, to which my hon. leader referred and which are in the basement of some police stations, are going to be put on posts that are already there while fallout rains down on the men erecting the signs is just ludicrous. A whole bunch of fancy, painted signs! What do they cost?

The cost—\$4,000 or \$5,000 or \$6,000—is not a big item, but it is thorough waste. There are signs lying in a police station basement that are never going to be used for anything. And you repeat this.

Mr. Chairman, maybe there is a role for some sort of body that is going to provide treatment, care and attention in the event of an emergency such as flood or fire or this sort of thing—Hurricane Hazel for example. But it would seem to me—and we are going to come to this a little later in the fire marshal's estimate, which is a part of this vote and I will have a few remarks—it would seem to me that this sort of money would be far better spent if devoted to the fire marshal's office to provide this kind of service with co-ordination throughout the province. I think that the hon. Attorney General owes to the people of the province a real justification for including this vote again this year in these estimates.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would say for the attention of the hon. members of the House is that the emergency measures organization, EMO as we call it, is a joint undertaking of three levels of government, designed by the federal government, the provincial government—our co-operation was sought—and the municipal governments. It is an example of governments working together, but the overall design, the primary responsibility, the direction in which we are asked to go, is given to us by the federal government. I think the least we can do, unless we are going to repudiate emergency measures planning altogether and repudiate what our national government says, and its policies, is to go along with it, unless we are going to repudiate it completely.

Mr. Young: Then put the responsibility on them, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Bryden: Make them justify it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We are asked to contribute in dollars, 15 per cent on the programmes. The rest of the money and a very large part of it, is paid by federal dollars. And the municipalities pay a larger share than the provincial government.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Who is in power at Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Who is in power?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

An hon. member: He does not know.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is why—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Nobody is in power in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to hear the remarks, particularly from the hon. gentleman opposite to my left, repudiating a programme which is federal, which is directed by the federal government, and in which we are asked to co-operate. I think the least we can do unless we repudiate the whole matter is to go along and do what we are asked to do in this joint programme of three governments. That is the first answer I would give to the matter generally.

The hon. member for Dovercourt, the hon. leader of the Opposition, says we have not given the answer to question No. 77. That was the question as to whether there would be evacuation and what were the plans for evacuation from Metropolitan Toronto? I would point out that the hon. member for Downsview, Mr. Chairman, asked ten questions and all of them had extra sub-questions—I think in all some 35 or 36 questions came out of the ten—and they have all been answered in detail except No. 77. They all bore on the matter of EMO. Out of some 30-odd questions, only one and one simple one, "What are the plans to get out of Metro Toronto?" remains unanswered.

There are reasons why the answer has not been given, and I think perhaps at this time I could say to the House that I fairly well recognize that mass evacuation of a city such as Metropolitan Toronto would be impractical, that it is not likely to be attempted, that it would simply be impossible.

With respect to the matter of signs, I know there has been some levity about the signs. I do not know whether this is justified or not. I mean, this whole matter could be extremely serious, and the seriousness seems to rise and fall as the danger in the international situation lessens or grows greater. The signs are available; the posts on which they are to go are placed. My own conception is that certainly they could not be put up while fallout is raining around, but if the international situation reached a point where it seemed extremely grave and likely that a national emergency could arise and even an attack on this nation or on the United States, and that there would likely be some fallout, then the signs would be put up.

Perhaps that is a small effort, perhaps that is a small contribution, but it is what we are asked to do. We are asked to go along with the organization, build up in its working detail at the municipal level, support it—and that is all we do—support, and add some direction in the provincial level and take our overall direction from the federal government. This is what we are asked to do, this we are doing. This is our answer when you say, "Why are you into EMO?" That is why.

There is the function that the municipality does build up an organization. Perhaps in some city which was hard hit, it might go out of commission, but there would be a nucleus to maintain some form of government to supply direction, police control, fire-fighting service, first aid, distribution of food, distribution of medical supplies, and the direction of the population, so that something could be salvaged to the fullest extent possible with the organizations which are built up at the municipal level. Many of these organizations are excellent, with dedicated people working in them, with their plans very complete. They have tried the plans out, they have tested, they have had their trial runs and they are doing excellent work. They would maintain operations and they would, I think, give an excellent account of themselves in any type of disaster, national or natural.

I was interested in hearing the hon. member for Downsview quote the recommendations of the special committee on defence of the House of Commons. I have here the statement made to that special committee in June of last year, less than a year ago, on the emergency measures organization. C. M. Drury, who is the Minister of Industry and who was charged with the carrying on of the emergency measures organization, spoke to the special committee of the House of Commons on defence, on the role and the

aims of the emergency measures organization. This is what he said:

The role of emergency measures is the co-ordination of civil defence planning by departments and agencies of the government of Canada;

that is one. He also stated:

The preparation of civil defence plans in relation to matters that are not the responsibility of any other department or agency of the government of Canada;

a special agency to carry on matters that are not departmental, in the government of Canada. He outlined a third role as follows:

The assistance to provincial governments and municipalities in respect of preparation for civil defence where assistance is not the responsibility of any other department or agency of the government of Canada;

then he mentioned general liaison with other countries, with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and with provincial governments on matters relating to civil defence, and he gave a fifth role:

The direction and administration of the civil defence college at Arnprior, Ontario.

As to the aims of the emergency measures organization, he gives three. These are the three aims as cited by the Hon. Mr. Drury:

To plan measures, including the most sensible use of our resources, that will assist the population to survive a hazard of a nuclear or conventional war.

That is aim number one. Second:

To plan for the continuity of essential elements of all levels of government so that civilian leadership, guidance and necessary instruction can be given to the Canadian people.

I think that in any type of warfare or disaster, you expect losses to some extent, and as I see EMO, it is to keep that loss to a minimum, to have as much survival as possible, and by means of the direction, the planning, the training and the furnishing of services planned now, to lessen the effects of a natural war or a nuclear attack. Mr. Drury said the third aim is:

The provision of assistance to provinces, and through them to municipalities, in developing their emergency services to meet disasters through the medium of financial assistance on the basis of up to 75 per cent federal contribution. The provision of training courses at the civil defence college, and generally through the preparation of planning done.

He goes on at length and deals with the matter of public survival, the continuity of government, and gives a progress report of what has been done, and I could use his report in answering most of the questions which have been asked here. But I should just like to stress that as a provincial government, and as a department of that government, it falls to The Department of the Attorney General to say we will co-operate with the federal government. We will contribute our 15 per cent. We will assist the municipalities. We will take direction. We will endeavour to keep these organizations to such level as they can be maintained when interest is low, that is in peacetime when the international situation is quiet and we are not too frightened. We will see what we can do to at least keep a nucleus of an organization going in our municipalities. We will co-operate with you. That is our role, and that is why I ask you for the funds which are in the estimate, to carry on the matter of the emergency measures organization.

The hon. member for Yorkview asks one or two specific questions. I am not sure I completely understood what he wanted me to answer. As I understood the question it concerned three municipalities who purchased pumpers, and the question seemed to be, did they purchase them within the conditions that they were auxiliary equipment, or had they disposed of others? Was this the question with respect to all the municipalities?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I can just reiterate. There were two or three instances I gave showing that perhaps EMO was not carrying out the full terms of reference. One was where a pumper had been sold by the town of Belleville to Woodville, prior to the purchase of a new one. This is contrary to the conditions. Another; at Port Hope, where tenders were called, the tender was let to a company which had bid \$2,000 higher than the lowest tender, although the specifications were met I understand, on all tenders. My question was, is this good business, and do we need an organization which is doing this kind of thing to make up the mind of our municipalities, or the mind of someone—whatever it is who makes up their mind—as to what should be done? A junior clerk, I contend, could do just as well as EMO in finalizing these basic decisions.

These were the illustrations I gave, and perhaps the hon. Minister might have some comment on them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, the inquiries went forward to the three municipali-

ties mentioned. I think perhaps it was unnecessary to inquire of any of them except Belleville, on the question of sale of equipment. In any event, the township of Brownridge wired this reply:

THE TOWNSHIP OF BROWNRIDGE DID NOT SELL FIRE PUMPER. BOTH FIRE PUMPERS—THE ONE ORIGINALLY OWNED BY THE TOWNSHIP AND THE ONE PURCHASED UNDER SUBSIDY—ARE IN COMMISSION IN THE VILLAGE OF DOUGLAS IN THE TOWNSHIP OF BROWNRIDGE.

Port Hope wires and confirms that the town of Port Hope has not, and will not be selling any of their fire trucks.

Belleville writes that they had sold an old fire pumper in February of 1964, that the pumper grants did not come into effect until April 1, 1964, and some time after, Belleville made application for a pumper grant on April 20, 1964. They do state that the old pumper was sold on May 6, 1964. That is the last statement in the information I have.

Mr. Young: This replaced the old pumper.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think, strictly speaking, it is fair to say that they probably have not complied in the sense that they were getting auxiliary equipment. That seems to be quite clear from the answer they have given. But how seriously one would regard the fact that they were lacking a pumper and got one from EMO, I—

Mr. Young: Mr. Minister, I simply said I do not object to this. All I am saying is that the conditions being laid down by EMO here and the way in which the whole thing is done is an exercise in futility. That is all.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has said any clerk or junior clerk could purchase these pumpers, make the application and get the grant. This is perhaps true, but it does happen to be one of the programmes designed, again by the federal government, to assist municipalities to obtain fire fighting equipment, auxiliary fire fighting equipment. And since it is in EMO, it is done as a matter of the EMO organization within the municipality. I cannot deny that the clerk that does it in the EMO organization, may be the town or city clerk for all I know, someone has to do it, but I think these are generally municipal officials who comprise the EMO organization.

Mr. Young: Then my question is, why maintain all this superfluity of organization to do these little jobs? Evidently there is no provision made for continuity of provincial government. Perhaps we should have a hole down into the subway here, so we could all

drop down in there in case of disaster. That might serve the purpose, or it may be that government has its own plans for evacuation and the Opposition does not know a thing about it. We do not count and this may eliminate the Opposition! Maybe that's an easy way to do it, I do not know.

But the whole thing seems so ludicrous, Mr. Chairman, that I just cannot quite make up my mind that we should be passing this vote. I think the province recognizes the futility of this, and our point is a very simple one, it is simply to recognize this futility, then let us make our protest to the federal government by cutting out this vote. Then if the federal government thinks this is important, it is going to have to do one of two things—either jack up EMO and make it significant, or wash the whole thing out.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, I feel this is another fine example where our great government is co-operating with the federal government, and especially the hon. Attorney General's department. I think this government should be commended for the co-operation it is extending to the federal government in this matter.

Mr. Bryden: I do not want to prolong this much longer. I think the subject has been well canvassed, but I must say I was a little surprised at the attitude of the hon. Attorney General as affirmed by the hon. member for Welland, that co-operation with the federal government is good per se, whether or not it accomplishes anything. It seems to be the attitude of the hon. Attorney General that it ill behooves us to question the matter. The federal government has a programme; whether or not we like it or even understand it, we should be prepared to co-operate because in this day and age co-operation is a good thing.

I think co-operation is a good thing, but I think it should be for a purpose; and I think it is high time that some coherent purpose was indicated with regard to this organization, or alternatively that the money spent on it should be saved.

Admittedly our proportion of the total is relatively small, 15 per cent I believe the hon. Attorney General said. It still means an expenditure in our estimates of about \$360,000. That is perhaps not too much in a budget of \$1.5 billion, but I do not see why we should undertake to spend any amount of money merely because the federal government would like us to spend it. That government spends \$6 billion or \$7 billion a year, I have a suspicion it does not know

where a large part of it goes. I do not think that we should get into their slack habits in reviewing expenditures.

A committee, to which the hon. member for Downsview referred, of federal members of Parliament, looked into this matter and could not really find much function being performed or much value being received for this expenditure of money. So why should we spend \$360,000 merely in the name of co-operation? There are many other fields where we can co-operate with the federal government with mutual benefit. This is one where some severe questions should be asked. I think the federal government should indicate, much better than it has up until now as far as I can see, what exactly it is trying to accomplish with this programme other than to give a few jobs to a few people who apparently want to make like soldiers.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would not want my attitude of co-operation with the federal government with respect to the emergency measures organization to be construed as a general attitude of co-operation without criticism or examination of any federal programme. But I think we must bear in mind that one of the words in the name of this organization is "emergency," "emergency measures"; meaning emergency measures verging on those that would arise from an attack by an enemy, by possibly a nuclear attack. The other side of this organization is the natural type of disaster—fire, flood, or something of that nature.

This organization arises out of what is called, broadly, civil defence, and in that respect it approaches the condition of a nation at war or contemplating a war. When the federal government, whose field this is, says to a province, will you co-operate in that situation, I think that I have to mute my criticism to some extent and say, yes; but not in every situation.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bryden moves that items 4 and 5 of vote 208 be struck out.

All those in favour of the motion please rise.

All those opposed to the motion please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 24; the nays, 47.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, a year ago this Legislature passed a bill, An Act to provide for the registration, supervision and control of used car dealers and salesmen. I

acknowledge that the government, for good reasons or bad, took until January to start proclaiming this Act. I acknowledge that it perhaps was not until last month that all aspects of the Act were put into effect and therefore one should reserve final judgment with regard to the effectiveness of this Act. But I must confess that I have some misgivings that I want to express, because I do not feel that we should let this Act become ineffective in any degree at all.

Public furore a year or so ago, revealed widespread public concern that I think merits consideration in this House, to the point that we can leave these estimates only with full assurance that we are going to get the kind of implementation that is required.

My misgivings arise from the fact—if I may be frank, Mr. Chairman—that the administrators of the Act are operating on the basis that all used car dealers—if I may lapse into the vernacular—are "good guys." Now, I would concede that most used car dealers, like most people involved in any line of business, are "good guys." But we became involved and took legislative action with regard to this situation, not because most of them were good guys, but because there were too many of them who were bad guys—"operators"—in the field.

For example, I was interested in an observation in the Toronto *Daily Star*, in one of their editorials, where they concluded with this comment, with which I would concur:

Queen's Park, in fact, still seems to be showing unusual gentleness toward a trade which is notorious for the number of sharpers it contains. A little less concern for the dealers and a little more concern for the public would be in order.

Now those are my sentiments and I want to give a few examples as to why I feel this is the case, in the hope that I can persuade the hon. Attorney General in his great variety of concerns to interest himself more in this particular Act and its administration.

For example, in the application form—and these are a couple of general comments—which is generally a good application form, I was rather disturbed to find an old problem that occurs periodically in various government departments. As the application form was reproduced in the *Ontario Gazette*, I discovered that it was requested of the applicant: "My nationality is . . ."

May I just make the point and pass on? I think we have passed the stage where any government application form, now that the human rights code has been passed, should have any concern what a man's nationality is.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We have already arranged to take that out.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good! Representations have been made in quarters which saw that it was done—and the hon. Attorney General nods.

A second point that I think is extremely important—and I think the hon. Attorney General is apprized of this—is that he has to sit down soon either with the Cabinet or his colleague, the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) and clarify the situation with regard to garage licences. Garage licences, as we have had them for some years in the department, authorized a businessman to become involved in a number of activities with regard to automobiles, including the sale of used cars. The garage licence is still in existence, so that when you give a garage licence, if the used car dealer wants to pretend to be obtuse he can assume that he has the right to sell used cars. It seems to me that a revision of the garage licence so that it may encompass other activities—whatever activities the government wants to put into its terms of reference—is in order. But clearly, beyond any shadow of doubt, the sale of used cars is not a right that flows from the getting of a garage licence; it is exclusively that of the licence that is granted under this particular legislation.

I raise this because when we get into the question of private sales—I asked a question before the orders of the day with regard to one Don Smith who was operating in a very cute way, if I may use that term. I understand that he even did not make application before the deadline and has made it since. May I, without going into further detail on that case, ask the hon. Attorney General if there has been some decision with regard to the Smith case?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He is still under investigation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: You see here, Mr. Chairman, a man who knew what the law was, beyond any shadow of doubt, deliberately did not make application before April 1. I believe this was the deadline under which they must all register. In other words, he was deliberately pursuing his business under the cover of a garage licence. I hope that a very severe look will be taken at his application for a licence.

However, on this question of private sales, I do not know whether the administrators of the Act have come up with any further instances, but if they have not, I draw this to their attention. In the Toronto *Daily Star* of

April 27, 1965, if one read with minute care, one would discover a couple of little advertisements:

1958 Buick auto., radio, beautiful car, original, \$400 full price. 766-3149.

Now there is a telephone number for those who want to add it in their little black books. It becomes even more interesting when you go to the next column and you find another one:

1958 Ford station wagon, 6, radio, 47,000 mi. stand, beautiful car. 766-3149.

Now I do not know if the hon. Minister is aware of this, but if you call up 766-3149 you will discover that the person at the other end is one, Liz Goddard. Liz Goddard, for those who are interested in the used car field, is no newcomer. Indeed, she is so well known in the field that quite some time ago Pierre Berton wrote a whole column on her. So here we are, years later, after the Act is passed, one month after she should have registered, Liz Goddard is still advertising on private sales.

I do not know what can be done. I am not minimizing the difficulties of playing policeman in this field, but it comes back to the proposition that if you are going to clean up the field you do not operate on the basis that they are all "good guys" because they are not. Indeed they are not all "good gals" either because some of them are Liz Goddards.

An hon. member: What does she look like?

Mr. MacDonald: I have no idea what she looks like. The interest of some of the hon. members here apparently extends beyond the telephone number.

The second point I would like to draw to the hon. Minister's attention is that on an earlier discussion on this issue I raised the question as to whether or not it would be a valid proposition to obligate used car dealers to list the licence numbers in their advertisements. I was very interested to discover that this is becoming increasingly the practice; indeed, even one Ted Williamson is now putting in the licence numbers in his ads. That being the case, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering, if I may suggest to the hon. Attorney General, whether it would not be a good thing now to amend our regulations so that every used car dealer will put in the licence numbers, because—without my going into the explanation of the value of a licence number—you can at least circumvent that tactic of advertising a very attractive car as a come-on when that car is never there. Even

though you call from a telephone booth literally across the street and then rush across the street, it still is not there, although you were told when you called from the telephone booth that it was awaiting your purchase if you wished to come.

There is a third item I want to draw to the hon. Attorney General's attention, and I do it because apparently he has to be persuaded on this point. There is a growing belief among those who are interested in this field that a log book, while it might involve some routine requirements and conceivably create some difficulties, may be the best way to catch many of the abuses that have grown up in the field.

In an interview that I believe CKEY, on "Politics' Three Levels," had with the hon. Attorney General on January 10 last, the hon. Attorney General is quoted in the transcript as saying this, with reference to a log book:

Well, that would be an extremely complicated and onerous and difficult thing to do. For instance, the dealer sells me a used car. I may keep it as my car. I am not subject to this Act. If I sell it to my neighbour John Doe, and John Doe may sell it to his neighbour Bill Jones, who is going to keep the records and the mileage and how this car. . . . And then eventually when Bill Jones trades it in, it gets back in the hands of a dealer again and it has changed its status, its character, its mileage, its condition. But that dealer, when he takes it in, must record it and when he sells it he must keep the details so to this extent we can go. It would be extremely difficult to follow a car right through perhaps a number of individual owners.

I repeat, I do not know whether the hon. Attorney General still feels that this is a difficulty. But you can read, for example, one column that Ron Haggart had on December 28, 1964, with regard to used cars and what happens to a car that is so badly wrecked that an insurance company does not want to bother with it at all, and pays off the complete amount. Then this car is handed to a dealer, it goes through two or three dealers, and a little while later you will find a very alluring ad in the paper with regard to a car that can be bought for \$1,400. This is the old, completely smashed-up car, presumably back in shape to go on the road.

It seems to me that even though you may have some difficulties—and I think the hon. Attorney General is exaggerating them—in keeping a log even though a car goes into private hands, the owner can keep the log up to date. He bought the car on such-and-

such a date; he sells it on such-and-such a date again; they know that he owned it during that particular period. But you would eliminate a lot of the abuses that have arisen by a deliberate rapid sale from one person to another, to hide from the future purchaser the record of a car.

A fourth point that I want to raise with the hon. Attorney General is in connection with advertising. If one reads, even in a cursory fashion, the advertising in the papers today, there are a number of items that clearly stand out as open to serious objection. I have a few of them here for example, ads which state in bold and attractive type the proposition that when you buy a car—"government-approved cars," or "all cars inspected by The Department of Transport—it carries the seal of approval on the windshield." My information is that the seal of approval, if it is there indeed, is not really an inspection to guarantee to the person the full operation of this car except for certain safety requirements in which The Department of Transport is quite rightly concerned. It seems to me that this is a deliberate misrepresentation.

I want to come a few moments later to the question of warranties. We indeed might cope with this problem if there was a warranty, so that when the buyer came in, and if he was the victim of the come-on, and bought this car because it was government inspected, if he got a warranty when he went out then the dealer would have to live up to it.

The second thing that I draw to the hon. Attorney General's attention—

Mr. Singer: That inspection has nothing to do with engines.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. It has nothing to do with engines other than a few safety devices, so it is misleading to the consumer.

Another one that is very, very frequent is the question of six per cent interest. I will say, and I think without any fear of contradiction, that those of us who have sat through the select committee on consumer credit will very readily agree that any man who pretends that he is providing interest on used car sales at six per cent and no more is misleading the public because this simply is not happening in many comparable lines of business. It is more likely to be 12 or 15 per cent or more. Here you have misleading advertising. Indeed, in this connection I was rather interested to read a little editorial in the *Toronto Daily Star* of May 6, which I draw to the attention of the hon. Minister because

it may be a good tactic to cope with these people who persist in using advertising as a come-on. It is entitled:

SLIPPERY AD

Mrs. Bernice Wyszynski of Bristol, Conn., noticed that a breezy dealer's ad priced a car in "bananas" instead of dollars. She took up the offer.

She marched to the car lot—with 1,395 bananas bought for \$60 at the supermarket—and demanded the advertised late-model convertible.

The dealer turned out to be not all that fond of bananas, and refused the sale. But the state consumer protection agency—

they have such things in Connecticut:

—backed up Mrs. Wyszynski and charged the dealer with misleading advertising.

She got the car. And Bristol advertisers learned a lesson.

If it had happened in Ontario, Mrs. Wyszynski would probably still be walking to work and feeding her family bananas three times a day.

This may be a rather amusing but a salutary way to cope with some of these misleading ads—just make them live up to them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might just remind the House, and particularly the hon. member for York South that in this session of this Legislature I introduced legislation, which is Bill No. 6, amending The Used Car Dealers Act of 1964, by adding thereto the following section:

Where, in the opinion of the registrar, any person registered under this Act is making false, misleading or deceptive statements in any advertisement, circular, pamphlet or similar material, the registrar may order the immediate cessation of the use of such material.

We had considerable debate on that but I was constrained to add:

Any such order shall be reviewable under the appeal provisions of section 16, and subsequent sections thereof.

We did seek to get at the misleading advertising, and I think not only will this amendment do that but it will have some very considerable bearing on the qualification of such persons to continue to hold a licence.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree with the hon. Attorney General, but I would remind him of two or three significant things: (a) the Act

was passed, (b) it has received Royal assent, (c) I have read ads with regard to six per cent interest and buying government-inspected cars since that Act was passed.

So I am back to my basic theme, namely, these are not all "good guys" and we have to administer this Act with some greater degree of vigour if we are going to achieve its original objective. I concur in it and I support it, even with the amendment with regard to advertising—but that is in effect now. I am reading from ads that have appeared since the Royal assent was given to that Act on April 14, if I recall that date correctly.

Perhaps I can clinch the main concern that I have, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the case of Ted Williamson—I am not going into all of the story because anybody who has read the papers will have it at his fingertips. Ron Haggart has done a very persistent study of this as a case history, and if the hon. Attorney General did not happen to hear an interview with the sales manager, Mr. Kelly, of Ted Williamson's firm that was conducted by Pierre Berton in his regular TV programme, I am going to send this over and let him read it at some time when his estimates are over and he is looking for an alternative to the whodunit when he is trying to go to sleep at nights. I say this to the hon. Minister, that if he can read this without coming to the conclusion that this man is a real operator, then I will strike a leather medal for him. Clearly this man is cutting corners, with the whole fantastic proposition of these offers of holidays in Florida and then he gets the people to sign somewhere further down in the contract in effect waiving the right to the holidays in Florida. All of these unnecessary come-ons, I think, are in the category of the "bananas"—he should be forced for about six months to live up to his holidays in Florida, and then he would cut out this nonsense and start to sell used cars.

But the important thing is that when I looked into this whole issue a year ago and took it up publicly when we could not persuade the hon. Attorney General's predecessor to take this whole issue seriously, I talked it over with the better business bureau. The better business bureau has been living, or trying to live, with this man for years. He was skating on the periphery all the while. He was just trying to live within the regulations, and you needed a one-man watchdog to watch this one man alone.

The question that arises in my mind, if the hon. Minister is really serious about going

after this, is how long do you play this sort of game? I would remind the hon. Minister that his Act has penalties and those penalties are \$2,000 or one year or both, for an individual who is charged, or \$25,000 for a corporation. Without having looked through, in any legal sense or in any court sense, I would say that Ted Williamson is a good first, either as a corporation or through some of the people in his firm. Those penalties should be imposed, not only the fine but one month in jail, too. Let us not go through a whole period such as the American anti-trust laws went through, where it took a couple of generations before the U.S. put some of the people in jail—for example, electrical industry heads who had been fleecing the continent of hundreds of millions of dollars down through the years. Let us just be tough about this and I think many of your problems will disappear rather quickly, because that is the only way you are going to let the people in the business who are the bad guys—if I may lapse into the vernacular again—know that you mean business and that they must cut out the nonsense which has resulted in an abuse of the public up until now.

The final point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, with some care, I said at the outset and I mean it, that I am convinced that the majority of the people in the used car business are as honourable people as you can get in any line of business. But it does not quite end there. This government and other governments have neglected this field for so long that abuses have grown up in the used car business that are now of epidemic proportions. As a result there are certain practices in the used car field which are indulged in by all the dealers—certainly by the majority of people in the used car field.

Let me take one instance and this is the question of meddling with the speedometers of cars. In one of his articles, Ron Haggart said, "The turning back of the mileage reading odometer, found on the speedometers of used cars, is a simple and straightforward piece of deception," and I do not see how anybody can deny it. Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, it is not simply a case of turning it back. In some instances of badly smashed cars, cases have been documented by Ron Haggart in pursuing this where they will turn it forward because they do not want the people to have the impression that there are only a few miles on it. The buyer will be a bit puzzled by it. Last fall I was quite intrigued by this aspect of the thing, by reading a Canadian Press story that was carried in

the *Globe and Mail* on September 25, which read as follows:

A former city street maintenance inspector said in Ontario Supreme Court here yesterday that all but three Ottawa car dealers set back speedometers. Melville George Warren, claiming damages for a back injury received in a car accident, said under examination that he was a specialist in setting back speedometers and that he worked for about 60 dealers around Ottawa. The court granted Mr. Warren \$1 in damages but did not inquire further into his statement.

The question that intrigues me is, what did the hon. Attorney General's department do about this? Conceivably it is no violation of the law. But I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that in some fashion or another, without underestimating the difficulties involved in it, that in this question of deceiving the consumer, one of the standard tactics that is used across the board, I would say by the majority of used car dealers, good and bad and otherwise, is the matter of changing the speedometer so that the consumer will not know what the true facts are with regard to that car. I draw it to the attention of the hon. Attorney General and invite him and his administrators to consider what can be done in the field.

Related to it is a final point, and that is the question of warranties. Less than one month ago, on April 15, there was an inquest held in this city in which the coroner was quoted as saying:

Coroner Brown: It is about time some check was made on used cars. I think every used car should have a warranty when it is sold.

I think this, too, is something that should be considered and implemented. If every used car dealer had to give a warranty that would be backed up so that the man would not have to go to court—there might be some automatic procedures for not living up to warranties—once again, I think you would get rid of a practice that is pretty widespread in the industry, particularly among the operators, of "dressing-up" a car, of making the necessary changes to give it the appearance of being a good car. But perhaps before you have gone three blocks the muffler drops off, and then a few other things begin to happen, and you find you have got a real lemon. This kind of thing is not an accident. It is not a lemon that has come off the assembly lines when first manufactured. This is deliberately created as a lemon. This is a calculated effort on the part of a used car

dealer to get something for nothing—to pawn off on the consumer a product for which he is not getting full dollar value.

On the two levels throughout the whole industry—the question of deceiving the public through manipulation of speedometers, and secondly, the necessity for a warranty which will sort of bring the whole used car field back into good repute again, so that you will know that when you buy a used car that you are not really in a pretty sharp game and are likely to get licked at it—I would appreciate if the hon. Minister might have some comments on the feasibility of these proposals.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would just say, Mr. Chairman, I find the remarks of the hon. member for York South interesting and I think many of the suggestions that he has put forward here are certainly worthy of consideration. Some of them I have had in mind. I would not propose to mention them specifically now. I think some of these things can be brought about, and as I say, some of them are at present within my own thinking and will be followed to whatever extent we find it feasible in the department. Perhaps when I talk on this subject again, I will be able to satisfy the hon. member that we are not idle. We have not just stopped with the enactment of The Used Car Dealers Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just make one other point? I am sorry, I just noticed that I had missed this.

I wonder if I might ask the hon. Attorney General about people who get into almost a professional business of towing cars away. There was a story just a few weeks ago of one, Walter Howson, whose Ace Towing Company hauls away parked cars. He sought and failed to get a parking lot licence here in the city of Toronto. I am wondering, for example, whether this man has a used car licence? Indeed, my wondering goes one step further, provoked by a very interesting letter that was carried in the Toronto *Daily Star* a few days ago, May 8, by one Henry S. Rosenberg. He is a lawyer. His letter is rather brief. I think I will put it on the record:

With the increasing congestion of traffic in Toronto more signs are appearing: "Cars will be towed away at owner's expense." This raises many questions. Does such a sign give someone the right to take the law in his own hands? Does it not require an order of the court to seize someone else's property? Can the towing company charge someone who gave them no instructions? Can they charge for storing

the automobile until it is picked up or might they be subject to an action for damages for conversion? Maybe the illegal parker is subject to an action for damages. What if an accident occurs while the automobile is being towed away? Is the insurer of the automobile owner responsible? Also, if they have the right to tow it away have they the right to drive it away?

In other words, periodically I get calls at my office with regard to people who are deeply indignant at some arbitrary action in this field, and I am wondering if the hon. Attorney General, apart from commenting on this specific case and whether or not he has a used car licence, could comment on the whole legal aspects of this game of towing cars away.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, first of all I do not believe that the professional tower, if that is what you might call him, needs a used car licence to operate. They do not necessarily deal in used cars.

Mr. MacDonald: Do they need any licence?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think not, except a garage licence—I do not know—

Mr. MacDonald: Presumably a garage licence to be able to park them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Perhaps a garage licence if he keeps the car. But I think there have been a number of these cases taken to court and I think in most cases the man who interfered with the car—who towed it, or kept it, or held it—was found in the wrong, in the nature of a trespass. I have not got a case on my desk but I have read of the cases. I think I would have to say this on the matter of legalities that each case would, I think, depend on its own circumstances, whether there is a contract, whether the car was stored, whether there were storage charges. I think in many cases there is no right whatever for someone just to take a car and tow it off and assert a right of his own volition, pure and simple, of his own assertion. The court, if the case is taken to court, I think in almost every case will say there is no such right. There might be a counteraction of trespass, if the car is put on somebody's private property and left there. But to take that car and assert rights to it, to hold it and tow it, I think is completely out of legality altogether.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I want to get on to a different subject, and I want to discuss for a while the question of coroners in

the province of Ontario. This has been a topic about which there has been great public discussion and, I would say, substantial public concern as to whether or not this office has been run as it should be, whether or not there are better ways of running the coroner's office and what those ways might be.

I am certain that the hon. Attorney General is familiar with the report prepared by Mr. Eric Silk, Dr. David Gemmell and Dr. Ward Smith, which dealt with their examination in 1960 of the coroner's office, and the many recommendations that are in that report.

That report runs some 41 pages, and during the immediate session of the Legislature after it was brought in, an Act was introduced amending The Coroners Act. This embodied a number of the recommendations, but not all of them. The next time The Coroners Act was dealt with was in this session of the Legislature, when the hon. Attorney General brought in an amending Act which dealt with two more of the recommendations that are in this report, and some additional ones that are not mentioned.

It is my thought, Mr. Chairman, that the coroner's office has not really been thoroughly examined since Mr. Silk and his committee did it in 1960. The Attorney General did come in with some recommendations. He also picked up a few that were here, and a few that were perhaps obvious on the surface, and incorporated them. I have been through that Act again and we discussed it very briefly on its way through the House. There is nothing wrong in that amending Act, but to my mind, as I tried to indicate on second reading and apparently I was out of order, it falls far short of the real examination of the coroner's department that should take place, and the sort of attention and thinking we must bring to this very important office.

I do not suppose that today in this province we can talk too long about coroners without bringing in the name of Doctor Shulman, because around that gentleman revolves a very substantial amount of controversy. In fact, in his report which he made available, apparently at his own expense—and I am sure the hon. Attorney General has seen a copy of it—he is quite open in his criticisms of methods, procedures and personalities.

I am not going to deal in any great detail with his criticism of personalities, or with his references to particular inquests, but there is one reference here where he refers to comments made by the supervising coroner Doctor Cotnam—I am referring now to page

28 of his report—and also to the deputy Attorney General. He says:

Three days after the hearing of a particular inquest, the supervising coroner stated to the press, in the presence of the deputy Attorney General, the post of chief coroner is superfluous and should be abolished.

Some weeks later the deputy Attorney General announced to the press his plans to abolish the post of chief coroner.

It seems to me that this kind of flying of trial balloons, insofar as the Attorney General's office is concerned, has to stop. If the hon. Attorney General has come to the conclusion that this office is superfluous, then I would think that rather than allowing his officials to make this sort of statement in leaking stories to the press—one of the newspapers featured this at great length and it ran for a day or two, and public opinion grew up—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Is the hon. member suggesting that this was put out by the Attorney General as his opinion through one of his officials?

Mr. Singer: Well—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If so, I may say there is no basis whatever for it.

Mr. Singer: All right, I accept the hon. Attorney General's statement. The Attorney General is an honourable man and certainly I would not disagree with him, but nevertheless, Dr. Shulman, in his report, refers to two statements, one of which he attributes to the supervising coroner, one of which he attributes to the deputy Attorney General.

One of the Toronto papers featured on the front page a story with banner headlines the suggestion—the writer sits in the gallery up here—that the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto was going to be fired. A few days later the hon. Attorney General said he had no intention of doing this.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This year?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The same day the Attorney General said it, the morning edition said he was going to be fired, and in the House, the first moment when the House sat the same day, the Attorney General said this was pure speculation.

Mr. Singer: All right. Nevertheless, the fact is this writer came back the day after—I did not bother to bring those clippings—and again said that he had information from the

Attorney General's department that lent substantial credence to these suggestions, and that it was, in his opinion, the flying of a trial balloon.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why we must go on with speculation. I cannot control a reporter who wishes to speculate. And if the reporter says he has a source, the only way I know to put an end to that sort of statement is to say to him, "Who was it? Name him." I said that story was the purest speculation.

Mr. Singer: All right. You said that story was pure speculation as far as you were concerned. Do you deny that the statements attributed to the supervising coroner and to your deputy were speculation, or are they factual?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The deputy, I know, never said any such thing.

Mr. Singer: The deputy never said that, so what is on page 28 is in fact wrong?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a year ago, is it?

Mr. Singer: No, this is the report which is dated—his last annual report—1964, but was—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Referring to an incident that occurred a year before?

Mr. Singer: He says, "Shortly after the particular inquest." It is the inquest that involves a clinic, yes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was a year ago?

Mr. Singer: That these statements were made.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know why we are talking about this at all.

Mr. Singer: My point, nevertheless, is that when senior officials, whether they made these statements a year ago, a month ago, or a week ago—these statements are attributed to senior officials—it would seem to me that somebody, perhaps not my hon. friend, is flying trial balloons. I suggest that you are flying trial balloons because you have not made up your mind which way the coroner's office should be run. No one would say insofar as the role of Dr. Shulman is concerned that he has not brought a new approach to the coroner's office. No one is going to deny, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that some of the different procedures that he has instigated have released to the public information which, by and large, the public

feels it is entitled to. No one can deny, on the other hand, that there has not been some substantial criticism by many people of Dr. Shulman's approach. As a matter of fact, he stirred up a real hornets' nest, and revolving around this whole discussion, Mr. Chairman, I think we have to determine where does the coroner's office go in the future; what is the policy; what is the policy of this government insofar as the future of the coroner's office is concerned.

For instance, does it make sense, Mr. Chairman, that a point that has been argued about for a considerable length of time apparently is decided by a statement of the supervising coroner, and that relates to the right to cross-examine witnesses? We have not heard—or I have not heard—any official pronouncement from the hon. Attorney General that the procedure is going to be changed. By and large, the rule seems to be—and certainly there is nothing in the statutes about it—that the cross-examination of witnesses at coroners' inquests is not allowed. Occasionally, the odd coroner does allow it.

Dr. Cotnam says he decides that a major change in policy is going to be initiated and the lawyers are going to get the right to quiz inquest witnesses. It would seem to me, sir, that this is one of the primary safeguards that should be written into the statutes and it should not be made to depend on the momentary announcement of a governmental official, which has no force or endorsement of statutory authority. It would seem to me, sir, that if this is government policy—and I think it should be—where a person's reputation is at stake there should be a right for that person to appear at a coroner's inquest and to be represented by counsel there and to have the inalienable right to ask, through his lawyer, questions of witnesses who are damaging his reputation.

It may well be—and I suspect that it is if the hon. Attorney General agrees with this—but if this is so, then, sir, I am suggesting it is very wrong.

It is very wrong that the only notification of this change of policy is a statement attributed to the supervising coroner which was in the paper a few days ago, and which may or may not mean that all coroners under his jurisdiction, or all coroners in the province of Ontario, are going to follow this or are not going to follow this. In other words, this is one particular example which leads to the very obvious conclusion, that there should be rules laid down as to how coroners' inquests are conducted and that those rules should be in a statute or in regulations where they can

be referred to and where they apply to all inquests.

I suggest that we have not got those; that the rule of conduct of inquests—what did they say about the rule of law?—that it is as long as the chancellor's foot?—the rule of the conduct of inquests is about as long as the coroner's foot and it varies from coroner to coroner and this is not as it should be. It should be the same in Kapuskasing as it is in Kingston and Metropolitan Toronto, and the rules should all be the same. That is point number one.

Then, sir, I note from the press that a story attributed to the hon. Attorney General on May 3, suggests that doctors are not suited—at least this is the head on the story—doctors are not suited to run inquests, and with this I am not in violent disagreement. Reference is made by Mr. Silk and his colleagues in his report, to the system of medical examiners. He came to the conclusion, and I do not share his view, he came to the conclusion in 1960, that the medical examiner system, as it exists in some American jurisdictions, was perhaps not the best system and should not be incorporated into the province of Ontario.

Now, the hon. Attorney General makes the point—and I think there is some substantial validity in it—that perhaps there could well be a legally trained person running these courts. A person who would be more acutely aware of rules and regulations, more acutely aware of statutes, more acutely aware of the common law, and that perhaps the coroner, as we know him today, would become the chief inquisitor, the chief investigator, the chief witness, and generally the person who lays all of the groundwork.

I think there is some very substantial merit in this, but it surprises me, Mr. Chairman, that this sort of a statement—if it represents the hon. Attorney General's thinking, and I think it is important that we know his thinking—is just sort of thrown off at random. If the hon. Attorney General thinks this is valid, or thinks an inquiry into this sort of approach is a valid one, then I would think that he should come to us here in the House and say that he has grave doubts about the present functioning of the office. That maybe one of the improvements we could make is this one, or that one or another one, and we are going to go off and we are going to set up machinery whereby we are going to reorganize the office of the coroner.

I would far rather see the coroner's office run from within this House, the way it should be, than run by newspaper stories—and I think this is a very important point—rather

than run by newspaper stories on the hon. Attorney General's views; rather than run by newspaper stories about whether or not lawyers are going to have the right to cross-examine; rather than run by newspaper stories about somebody's opinion about the chief coroner in Metro. I think pronouncements of this sort, which are very, very important, Mr. Chairman, should be made within the context of legislative responsibility and I am suggesting that they are not made within the context of legislative responsibility.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): You want managed news, do you?

Mr. Singer: No, I do not want managed news, my friend. What I am suggesting is that when the government sees fit to change a policy or to improve a policy, it should do it within the context of legislative responsibility. I do not think that it lies within the mouth of a governmental official to throw out an idea saying that he thinks that maybe it will be an improvement.

This is a very serious matter we are dealing with and if the hon. Attorney General and those responsible with him have come to the conclusion that there is a better way of doing things, then with all of the power and authority that they have vested in them, they should say that in their opinion this is the way it should be and this is the way it is going to be. I object very strongly, to persons in this position who cannot speak.

The hon. Attorney General would like on occasion—upon many occasions—to say what is his opinion on many things, but in his position as the first law officer of the province, whenever he makes a pronouncement in public, fortunately or unfortunately, it has a tone of authority, as it should have. The only way the Attorney General can avoid that is not to make these statements in public because when the present occupant of the office makes a statement and the press are there and take it down, it seems to have—naturally it seems to have because he is the responsible Minister—a very definite tone of authority. The same follows with his deputy and the same, I think, follows with the supervising coroner in so far as statements that relate to that office.

If the supervising coroner wants to go off and talk about used car dealers or something else, perhaps he could be regarded in that instance as venturing a private opinion. But when he talks about his office, then I think he appears to be at least talking with some public authority about an office with which he is concerned and unless he means it, un-

less this is going to be policy, then I do not think it should be said.

This brings me to the ultimate point, my real suggestion insofar as to how we are going to handle the coroner's office. To my mind, sir, there is a real problem in separating the whole coroner's office from political control—from the control of the Attorney General who is elected as a political person.

How do we avoid this? Is there a way? I think, Mr. Chairman, that there is a way of avoiding this. There is a bill in my name standing on the order paper about an ombudsman, or parliamentary commissioner—and my general theory—insofar as an ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner is concerned in relation to administrative problems and the difficulties people get themselves involved in dealing with an administrative board—is that the province of Ontario should appoint a parliamentary commissioner, who has the same sort of independence as the provincial auditor has; who is in fact that appointee, not of the government, but the appointee of the Legislature. This man—if he is appointed, and I hope some day he will be—would be independent and as far removed as he could be from the day-to-day political influence that could otherwise be attached to him if he came under the control and under the aegis of a political appointee, such as my hon. friend, the Attorney General.

So, Mr. Chairman, it would be my feeling, my very strong feeling—and I put this forward as a concrete suggestion—that we need someone holding the coroner's office as removed as he can be from even the suggestion of political interference; that this man could well be an ombudsman for investigating deaths, or an ombudsman for deaths.

It is in the public interest—in the real public interest—that when a death has taken place under the circumstances that are enumerated under section 7 of the Act—the suspicious ones in public institutions and jails and so on, all through all those enumerations—there is not only a curiosity, but a public concern that if there is anything wrong with the circumstances surrounding that death, that it be fully and completely investigated.

We do not have time, sir, in this important office to engage in the clash of personalities that has so obviously existed between the chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto, the supervising coroner, and probably officials in the hon. Attorney General's department.

It would be my thought that this coroner should have the same sort of role that the provincial auditor has, or that the ombuds-

man for administrative matters would have; that he could be and would be the appointee of the Legislature in the same sense that the provincial auditor is or the ombudsman would be if my Act is adopted, that he would mandatorily report every year to the Legislature. The Legislature could every year review his appointment and review his report, and the Legislature would have the power to hire that man or to fire that man. It seems to me, sir, that we must bring some order out of the chaos in this important office.

The whole complexion of the office has changed since the advent of the chief coroner of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Certainly much good has come from his advent and many people have suggested there are some things wrong with his advent. I notice that my colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), quoted in the papers today as he made his submission to Chief Justice McRuer, criticizes some of the things that have gone on in some of the inquests in which this gentleman was concerned. I am not without criticism, either—it is not all black and it is not all white—but I think he has brought a new approach, and I think it is a new approach that is important to the people of Toronto.

It is my thought, Mr. Chairman, that we have to examine the office of coroner thoroughly in the province of Ontario. I think the difficulty is in the possibility of political influence swaying him, the possibility of political influence interfering with his apparent independent duty, the same as with a magistrate or with a judge. If somebody wants to come here after this system begins and say, "We don't like the chief coroner for Metro," or "We don't like the supervising coroner," he should be available for criticism in the same way as these other officials.

But in the meantime and within those terms of reference it is my suggestion that we have a coroner who could be called an ombudsman for deaths, who would and should be politically independent and would carry on with his duty subject to regular reviews by this legislative assembly.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word about the matter that the hon. member has been discussing, that of coroners. I would say this first of all, that on March 22 this year in this House I introduced a bill to amend The Coroners Act. The bill received first reading, and at that time I said—I would just like to read again what is in *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, to give the House an explanation of the purpose and intent of this

bill, I think I should say that considerable study has been going forward with respect to The Coroners Act and the coroners' procedures generally. This is now before the law reforms commission out of which may come a different procedure or re-writing of the Act. That remains to be seen. This Act simply defines certain additional powers or limits, or extends certain powers with respect to the supervising coroner and other procedures with respect to the holding of coroners' inquests.

By that I intended to convey to the House that the whole matter of the coroner's office and the coroner's inquest was a subject of study, and actually I tried perhaps to indicate that it had been receiving study in my office. Then we felt perhaps we should have the benefit of the law reform commission study.

I have been correctly quoted in the papers and I believe on other news media as saying that I think there is a good deal of merit in the medical examiner's system, and I said, with much respect to my friends of the medical profession, that they do not always turn out to be the best people to conduct what should be a rather judicial procedure. They do not observe the necessary correct rules of evidence, they do not see that the proper questions are asked, or perhaps they permit questions to be asked that should not be asked. In the medical examiner's system a medical person says, "Here is a death, there may be misfeasance, there may be intent, there may be malfeasance, there may be criminal negligence," or something of this sort, but when the inquiry starts it is conducted by a magistrate in a court. I think there is some merit in this and it is being studied.

I do not want to stand in this House and criticize officials of my department or any department because they may sometimes err—and sometimes this happens—in making a statement that I think with the best of intent may verge into the area of policy. There are ways of controlling this thing and if it becomes a serious matter I am not unaware of how to contend with it and how to take care of it, but generally we do not have too much trouble. I think a coroner outlining what he thinks might be a procedure in a court may be laying down something that perhaps just indicates what I have been saying—trying to state legal rules which may not apply. As a matter of fact, just to clear this point, the right of a person and a witness in the court to examine or to cross-examine in a coroner's inquest, which is not an accusatory court, does not exist.

Mr. Singer: Maybe it should—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have just been handed a note by the law officers of my department that in a recent case in the Supreme Court of Canada—I have not seen this myself—it was held that the provisions of a Saskatchewan Act relating to the admissibility of evidence in this type of inquiry was *ultra vires*, that this is a criminal matter when you are looking into an inquiry which may have criminal aspects in a coroner's inquest, and that the rules of evidence are federal rules. This is apparently what this case held. I would think anyone saying "I am going to lay down a procedure," who is not a judge or a legal gentleman, may be outside of his field.

Mr. Singer: That is my very point.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must say I agree with the hon. member, that there are rules, there are lines within which policy should go and be determined and that is at the ministerial level. This I want to make very clear, however: I do not understand him, I do not think I understand him. I was going to say that if I did understand him I would disagree that there is any political interference, so far as I am aware, by coroners. I do not know where politics reaches out and touches coroners. I am unaware of it, at least as coming from this ministry to the supervising coroner, chief coroner or coroner whatever-he-may-be. I do not know of politics or political interference as the hon. member used it, where he fears it or where he finds it. I know of no instances of it.

Whether an ombudsman—or a parliamentary commissioner, or call him what you will, fits into our type of government at all or not is another question. I will not debate it at this moment, but to say that because he would take over the coroner's type of service I do not think makes him any less political, if there is politics here, and I do not see it. I just do not accept, I just reject the idea that there is any politics or political interference or political influence reaching down to the coroners. I do not find it. That is all I would say.

Mr. Singer: Just in very brief answer to my hon. friend I suggest that all of the trial and tribulation and discussion about the merits or demerits of the chief coroner for Metropolitan Toronto seems to revolve around his opinion of how things should be done, which occasionally flies in the face of other opinions of what should be done. The criticisms that have been made of him by other officials, who are political officials in

the sense that they are the hon. Attorney General's servants—the hon. Attorney General is responsible for them—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Both the chief coroner and the supervising coroner of course are my responsibility.

Mr. Singer: That is right, that is right.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: But because they take contrary or differing viewpoints at times, whether for good or bad, for better or for worse, I do not think this is political in-fighting at all.

Mr. Singer: My hon. friend and I are not ad idem, as we say, on the meaning of the word "political." I used it in my remarks on February 9, and when the hon. Attorney General was introducing his estimates—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I commented on that; when I introduced my estimates I said I had no politics in this department.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Without repeating that same view that I have at any great length, there can be good politics and bad politics. I am merely suggesting, and I repeat this, I feel it very strongly, that when the hon. Attorney General, who is a political appointee, makes a decision, albeit how good it is, he is making a political decision. He could make bad political decisions and he has shown an abhorrence to making many bad political decisions. I commend him so far as the registry offices were concerned, and I commended him for it; instead of bringing in outsiders he has recognized the ability of deputy registrars and has promoted them. That is a political decision but it is a good one and he deserves to be commended for it.

What I am suggesting now is that as long as the tight control of the coroner's office remains a political control—and I am not necessarily suggesting that this means that the politics of anyone in that office is Conservative, Liberal or NDP—it is a political decision and there is this sort of conflict that the sort of freedom that could and should be attached to the coroner's office, in the same way that it is attached to the provincial auditor's office, is not there. It is my very strong feeling that rather than giving the Attorney General anything more to say about the coroner's office, the coroner's office should be in the same category as the provincial auditor's office—that the coroner should be the subject of the legislative control, that he should be appointed after a vote in the Legislature, that he should be given his duties, and that he can only be removed after the

Legislature has decided that he should be removed. I suggest that a group of officials who perform this sort of function, have to be put into that position so that those offices can be properly run. In that sense, I was using the word "political" and I think this is an intelligent suggestion and one that should commend itself to the hon. Attorney General. Certainly it needs no prophet to see that not only have we had serious trouble in this office, but unless some drastic step is taken to improve the running of the office and, if nothing else, the personality problem is worked out, we are going to have continuing trouble in that office. Some different approach has to be taken.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, during the debates of the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions I raised certain questions about an inquest which took place in Guelph on September 9—an inquest concerning the death of Ronald Cross of Belleville.

Cross had been an inmate of the Guelph reformatory, and he died of heart failure on his way in from work on August 20, 1964. The inquest was called; it took place on September 9, 1964. I think the case was prepared by Guelph lawyer, J. M. Kearns, who—we learned from the report in the *Toronto Telegram* of April 3—at 87, is the oldest Crown counsel in the province. The verdict at that time was that there had been no negligence, as far as the evidence showed, on the part of the reformatory staff.

Certain questions were raised, Mr. Chairman, and at that time the Minister said this—page 1889 of *Hansard*—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I am saying that if you are not satisfied with the coroner's inquest, and the way it was handled, take it up with the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). He is competent to answer these questions and I am not.

During our questioning of that inquest, this was the answer: That this was properly a matter of the Attorney General's department. We accepted that as proper, and so at this time we raise the matter to try to find some of the answers.

The questions we raised were primarily those concerning the conduct of the inquest; the lack of witnesses and the lack of certain evidence that we felt should have been presented.

On page 1892, Mr. MacDonald is quoted as saying this:

Mr. Chairman, the reason I rise at this point is that I would like to add one other aspect here with regard to the rather

puzzling fact that key people were not called as witnesses. I received information a few days before this coroner's jury inquest was held, and as a result of that, I called Dr. Cotnam and informed him that it had been suggested to me that all of the evidence would not be put before the coroner's jury. I suggested that with this forewarning, word could be passed on to the coroner who was involved so that he would be sharply alerted to make certain that every conceivable witness who might be in a position to contribute relevant evidence would be called.

I got a call back, either from Dr. Cotnam or somebody in his office, I cannot quite recall that aspect of it now, indicating that anybody who wanted to come, could testify. I suggested in a return call to Dr. Cotnam that this was not good enough, there are some people who are not free to come, for a variety of reasons. I said, I repeat once again, the coroner who is going to be responsible for this inquest knows in advance that there are some people who believe that all of the witnesses are not going to be called.

And then again on page 2004 of *Hansard*, a letter which was read by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) into the record at that time from Patrick Lindsay, a one-time custodial officer in Guelph. He says:

With reference to the news media in regards to the death of an inmate last year, it is true that all witnesses were not called. I, for one, was involved. I cannot, due to my oath, elaborate further. I did, however, deliver to the Attorney General's secretary on or about November 9, 1964, private and confidential information pertaining to this case and other conditions. There was further correspondence between myself and the Attorney General plus two telephone conversations. This honourable gentleman thanked me for this information and asked my permission to turn it over to the Minister of Reforms. I complied with this request.

Using just a small excerpt here, Hon. Mr. Grossman, on page 2006, is quoted as saying: —conducted the inquiries and investigated every charge made in the letter, with the exception of one concerning the evidence given or withheld at the inquest into the death of an inmate, which he was instructed to lay in the area of concern of the Attorney General.

So, evidently, this matter was placed squarely before the Attorney General, and it is a matter for him to deal with.

There are several questions which we raised and which I will repeat to the hon. Attorney General. On page 34 of the transcript of the inquest, I find these words:

This is the superintendent speaking and he said: "The report states that a couple of weeks ago the above-named inmate asked me for a work board out of the kitchen. He said he hated working inside and that he wanted on the main work party. He was returned to the main work party and that was the final dealing I had with him."

That is May 26. That is page 34 of the evidence. Then when I turn to page 1888 of *Hansard*, I find that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions says this, speaking of Cross:

He was not put in detention until, on August 10 and 11, he was brought before the superintendent on the two consecutive days on a series of charges, such as gambling, possession of contraband, and possession of money.

The superintendent's evidence says that he did not see him. The last dealings he had with him would be in May. The hon. Minister says that August 10 and 11 he was brought before the superintendent on two consecutive days on a series of charges.

I understand that in an institution of this kind, the superintendent or his deputy is the one who sentences inmates to detention of this kind and also releases them, and then one of these people is supposed to visit these detention areas each day. The question arises naturally as to who did sentence Cross to detention, who released him and who did visit him during this period, if the evidence given in the sworn statement before the inquest is correct.

The family was not notified of this inquest and here again questions arise. On page 1890, in a statement, the hon. Minister says:

I think the institution felt that the family would have been subpoenaed by the Crown attorney and expected that they would have been there. Mr. Harloff, the assistant superintendent, attended the funeral with the family and spoke to the parents. He took it for granted that the Crown attorney or the coroner would have informed them of the inquest.

On page 35 of the evidence we find this statement:

The Coroner: You don't know whether his mother knows of this inquest being held?

This is the superintendent:

A. No, personally I do not. I just didn't think of it. I didn't know if we should. I just didn't think of it. It might have been an oversight on my part.

This would almost indicate that the superintendent, or the department in this case, was indicating who should be called to the inquest, and here the admission is that it is an oversight on the part of the department.

Q. Under normal circumstances, all those acquainted with it, they turn up at these inquests?

A. Well, if there is anything, I did not think of it. The people in Belleville, they are in Belleville and they are in straitened circumstances.

Then who did decide who was to be called to the inquest? Who decided what witnesses should come? Who decided whether the parents should be notified of this inquest or not, and why was the warning, issued by the hon. member for York South to the supervising coroner, ignored?

During the course of the inquest other things were noted by us as we brought this to the attention of the House. Ronald Cross was in detention for several days prior to his death—in detention on a limited diet with limited exercise, and naturally this would mean that violent exercise following this might have some adverse effect. No mention was made of this at the inquest. No witnesses who were acquainted with this fact were called. No evidence was submitted about a medical problem that he had in detention.

The hon. member for Riverdale and I talked to Dr. Mellow in regard to this and he told us that he had prescribed for a stomach ailment during the period that Cross was in detention, that Cross had evidently come to the hospital, had been given the medication and had been returned. Then we asked the question as to whether any careful diagnosis had been made at that time to make sure that the pain reported was indeed indigestion, because a pain in the chest can be a variety of things. There certainly was a record of Cross's problem as far as the heart was concerned. His mother said that they had notified the institution. She says, according to a report in the *Telegram* on April 3:

The mother of an inmate of the Guelph Reformatory, who died while returning from a work gang assignment, charged last night that officials knew full well her son had a dangerous heart condition. "We also told the parole board that he couldn't do

any strenuous work when we applied for his release last July."

She was anxious for investigation into this and Mr. Cross was, too. He said he would like to have investigated fully the circumstances of his son's death but could not, because of a lack of money. An investigation, he said, would not help bring Ronnie back but maybe some other boys might get the good of it. And so the question emerges as to why no mention was made of this problem which occurred just days prior to the boy's death.

We raise the question, too, as to why the records were not called for about the treatment given Cross from time to time, especially during that period of detention. We also pointed out that there was a statement by Cross's mother that Grant Wiltshire of Belleville, who had also been an inmate at the same time and who had been on the work gang that afternoon with Cross, said that Cross had complained about trouble that afternoon, just prior to his death. Whether Wiltshire conveyed this to other people or not, or whether those complaints were heard by others in the work gang, or whether Cross himself asked those in charge of the work gang to excuse him because of his trouble, we do not know because no witnesses were called—no witnesses from the work gang and as far as the custodial officer in charge of the work gang was concerned, he was not asked about this aspect of the situation.

We put these questions before you, Mr. Attorney General. The questions I have asked are very simple ones and I think call for a straightforward answer. Who decided what witnesses should be called and how were these decisions made? Why were the parents not notified of the inquest? Why was no mention made of Cross being in detention for several days prior to his death? Why was no evidence submitted about his medical problem while in detention? Why was no inquiry made as to whether a careful diagnosis was made at the time to make sure that the pain reported was indeed indigestion? Why were no records called for as to the medication given Cross from time to time, especially during that period of his detention? Why was no inquiry made as to whether Cross complained of trouble on the day he died, particularly in view of the statement his mother made about the information she received from Wiltshire? Why were the inmates working with Cross on August 20 not called as witnesses, and why were the custodial officers who dealt with Cross during his detention not called? And

above all, why was the letter, or the information conveyed to the hon. Attorney General by Mr. Lindsay, evidently ignored in connection with this case and a warning issued by the hon. member for York South to the supervising coroner discounted and also ignored?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the decision that was brought down by the jury in the case of the death of Ronald Franklin Cross, was based on very limited information. It was based on the evidence of witnesses who were called; but many witnesses were in close contact with Cross during the period of his sickness and death, and many witnesses who might have been called and certainly must have been known by The Department of Reform Institutions as closely connected with this, were ignored and not called to that inquest.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we place this before the hon. Attorney General; it has been placed on his doorstep by another department of his government and so we bring it to him and ask that at this time, he give us answers to the questions that we have asked.

I notice in the *Toronto Daily Star* of April 3, that the hon. Attorney General is quoted as saying that he would consult with the supervising coroner about the case of Ronald Franklin Cross to see if evidence should have been produced which was not presented, and the *Star* report goes on to say:

Mr. Wishart said that if preliminary study shows that charges of a New Democratic Party critic have substance, his department would conduct a full-scale investigation.

Certainly, in light of the facts that have been brought before you this afternoon, Mr. Minister, it seems to me that a full-scale investigation is called for and that such an investigation should be undertaken without delay.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I have a very complete file on this matter, including the very voluminous report of the supervising coroner, Dr. Cotnam, which is dated May 10, 1965. I have the statement of the man, Lindsay, apparently the witness who felt he should have been called but who was not called; the report of Mr. Hills, the executive officer, and the transcript of all the evidence; the report of Dr. Wright, the director of psychiatry, and the report of Inspector Duguid of the criminal investigation branch of the Ontario provincial police, and in reporting this to the House I should like hon.

members to know that there has been the most thorough investigation, I think, that the case required. It has been gone into extremely thoroughly as I undertook would be done.

I could put a great deal of this material on the record and I am quite prepared to do so; it will take some time but I think I may say to the House to begin with that I am satisfied there was no serious result occasioned by the failure to call the witness who indicated that he had something to say. The statement indicates that he had nothing which would have added in a material way to the evidence before the jury, both in my view and in the view of other persons who have examined and investigated this case.

It must be admitted that the failure to notify the parents of the inquest is something that I regret; it was something that was an oversight and something that should not have happened. I have no explanation for it; it was just oversight, without any excuse. The parents, however, I would be quick to point out, were notified at the time of the boy's death, which preceded the inquest by some weeks, and they were promptly notified of, and were aware and present at, the funeral arrangements and everything in connection with the death itself.

I think the fact that they were not at the inquest is an oversight which is regrettable, but I do not think it is a matter that they make a great point of.

The fact that evidence was not given at the inquest that the boy had been in solitary confinement for some ten days or thereabouts prior to his death, as indicated in the material I have of the investigation, had no bearing on his death. That is the finding of those who examined him; of those who assessed his condition and I presume if there was any reason to leave that out, it might have been for the feelings of his parents, that he had been in solitary confinement. I mention that in reviewing the matter generally.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps the best way to answer the questions which the hon. member for Yorkview has raised, is to read the report of the supervising coroner, and perhaps the statement of Lindsay, to show what content there is to it. The report of the supervising coroner dated May 10, 1965, is addressed to me, as Attorney General, and it reads:

Sir:

As you are well aware, Mr. Donald C. MacDonald, MPP, in a press release of April 2, 1965, stated that vital evidence

had been suppressed at the inquest held into the above death—

that is the death of Ronald Franklin Cross:

—in spite of the fact that he had twice warned the office of the supervising coroner that evidence might be withheld. I was absent from my office when Mr. MacDonald called. However, Mr. E. J. Hills spoke to him about this matter and attached is a memo from Mr. Hills concerning their conversation and what was done to ensure that all relevant evidence would come out at the inquest, which was held in Guelph on September 9, 1964, with Dr. H. Frank Farmer presiding as coroner, and Mr. J. M. Kearns, QC, in attendance as Crown attorney. The inquest appeared to proceed in a normal manner and I heard nothing further until Mr. MacDonald gave his statement to the press.

Following this, it was decided to check out this whole investigation and inquest thoroughly, in order to satisfy myself whether vital evidence had been suppressed or not. A transcript of the evidence was obtained and reviewed—

this, I have here:

—which covered the circumstances leading up to and surrounding the death of the deceased in a thorough manner.

The verdict seemed to be a reasonable one on the evidence given. It should be noted on page 37 of the transcript that the coroner remarked that anyone else present could volunteer any additional evidence, but there was no one else present who had not already given evidence. The inquest date was announced in the local newspaper, the *Guelph Mercury*, on September 3, 1964, so anyone else could attend and give evidence if relevant.

On Wednesday, April 14, 1965, I proceeded to Guelph with Inspector G. A. Duguid of the criminal investigation bureau of the Ontario provincial police to personally see the living and working conditions in Guelph reformatory and also have an interview with the Crown attorney, the coroner and the officials at the reformatory.

I also examined the deceased person's medical records thoroughly while he was an inmate on this admission and also from

a previous admission. I understand Inspector Duguid is forwarding a copy of his report to Mr. Frank Wilson.

From our combined investigation it would appear that the alleged suppression of evidence refers to the fact that the deceased man was in solitary confinement during the week prior to his death to discipline him for repeated breaches of the rules and that this contributed to his death in some manner and these facts were deliberately withheld at the inquest, which is not the case. The evidence was not introduced for two reasons: one, it was not relevant to the cause of death; second, it would cause more unnecessary grief and suffering for his family.

Mr. Bryden: That is the feeblest excuse I ever heard.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, this is the supervising coroner's report.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is certainly a poor excuse.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Let me place it on the record.

Mr. Bryden: What a suggestion, the fact that a man was in solitary confinement could not possibly have any connection with his death; that is the most ridiculous nonsense I ever heard of.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that I might be allowed to put this on the record and then leave it open for comment.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, before we go any further, the suggestion that I gave my statement to the press is just another of the many inaccuracies that are emerging. I made no statement to the press. The statement I made was in this House in debate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am not aware that the hon. member made any statement to the press.

Mr. Bryden: The man who signed his name to that stands convicted of incapacity for his job.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 17, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, May 17, 1965

Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, continued	2989
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3022

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 208:

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, just before six o'clock, I was reading from the report of the supervising coroner, Dr. Cotnam, and I would continue reading from the report:

I examined the solitary cell area thoroughly and I would agree with the coroner that the period of confinement did not contribute to his death since he had no mistreatment there but merely segregation for purposes of discipline.

This is not a dark, miserable dungeon. It is warm, clean and well lighted, and although it is small, it contains a bed, toilet facilities, and there is space to move around. There is a washbasin immediately outside each cell and shower facilities at the end of a series of solitary cells. There is a guard constantly in attendance.

As part of the punishment the food is not as tasty and appealing as in the regular dining room but contains all the necessary calories, minerals and vitamins. If ill, a prisoner may be seen here by one of the attending physicians or may be taken to the hospital examining room. In fact, the deceased person did complain and asked to see the doctor a day or two prior to death and was examined at the hospital and treated for a stomach ailment and had no further complaints.

It has also been alleged that the medical authorities did not examine him properly when he was admitted as an inmate and were unaware of his heart condition and he was therefore allowed to do hard physical labour which eventually precipitated the heart failure and sudden death. These points were covered at the inquest. Medical records show the authorities were well aware that he had some type of heart disease, probably rheumatic in origin, and had advised no strenuous sports and

moderate restrictions on physical labour and work. He was therefore assigned to the tailor shop but he requested and begged instead to go with the work party outside, where he preferred to be, and consent was given by the authorities in order to accommodate and satisfy him.

Since he was always a very difficult prisoner to handle and rehabilitate he was given the easiest outside work possible with the work party. He had no further complaints prior to his sudden death while returning to the mess hall for luncheon. I personally observed the work party area, the labour they did, and no prisoner in my opinion is overworked in any manner. This is only moderate physical exercise by comparison to the work produced by our labourers in civilian life today. Prisoners have frequent rests and appear to be enjoying themselves under restricted but necessary circumstances.

The deceased's job was to loosen earth with tools at his own speed, so it could be placed in wheelbarrows and moved a few hundred feet for fill by other prisoners. The deceased did not have to use a wheelbarrow. No easier work was available if the deceased was to be accommodated with work outside, which he requested. In addition, the work day is not lengthy and there are breaks for smoking in the morning and afternoon and nearly two hours off for lunch.

However, the man did collapse and die suddenly while crossing the yard behind the mess hall to come in for luncheon. He had not complained that morning. They do not march to the mess hall, but rather just walk along at a leisurely gait. The doctor in attendance stated in his opinion that the prisoner could do any of this work and walking in spite of his known heart condition.

At the autopsy he was found to be suffering with endocardial fibroelastosis, which is an uncommon heart disease of obscure etiology, which is characterized by marked weakening of the lining and muscles of the heart with subsequent enlargement and eventual heart failure. Death

may come about slowly, similar to other types of heart disease and failure, but sudden death is not uncommon even while at rest.

This disease has been encountered within several members of the same family which is an interesting point in this case. It is our understanding, now, but not known prior to this death, that a teenage brother of the deceased dropped dead suddenly of heart failure due to the same pathological condition, while sitting quietly in a chair in the kitchen of his family home.

It is true that the doctor at the reformatory did not diagnose this precise pathology prior to death, but did make a tentative diagnosis of rheumatic heart disease, which may produce somewhat similar symptoms and signs. Endocardial fibroelastosis is not common. Frequently the condition is not accurately diagnosed during life. Even if it had been precisely identified before death, it is not likely that the doctor would have advised anything different with respect to his activities, which were already minimal since those afflicted may die while sitting or walking or even while lying in bed.

In my opinion, he suffered no mistreatment by the guards or senior officials while in custody which might have contributed to his death, or any neglectful or negligent treatment by the doctors at the reformatory under the existing circumstances—taking into consideration the fact that all prisoners, of necessity, must be treated and handled somewhat differently than free citizens in ordinary life, and also the additional fact that the deceased prisoner had always been a difficult person to handle and rehabilitate.

I am not aware of any other allegations of evidence being suppressed, or if any others should arise I would be pleased to check them out in an impartial and objective manner. Undoubtedly the parents and the next of kin should have been notified of the date and place of inquest well in advance. This was not done and was simply a careless and unintentional error. This has happened in previous cases and steps are being taken immediately to prevent a repetition.

Pursuant to section 17 of The Coroners Act, the Attorney General may order a second inquest if the first one has been improper or evidence has been suppressed or the cause of death was not determined accurately, etc. However, in the light of my present knowledge none of these conditions

exists and in my opinion a second inquest would serve no useful purpose.

For your information and comments or instructions,

Yours truly,

H. B. COTNAM, MD,

Supervising Coroner for Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to the report of the officer who investigated, Inspector Duguid of the criminal investigations branch. I may read a considerable part of this, but possibly or not necessarily all of it. The report is dated April 21, 1965:

Memorandum to the assistant commissioner, provincial police, special services division, re Ronald Franklin Cross, inmate of the Ontario reformatory, Guelph, Ontario—deceased:

With reference to the marginally noted, the following is submitted for the information of the supervising coroner of Ontario, Dr. H. B. Cotnam. On Tuesday, April 6, 1965, on the instruction of the chief superintendent, D. A. Nichol, I attended at the office of Dr. H. B. Cotnam, the supervising coroner for the province of Ontario, regarding assistance to that office. I was advised by Dr. Cotnam that as a result of the death of Ronald Franklin Cross, an inmate in the Ontario reformatory at Guelph, Ontario, on August 20, 1964, an inquest had been held by Dr. H. F. Farmer, coroner, Guelph, Ontario, in the city of Guelph, on September 9, 1964.

It was learned that several days prior to the inquest, the office of the supervising coroner had been advised by Mr. Donald C. MacDonald, MPP, leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party, that evidence would be suppressed at the forthcoming inquest. Mr. MacDonald was invited to have his client attend the inquest but the invitation, apparently, was not accepted.

Investigation revealed that on September 9, 1964, at the inquest into the death of inmate Cross, there was a total of nine witnesses from the reformatory which included the superintendent and the medical records and supervisory staff. Dr. R. P. Slinger, the pathologist at Guelph, Ontario, also gave evidence.

At the conclusion of the evidence, the coroner, having been forewarned, made special mention of the fact that anyone could testify at the inquest. However, there was unfortunately no one else present.

I presume he means in addition to the jury.

The jury retired for 25 minutes, after which time they returned the following verdict:

"We, the jury, inquiring into the death of Ronald Franklin Cross on August 20, 1964, at the Ontario reformatory in Guelph, find from evidence submitted that death was caused by abnormal heart condition, that officials of the institution were aware of the health condition and everything possible was done for his welfare, and that there was no indication of any neglect on the part of the officials."

Nothing further was heard of this matter until Donald C. MacDonald, MPP, raised the issued of suppressed evidence in the Legislature, and it was fully covered in the local news media beginning on April 2, 1965, and being covered daily for some time.

On Thursday, April 8, 1965, county Crown attorney J. M. Kearns, coroner Dr. H. F. Farmer, assistant superintendent E. J. Harloff, clerk of records R. Nash, and provincial constable J. Pitts of the Guelph detachment, who assisted in preparing the inquest, were all interviewed. On Monday, April 12, 1965, during a meeting with F. L. Wilson, assistant deputy Attorney General, and Dr. H. B. Cotnam, it was suggested that Mr. Patrick Lindsay, ex-guard at the Ontario reformatory, should be interviewed. It was alleged that Mr. Lindsay had informed Mr. MacDonald about evidence that would be suppressed at the inquest. It was also suggested that the area at the reformatory where inmate Cross had been employed, and the detention area he had been confined in as punishment four days prior to his death, be examined.

On Wednesday, April 14, 1965, in company with Dr. Cotnam, I proceeded to Guelph, where we interviewed Mr. Kearns, Mr. Harloff, medical staff at the reformatory, and examined the medical records. The work area where Cross had been employed was viewed, the method of returning inmates from the work area to the main building was observed, and the detention cell examined. At this time nothing was found which could be construed as harmful to the health of an inmate.

On Thursday, April 15, 1965, I again proceeded to Guelph where I interviewed Mr. Patrick Lindsay, 39 Dublin Street, who had been formerly employed at the Ontario reformatory as a guard. Mr. Lindsay agreed to give a statement which he dictated. In this statement, he relates the facts of having taken inmate Cross to the reformatory hospital on August 14, 1964, from the

detention cell. He relates certain symptoms exhibited by the inmate which alarmed him. It is further stated that he felt he should have been called at the inquest and that the inquest should have been made aware of the confinement of inmate Cross in detention cells.

The facts of this visit to the hospital by Cross were documented on his personal records, and diagnosed as a gastric complaint, which was treated. No further complaint was heard from this inmate.

In dealing with Mr. Lindsay, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not he was using this matter and the attendant publicity as a means of embarrassing The Department of Reform Institutions and the senior officers of the reformatory, as he apparently was in conflict with them on numerous matters.

It is at present felt that no evidence was omitted or suppressed at the inquest that would in any way be relevant to the circumstances surrounding the death of inmate Cross.

Find attached copy of the statement of Mr. Lindsay.

And I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I shall read this:

Statement of Patrick Lindsay, dated April 15, 1965: Patrick Lindsay, 39 Dublin Street South, Guelph, Ontario.

On or about August 14, 1964, at approximately 10 a.m., while directing the cleaners in the detention cells, I was called by an inmate who was holding the bars of his cell with both hands. This inmate seemed to have difficulty breathing, said he had a severe pain in his stomach, and asked me to call the doctors.

I felt alarmed due to the symptoms and phoned the tower. I was informed by the person on the phone to call the hospital. I complied with this order, and was connected with who I believe was Miss Kruspe, the nurse. This person directed that I bring the inmate up to the hospital.

I checked the name on the cell sheet and informed the guard in charge of detention that I had permission to take the inmate to the hospital. On the way from the detention cells to the hospital I had to stop once and again walk at a slow pace due to the difficulty this inmate was experiencing from what he stated was a stomach pain.

When I brought him to the hospital, the guard who let me through the grill was Mr. Meyers. I informed nurse Kruspe that this was the inmate from detention, should

I wait to take him back, and she replied no, he would have to see the doctor. I returned to detention.

I thought nothing further of this incident until I heard the inmates and guards discussing the death of this inmate and I realized this was the man who I had brought from detention.

I felt that I would be called to the inquest and was surprised when I was not called. I felt that the inquest should have been made aware of the fact that the inmate had been in detention in the week before his death. This would be due to confinement and abnormal diet during detention. Some time before the inquest I received a telephone call from Mr. Donald C. MacDonald inquiring what I knew about this matter. I told him that I was involved and expected to be called at the inquest.

This is typewritten, signed "P. F. Lindsay."

Mr. Chairman, in the transcript of the evidence, I would like to make some brief reference to certain excerpts—and this is the complete transcript. I would ask that it be noted that there were called as witnesses Robert Nash, clerk of the records of the prisoners; Sergeant S. W. Richardson, who was in charge of the main working party with which the deceased was working the day of his death; Mr. L. C. Yeo, the custodial officer; F. Cook, another custodial officer; Sergeant Corcoran, another custodial officer; E. J. Harloff, the assistant superintendent; Dr. G. A. Mellow, the senior medical officer; Dr. Marcinkovsky, a physician; Dr. Slinger, the pathologist, and Charles Sanderson, the superintendent of the institution.

In the evidence of Sergeant Richardson, on page 5—the questions are not numbered but at line 16, the question is:

Q. What time would you start work with them?

And he mentioned there were 77 in the work party.

A. In the afternoon, they would be broken off to work at approximately 1:30, 15 minutes' smoke break at three o'clock. We would start to reassemble in our group to return to the institution.

Q. What kind of work were they doing on that particular day?

A. They were moving land fill from the gravel pit area, so-called, to a stockpile. This inmate in question was loosening up the dirt for those who were taking it away in wheelbarrows to remove it.

Q. Loosening it up?

A. Loosening it up with pick and shovel to make a convenient heap for the boys with the wheelbarrows to load and take it away.

Q. He really wasn't wheeling.

A. He wasn't wheeling away, no. Those that do this type of work, on this day, the work, can more or less set their own pace, in that so long as they have sufficient dirt kept ahead, if they want to sit down and take five, as it were, they can.

Q. How long roughly had they been with this work party?

A. In this instance, almost three months.

Q. Any complaints from him at all about the work?

A. No complaint about the work.

Q. What time did they break off on this day, the 20th?

A. They started to break off and line up at approximately a quarter after four. It was precisely 19 minutes after four when we moved off from the work area to return to the institution.

The witness Cook was asked, on page 10, line 6:

Q. And did Mr. Yeo call you up?

A. As the gang kept moving in and I got closer I saw him lying on the ground. Mr. Yeo and I, we moved him off to the side so as to allow the gang to go through without jumping or running around.

Q. Was he able to say anything?

A. No.

Q. Did he ever complain to you about anything?

A. No, sir.

I think the medical evidence, and that might perhaps complete what I would wish to put on record.

This is the evidence of Dr. Marcinkovsky and I should like to read very briefly from it, Mr. Chairman. He was questioned by Mr. Kearns, the Crown attorney, at page 19.

Q. How long have you been a medical officer at the Ontario reformatory?

A. Since March 31, 1956.

Q. Eight years ago?

A. Yes.

Q. And you are duly qualified here in the province of Ontario?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you examine this young man Cross when he was admitted in October last year?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you got your examination there?

A. Yes.

Q. Tell the jury what your examination was and what it consisted of. Have you got your report?

Dr. Marcinkovsky refers to his file and wanted it to go in as an exhibit.

Q. What did it say?

A. I usually ask first to recall all about the previous sicknesses, operations, accidents and so on. He first told me he hadn't any sickness at all. After examination when I was listening to his heart I noticed that he was not completely well as it should be. There was nothing striking. Then I tried to pursue the history about the shortness of breath but he admitted he does a little bit—

I think it means "has" a little bit:
—of shortness of breath.

After exertion, I asked him, in comparison to other boys the same age and so on, doing the same job of exercise? He said yes, he thinks he is shorter of breath than anyone else and I marked that here.

Indicates on the report of examination:

I marked here, shortness of breath and then at heart, I found there were no murmurs, there was some indication of heart disease. I tried him at the exercises, like running for a little while on the spot. I listened to his heart. I found some slight murmurs but I put here in my finding, I found that under rheumatic heart. At the end where we ask disability if any, I put, rheumatic heart condition, mild, fit for general work, fit for moderate work. No competitive sports and no heavy exertion.

He is quoting from his report.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Pick and shovel is not very heavy.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Then there is further evidence of the request by the boy not to serve in the tailor shop but to go back on the job.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that what I have put on the record has to do with evidence which was given at the inquest and perhaps in a sense does not touch the question of what was omitted. There is a suggestion that some evidence was omitted. Now what I have tried to show to the House is that from the investigation by the police, by the supervising coroner, by the evidence which was presented, that if evidence was omitted,

I feel very firmly of the view that it was not so relevant as to cause a change in the verdict of the inquest. With this, I think, anyone who reads the evidence presented, will agree.

Now, I have this to say, Mr. Chairman. I think it must be borne in mind that the man Lindsay had written to me, as has been related in evidence that has been put on the record in this House before, he had written to me about complaints. I replied to his letter, as he had related, and talked to him on the telephone. His complaints were referred to where I think they belonged, to The Department of Reform Institutions and there they were investigated. I had nothing further to do with the matter.

But he, at this time of his complaining. I believe, was no longer employed at the Guelph reformatory. He had been dismissed, released. He was disgruntled. There is not much doubt of that, I think, in anyone's mind. As the investigating officer says, there would seem to be a question as to whether he was seeking to embarrass officials of The Department of Reform Institutions and certain of the officials at the reformatory.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why do they question his motives and nobody else's?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Now this is what really gives me cause for concern, that an hon. member of this House, the hon. member for York South, before the inquest was held is told by this disgruntled guard, "There is going to be an inquest and I am not going to be called. I have something to tell." And the hon. member calls the supervising coroner—

Mr. Bryden: Who else?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and says there is going to be suppression of evidence.

Mr. MacDonald: Not all the witnesses will be called.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He gets, not the supervising coroner, I believe an assistant, and he is invited, according to the evidence, to say who is the witness. Who should we call?

How would Dr. Farmer know? I do not know Dr. Farmer, but I presume he is an eminent, respectable, competent medical doctor and a good coroner. How was he to know that this disgruntled gentleman, Lindsay, wanted to be called or had anything to say?

Mr. MacDonald: Would the hon. Attorney General permit me to interrupt? You are making all your comments on the assumption that it was Lindsay that first informed me. This is a conjecture on your part.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I am going to continue to conjecture on the same basis. I think it was Lindsay. Whoever it was, I think that the hon. member, if he was really interested in making certain that the evidence should come out, should have said, "There is John Doe who has evidence to give, be sure and summon him to attend at the inquest, be sure and subpoena him or bring him forward as a witness to this inquest." This, I think, would have been conduct that the hon. member should have seen fit to perform.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Rather sit back with a dynamite bomb!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Not only that, Mr. Chairman; perhaps it was not Lindsay that told him, but somebody said, "I know something and I bet you they do not call me." How did the coroner know that Lindsay had anything to say, or anybody else? He calls everybody; nine people from around that area, that working party, the superintendent, the officers, the guards, the custodians, the doctors. He gets the whole story, he brings it out; and the inquest had been published. Notice of the inquest had been published in the Guelph paper. I think it is a daily. In any event, it had been published so that anyone could attend. An inquest is a public and open hearing. There is nothing closed, there is nothing secret about it, all the world may be present.

Now whatever the hon. member may have thought was his duty and his responsibility and the proper conduct for him to perform, if Mr. Lindsay or whoever it may have been had anything to say, he had only to go there and he could have sat and listened at least to see if anything was omitted. He had the full opportunity to go there and talk and tell his story to the world.

When the inquest was about to conclude, the coroner then said, openly in the inquest, and I am reading from the transcript at page 37. Mr. Kearns the Crown attorney had said:

As far as I know that is all the witnesses.

The Coroner: Gentlemen of the jury, under normal circumstances anyone else who is here can certainly volunteer any evidence, anything relating to it. Unfortunately no one else is here today. You have heard the evidence of this man's record at the institution. You have heard

the evidence of the pathologist who admits this man's heart was enlarged. He found it difficult to pin it down to anything definite but he knows of similar cases of similar disease. These cases are often similar in type.

This is a doctor, the coroner, addressing the jury. My point is, he said if there is anyone else present, they certainly may give evidence of anything relating to this matter. Then he went on to address the jury and he discussed the evidence of the witnesses. Then the jury brought in the verdict that I previously read.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the evidence of the unknown, whoever he is, might have been interesting; but the fullest investigation by the supervising coroner and by the police officer of the investigation branch indicates that there was nothing relevant that was omitted from the evidence that was presented to the jury that held this inquest. I say again that I cannot understand why, if it was felt that there was any evidence, why this was conducted in this manner, sitting back and saying, "They will not call me"; and then later on saying that evidence was suppressed. I just do not understand that performance.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney General answer two or three questions on this matter?

Did the supervising coroner or the inspector from the Ontario provincial police question Mr. Sanderson, the then superintendent of the Ontario reformatory at Guelph?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It does not appear, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Sanderson, the superintendent, was examined by the police officer. Sanderson was called at the inquest, was presented by the Crown attorney, was examined and cross-examined.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, when did the supervising coroner state in his report that Cross appeared to stumble and fall—his report of May 10?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not recall that; you mean it was something I read?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, I think you referred to something about lunch time; I am not certain that I heard it correctly.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, you mean at the time of his death?

Mr. Renwick: Yes; there was some statement in the supervising coroner's report.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I read every word of the supervising coroner's report and it is all on the record, but I do not think that the words "he stumbled and fell" are in it at all.

Mr. Renwick: When did it say that he died?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It just says: "Unfortunately, this prisoner died, but in my opinion he suffered no mistreatment."

Mr. Renwick: Yes, but during the course of the time when he investigated the working party and how the working party functioned—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, yes. "The man did collapse and die suddenly while crossing the yard behind the mess hall to come in for luncheon. He had not complained at that point."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the supervising coroner has submitted a report to the hon. Attorney General which is in error on two very simple facts:

1. When the boy died—the boy died somewhere between 4.15 and 4.30 in the afternoon and not at lunch time.

The other fact, Mr. Chairman, is that the supervising coroner's report referred to my hon. leader's release to the press about this matter on April 2, when he did not send anything to the press on April 2 about this matter.

I would say that those two items alone indicate that the supervising coroner's report is not worth anything in establishing the responsibility in this case why there was no disclosure about the detention of this boy in the period immediately prior to his death.

I would ask the hon. Attorney General if the supervising coroner gave any instructions to the, I believe 87-year-old, Crown attorney; or to the practically inexperienced coroner that would lead those persons to do anything to ensure that persons other than those named by the superintendent of the Guelph reformatory would be called as witnesses.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know how the supervising coroner would subpoena witnesses; this is what I fail to understand, how you would subpoena witnesses whose names you are not aware of. Somebody knew about them, but they would not reveal them.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Attorney General, somebody knew the names of the witnesses who were called; somebody told the coroner and

the Crown attorney who was to be called. I am quite certain that the Crown attorney did not know all the persons who were called by name, somebody told him.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This appeared in the report of the police officer. There had been a provincial police officer assigned to get the material for this inquest. This appears, I am quite sure, in the report which I read, and I shall check it again.

Mr. Chairman, I will read again from the report of Inspector Duguid. He says:

On Thursday, April 8, 1965, the county Crown attorney, J. M. Kearns, coroner Dr. H. F. Farmer, assistant superintendent E. J. Harloff, clerk of records, R. Nash and provincial constable J. Pitt, Guelph detachment, who assisted in preparing the inquest, were all interviewed.

Now what would happen in the normal course of events would be: A death occurs, an inquest is ordered, the police officer—in this case an officer of the Ontario provincial police—is asked to investigate and ascertain who should be summoned to the inquest as witnesses. I presume he also may have had some part to play in assisting and serving jurors and that sort of thing. But that is the officer, I take it, who would assist the Crown attorney in preparing the inquest and getting the witnesses.

How he would know how far afield to go, I do not know. It seems to me that everything reasonable was done; but what I still cannot understand is if somebody was standing on the sidelines and saying that he knew something and telling hon. members of this House that he has evidence to give and hon. members call up the supervising coroner's office and say, "Oh ho, there is somebody standing on the sidelines but you are not going to call him."

And they say, "Who is he?"

"Sorry, I cannot tell you." And then come forward in this House and say that evidence was suppressed—this I just cannot believe.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious from what the hon. Attorney General has said that the supervising coroner was not in the least bit interested, in making up his report, to determine who the person was who named the witnesses that were to be called at the inquest. The only answer that we are obviously going to get from the hon. Attorney General, and there is no point in labouring the matter any further, is that nobody knows

who determined who the witnesses were that were going to be called; we will just drop that particular matter.

Let us just reiterate again that notice of an inquest is published; it is a wide open invitation to the world. A man has been found dead; somebody has died; there is going to be an inquiry so come forward and tell what you know if you know anything.

Mr. Chairman, obviously this is perfectly right and this is a fine generalization; but when a person dies in a penal institution in this province, then the person who determines who the witnesses are going to be in all likelihood is the superintendent. Apparently nobody made the decision this time but the investigating police officer. I gather he must have made up his mind who would be called, but there is no statement from him as to how he determined the witnesses that were going to be called.

So the supervising coroner really was not interested in the question that we raised at all, any more than he was interested, or the Ontario provincial police inspector was interested, in questioning the superintendent of the Ontario reformatory at Guelph. The whole point that we were trying to make in this Legislature—and for my money it does not need to be made any longer in this House—the whole point was that the superintendent of the Ontario reformatory at Guelph was the one who was deliberately controlling this inquest. He not only deliberately controlled it in terms of determining who the witnesses were, but he went so far as—and the hon. Attorney General reiterated this evening that it was not relevant at all that he was in detention—but the superintendent in his evidence felt that it was very relevant to relate practically every incident in the boy's term at the Ontario reformatory at Guelph.

But when it came to the simple facts of the week previous to his death—and when anybody dies certainly these are the hours and days which are of some significance—the superintendent did not choose to make any statement whatsoever about it.

Indeed, he categorically stated in his evidence that after May 26 he had no further dealings with the boy. Yet the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions in reading a report prepared by his staff for submission to this Legislature, said that on August 10 and August 11, the superintendent had in fact seen the boy on relatively serious charges concerning the boy and, my understanding is, ordered that he be placed in detention. Yet the superintendent swore under oath that he had no further dealings with the boy.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member please refer me to the pages in *Hansard*.

Mr. Renwick: The page in *Hansard* is page 1888. It seems to me that if the hon. Attorney General were interested, if the supervising coroner had been interested, if the inspector of the Ontario provincial police had been interested in trying to find the answers to the questions that we had placed before them, the obvious place for him to go was to the then superintendent of the Ontario reformatory at Guelph; and he did not choose to do it.

Now, the supervising coroner, as I mentioned in the first place, did not even bother to find out at what time of day the boy died. Similarly, he did not even choose to make certain as to his facts about the statement made by the hon. member for York South.

To my mind, the whole report and all of the explanation given by the hon. Attorney General, despite his obvious attempt to shift the blame to the hon. member for York South, just does not hold water; because there was no answer to any of the questions that we raised.

I would like to also state, Mr. Chairman, that we here did not make any allegation whatsoever about the physical examination of that boy when he was admitted to the institution. There was not anything to answer, we did not make any allegation about that.

The points which the hon. Attorney General has raised in reading these various reports into the record are practically irrelevant so far as the allegations that we were talking about were concerned. I cannot, from my point of view and I am certain from that of other members of this party, and in the view of many of the other hon. members of this House, accept the fact that the supervising coroner's report is worth anything in terms of the points that we raised. I would suggest that it is up to the hon. Attorney General to make certain that the then superintendent of that institution is thoroughly questioned as to the discrepancy in his evidence, and is thoroughly questioned as to why, under oath, he stated he had no further dealings with that boy, when, in fact, he did have further dealings with him on August 10 and August 11. The hon. Attorney General's replies to our inquiries are just not satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Just one further point that does seem to me to show an effort here to bring out the evidence. The hon. member for York South spoke to Mr. Hills—

Mr. MacDonald: First to Dr. Cotnam—let's keep the record straight.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And then to Mr. Hills. Mr. Hills phones Dr. Farmer, the coroner, and says: "We are told there is going to be evidence suppressed, call everyone that you know of, make certain—"

Mr. MacDonald: So there was; what is wrong with that? So there was!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: "—make certain that there was the fullest opportunity and—"

Mr. MacDonald: But information was being suppressed by the people who were there.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A witness who is known; a witness who it is said has something relevant to say. His name will not even be revealed!

Now, how can anyone with tongue in cheek say: There is a witness who has something to say but we will not tell you who he is; and then get up and say evidence is suppressed?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General is engaging in an old Tory tactic: Whenever a matter is under inquiry they try to attack the people who are trying to get at the facts.

An hon. member: What are you engaged in?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: This is an ancient Tory trick, the old smear campaign directed against the person who is trying to get the facts.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I like it a lot better than the tricks over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: So we might as well just have the record straight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

As Chairman I do not profess to be a lawyer, and I am trying to sit here, and sift the evidence and decide where to call or draw the line! Let us deal with the subject in a manner which is conducive to the good business of this House.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, you can easily tell when you have hit a soft spot, a tender spot, because you can hear the howls from all over this House.

An hon. member: But you do not like it.

Mr. Bryden: I know you fellows do not like to listen to the truth at any time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that the hon. Attorney General in his defence, which I agree was presented with great forensic skill, worked at two things: To discredit a gentleman by the name of Lindsay, whom I personally do not know at all—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Your hon. leader phoned him up.

Mr. Bryden: —and to discredit members of this House. This, as I say, is an old Tory tactic, but I want to get on to another aspect of this matter.

The hon. Attorney General says that no evidence was suppressed. I submit to him that it is as plain as the nose on his face that evidence was suppressed. The facts were suppressed that this man had been in solitary confinement for, I believe, five days shortly before his death?

An hon. member: Who said that?

Mr. MacDonald: The superintendent.

Mr. Bryden: Everybody in that institution, certainly the officials in that institution, the people in charge of the medical records and other records knew that; yet they did not bring that fact out. That surely was a relevant fact!

I am not saying that if the fact had been before the coroner's jury it would have found that it contributed to the man's death. I do not know, no one will ever know, because the fact was not before the coroner's jury. But to suggest that it is irrelevant is completely preposterous. That should certainly have gone before the coroner's jury and I am going to suggest to the hon. Attorney General why it did not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Everybody in that institution knew about it, and it did not go before the coroner's jury because the officials in charge of the institution did not want it called to the public attention that this form of barbarous punishment is still practised in that institution. Particularly they did not

want the public to know that such a barbarous punishment is practised with regard to a man who was known to have a heart condition. That is why it was kept quiet.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Like the people in the NDP—

Mr. Bryden: I know that these people over here consider that solitary confinement is natural and normal.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I ask the hon. member a question? Is that all right?

Mr. Bryden: Go ahead!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member referring to the barbarous treatment as putting a person into solitary?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, sir, I am.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What would you have done with a prisoner who will not behave himself?

Mr. Bryden: I am suggesting to you that solitary confinement is no answer to a problem, especially with a sick man.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What would the hon. member do with that man? What would the hon. member do with such a person?

Mr. Bryden: This sort of question—

An hon. member: What would you do?

Mr. Bryden: Present to me all the facts of the man's case, let me go to a psychiatrist and I will give you an answer. But to suggest here that I should now diagnose this man's case is ridiculous, and just another red herring by the government opposite. I am suggesting to them that it is high time that they dispensed with this type of punishment in any institution.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What type of punishment? Are you talking about solitary confinement?

Mr. Bryden: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You say we should not have it, is that right?

Mr. Bryden: I am saying you should not have it, that is it exactly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, I will have to go to Saskatchewan and see how the CCF

did it for 20 years. They had solitary confinement and every penal system in the world has solitary confinement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is out of his mind if he thinks he can run a penal system without detention.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, who has the floor? I can see that the hon. Minister of—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order? A few moments ago you chose to interrupt the hon. member because you thought he was not conducting himself with decorum. Is this continued shouting from here acceptable in the House procedures, or do you crack down only when it happens to be somebody on the Opposition side?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I have asked for order on different occasions here and I do not receive it. The member for Woodbine made a statement about some barbaric punishment, and the Minister of Reform Institutions was asked if he could answer a question, which he did. Then the member for Woodbine continued.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, you are ignoring the point I raised. When we are having a debate across the floor of the House are you going to allow all of this noise from the back bench here?

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): It is all right when your boys make a noise.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just to keep the record straight, when I started to try to answer the question, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions thereupon took over the floor and tried to occupy it, even though the floor was not his. However, that does not matter to me. I do not care about these ignorant interjections that continue interminably from behind us, and I am quite prepared to let the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions say his piece, although I think it would be better if he waited until I finished.

I think my point has been made, Mr. Chairman. I just want again to emphasize that there was no need for special witnesses for the fact to be brought out that this man had been in solitary confinement. That was

known by witnesses who were there. For some reason they did not bring it out, and I am suggesting that it was highly improper that they did not do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleagues have been pursuing the details of this case and so I have sat back and let them deal with the details, but I want to come back to a few of the circumstances in relation to the very limited association with this that I have had. When I was informed of the possibility that not all witnesses would be called, I asked the hon. Attorney General not to build his case from poor conjecture as to who it was; there are many guards, and many unhappy guards; there are many people who are not guards in this institution from whom this information could have been got.

I called Dr. Cotnam and I told his office that I was told that not everybody with information that was relevant was going to be called. I did not say "Ah-ha, you are suppressing evidence." Let us not have a coloured story. I was trying, in advance of the event, to make certain that all of the evidence would be there so that it could not be said afterwards that there would be suppression of evidence. It was an effort to assist.

I did not give the names because I was not in a position to give the names, and it is idle, I suggest to the hon. Attorney General, who is a reasonable man, to get up and say that any man who was working in the institution, or any people who were working in the institution, who had not been authorized by the superintendent of the institution, could, in effect, say to the superintendent some afternoon, "Well, that is fine, I have not been called but I think I have got some evidence and I will go down and testify without your authority."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why not?

Mr. MacDonald: Why not? Well, let the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions not be so self-righteousness about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member for York South suggesting that Mr. Sanderson might have taken disciplinary action against Mr. Lindsay for having offered to give testimony at a coroner's inquest?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not only suggesting, but I am saying it was done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is outrageous. Would the hon. member give us the evidence that that was done?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, would you please have that hon. gentleman sit down?

The fact of the matter is that the coroner's office was alerted in advance that not all of the evidence was going to be submitted—and to my friend, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), who has lost interest and gone out and said "Who suppressed the evidence?" I would say it is not only that some people who had evidence were not called, it is an even more important factor—that some people who were called, and who gave evidence under oath, including the superintendent of the institution, suppressed evidence. I just ask the House to pause for one moment and ponder that.

It was impossible, absolutely impossible, for the superintendent not to have known that he had had some contact with this boy after May. Indeed, one week before his death he had had him once or twice before him. How conceivably could any man come before a coroner's jury a month after that and say he had had no contact with this boy since last May?

I ask the question, Mr. Chairman, why did the superintendent of the institution, under oath, perjure himself and suppress key information?

An hon. member: How do you know he did?

Mr. MacDonald: I am saying he did. There is no doubt about it.

An hon. member: There sure is.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

An hon. member: There is doubt about it.

Mr. MacDonald: We now know, Mr. Chairman, there is no disputing this simple fact that the superintendent testified that he had no contact with this boy since May, and it is known, and the hon. Attorney General this evening read into the record, the fact that he had met with the boy, and he had sentenced him into detention. Let that fact sift in for a moment, because if you want to start questioning motives—and I notice the alacrity with which the supervising coroner and many other people are willing to question the motives of Lindsay—when we start to question the motives of anybody else, who happens to be on your side of the case as we try to get to the full truth of it here, then the hon. Minister retorts they are honourable men and we are impugning them, we are questioning their reputation. The

simple fact of the matter is that the superintendent of the institution perjured himself under oath, by not informing the inquest that he had had some contact with the boy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When? I am trying to gather this together and get it clear in my mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Why the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions at this point should have to take any more time to get this basic point, which was pointed out to him when his estimates were before the House and which has been dealt with five times here before, I do not know. The hon. Minister it appears to me is uncharacteristically obtuse at this moment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, tell me now.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I now realize why we need Dr. Shulmans.

An hon. member: Why?

Mr. MacDonald: Because when the supervising coroner in an office which was covering up facts in this province for years, was given an alert to the effect that evidence was not going to be submitted, what did he do? He passed the buck back on to me, but I said to him, "It is not my responsibility because I am not free to name the people who have the evidence." I told him in advance to make certain that everybody was called there, and what happens? I just ask the hon. Attorney General to consider this. They forgot. It was a careless mistake; it was an error. They forgot to call the parents.

Second, we have now the testimony that was carried in the newspapers in defiance of two or three allusions in those reports the hon. Attorney General has, that nobody else had heard any complaints from the boy during that day out on the work gang. One of his friends, who has since been released from the institution and lives in Belleville, has been quoted in the papers as saying that he had heard Cross say a number of times that he was not feeling well that day.

There is another person who might have been called. In other words, the only person who was approached to get some idea of who should be called—the key person—was the superintendent, and that superintendent, according to the record, himself withheld information.

This is the kind of thing which you think you can defend. I repeat, I know now why we need Dr. Shulman, when I pick up a record after Dr. Shulman, for example, has

tried to clean up a situation where the establishment in all its ramifications has been covering up the facts until he got the public support back of him in this province, so that this government dares not do anything about it. When I read in the paper, for example, when Dr. Shulman brought out his report—a report which he sent in and which was not sent forward to the appropriate authorities—that Dr. Cotnam is quoted in a headline, "Shulman a swellhead, says Cotnam."

The hon. Attorney General says he is not going to criticize, publicly, people in his department, and he was very wise not to be publicly criticizing his department. But I think it might be appropriate some time soon for the hon. Attorney General to ask Dr. Cotnam to follow the same advice. We need Shulmans to clean up precisely the kind of situation we have got here, because the supervising coroner's office was given some indication that the evidence would be suppressed, yet witnesses were not called, and witnesses who were called suppressed evidence.

Finally, to keep this closed circle beautifully closed, who went up and did the investigation? The supervising coroner. And if I ever read of a whitewash, it is a statement that the hon. Attorney General put into the record this afternoon—a whitewash which is discredited because it reveals it as a typical kind of bias toward an opposition in saying that I ran to the press, or some such comment as that. I did not run to the press. The first comment I made was a two-minute one in this House after my colleagues had put all the details on the record. Secondly, and even more significant, the report is completely discredited because it is factually in error on the key bit of information as to the time that this boy died in the institution.

Here is a man—presumably an authoritative person—who was doing a thorough investigation. He makes a report, comes back, and has even got factual areas—

Mr. Bryden: He has not even got the basic facts right.

Mr. MacDonald: He has not even got the basic facts right as to the time of the man's death. I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that if he will maintain his normal reasoned approach to this, he will have to conclude that this is not a closed area. Indeed, the final and most important thing, Mr. Chairman, is that the supervising coroner and everybody else did not go to the one person to whom the evidence points more and more con-

clusively as being in control of this situation. In trying to make an investigation, he did not go to that one person, Superintendent Sanderson. He did not even interview him. Surely for the hon. Attorney General to come into this House and say that this is a thorough investigation when it is factually in error, and did not go to the key person whom he should have approached, nothing more need be said. If the Tories want to close ranks and cover this up as they cover up everything else because they have to protect the establishment of which they are a part, fine—we in the Opposition cannot do much about it. But we will get these facts out, and we will document the suppressed evidence which is now on the record.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this occasion go by without defending the reputation of one of the most respected men in corrections in the whole of Canada—Mr. Sanderson, the superintendent. I did not pay attention in the past to the business about whether he had interviewed him after he had said he did not, because at the time you were discussing the matter of the coroner's inquest. It was a matter for another department, particularly when the allegation was that it may prove that there was some dereliction on the part of some officers of my own department. It would have been ridiculous for me to give an opinion on it.

Whether, in fact, Mr. Sanderson has contradicted himself in this particular instance, I do not know—I will go into this a little more tomorrow when I get an opportunity. But to say that he deliberately perjured himself is an outrageous charge to make about an honoured civil servant in this department.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But to suggest that he deliberately perjured himself is, I repeat, outrageous.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You read it into the record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not read anything into the record about him perjuring himself. Maybe that is the kind of terminology that the NDP likes to employ, but we do not like to hear it unless you can definitely prove it. Just because a man may—and I have not established that to my satisfaction as yet—he may have contradicted himself in one or two instances on unimportant matters—

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman! If the hon. Minister has not established the fact, I would suggest that he is premature in coming to all the conclusions—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it does not take me more than a few minutes to make up my mind that I will defend Mr. Sanderson against the charge that he deliberately perjured himself. That is all I am saying. He would not deliberately perjure himself. He is not that kind of gentleman. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion is that it is an old Tory tactic that if you—

Mr. Bryden: It is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You have not even heard what I am going to say.

That it is an old Tory tactic that, in coming to the defence of a member of the civil service, we attack the reputation or sincerity of the person making the charges, or originally was responsible for the charges. I think it is important to establish the credibility of the people involved, and I am going to do that right now about our friend Mr. Lindsay.

I say the NDP has lent itself, wittingly or unwittingly—I am not going to say wittingly, because I do not know that—to a most fantastic conspiracy to destroy the reputation of the superintendent of Guelph reformatory. You never heard of such cloak-and-dagger operations in your life, and I am rather surprised that a couple of the hon. members engaged in this cloak-and-dagger comic opera—

An hon. member: That is their usual procedure.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me inform hon. members about this. On April 28, 1964—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On April 28, 1964, Mr. Lindsay—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order! Does the hon. Minister for Reform Institutions always have an opportunity to make statements at times when he has no right to make statements? He made a statement before the orders of the day when he was not subject to being questioned; he is now speaking on a matter which has nothing whatsoever to do with the supervising coroner—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): You are an uninformed novice, you are.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) wants us to keep to the estimates, I suggest that he should intervene. We are going back and thrashing over a battle with regard to Mr. Sanderson and the reform institution, which has nothing to do with the inquest—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who started the inquest? You started it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you rule, Mr. Chairman, that I am in order?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order! Is the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions in order or not?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Certainly he is in order; this is the inquest, is it not? The same one you are talking about?

Mr. Chairman: You have made your accusation against the Minister of Reform Institutions, therefore he should have the opportunity to reply.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, what I am attempting to do is to establish the basis for some of these allegations which have been made, and which caused the questioning about the inquest.

On April 28, 1964, Mr. Lindsay wrote the Minister of Reform Institutions with a petition signed by 73 employees out of a total complement of 406, requesting the Minister to meet with them to discuss their wages and related details of unemployment. Later it was found that, except for one or two, those signing the petition were not aware of the contents of the letter, nor the manner in which it was forwarded. They had assumed that the petition would be forwarded to the superintendent or the civil service association, through the branch. Mr. Lindsay was informed that there were established procedures dealing with matters such as the grievance procedure, the departmental council and the civil service association, which is recognized by the government as the official bargaining agent for civil servants.

On November 9, 1964, Mr. Lindsay wrote to the hon. Attorney General, making allegations, inferences and accusations about the operations of the Ontario reformatory at Guelph, as well as its superintendent and other senior officials of the institution.

In this letter he also implied that the Minister of Reform Institutions refused to see him about complaints made in this letter, including the death of inmate R. F. Cross. This was certainly not the case, as only salary

and ancillary matters were referred to by Mr. Lindsay to the Minister of Reform Institutions. I received no other complaints from him at that time.

Mr. F. J. Matthews, inspector of prisons, made an exhaustive investigation into the charges made by Mr. Lindsay and found:

1. Mr. Lindsay was not apparently concerned about the possibility of being dismissed, as he had stated there were eight good reasons why he would not be fired—

Mr. MacDonald: They are right there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —referring to the eight NDP members in the Legislature. 2. Mr. Lindsay had written this letter to the hon. Attorney General to embarrass the department and senior officials, and 3. Mr. Lindsay's accusations were maliciously misleading and could not be substantiated in fact.

On January 27, 1965, Mr. Lindsay submitted an application—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): How do we know they were? You did not tell us what they were.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —for a hearing by the public service grievance board, stating, and I quote: "I grieve against unjust dismissal."

A hearing was set by the grievance board for February 17, 1965, but at the request of the civil service association, representing Mr. Lindsay, the hearing was postponed. Incidentally, there is no doubt in my mind at all, that it was deliberately delayed so other matters could be brought up by the hon. members on the other side.

Mr. MacDonald: You can impute motives to suit your own political purposes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On April 1, 1965—

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, may I just put the hon. Minister straight in this regard? There was absolutely no direction as far as I know between the two incidents that the hon. Minister is referring to, and he knows it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On April 1, 1965, when the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions were before the Legislature, the hon. member for Yorkview asked why pages were missing from the detention record book. I might say parenthetically here, Mr. Chairman, in one way I was a little surprised that the hon. members had not mentioned this in quizzing the hon. Attorney General, because they made quite an issue of

this before. But of course in the interim they have found out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order I would like to be accurate here and inform the hon. Minister, through you, that the missing pages were first mentioned to us by the superintendent himself.

An hon. member: You are sure you did not find them under a rug?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this is completely at odds—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know what point of order there is there.

Mr. MacDonald: You are not only fabricating facts but—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How am I fabricating facts? I said, and I quote again:

On April 1, 1965, when the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions were before the Legislature, the hon. member for Yorkview asked why pages were missing from the detention record book.

Is that not factual?

Mr. Young: All right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well that is all I said.

Mr. Young: Okay! Just tell the truth.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We will hear about the couch after a while, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When the hon. member for Yorkview and the hon. member for Riverdale had visited the Guelph reformatory a month earlier on March 5, 1965, they asked to see this book and found pages missing for the period inmate Cross was in detention.

Mr. MacDonald: This has nothing to do with the inquest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has not? These missing pages covered the period inmate Cross was confined to the detention cells. The Department of Reform Institutions has a signed statement from an employee of the institution that he was informed by Mr. McQuillan and a reformatory guard, who, incidentally, has also since been dismissed and is grieving, that Mr. Lindsay had removed some pages from the detention book, passed these pages through a window

to Mr. McQuillan, who returned them to Mr. Lindsay upon leaving work—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is your friend.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: By removing these pages, Mr. Lindsay and Mr. McQuillan conspired to cast suspicion on institution authorities. This not only would discredit senior civil servants, but raise doubts in the minds of the parents of the inmate who died.

On April 14, 1965, the grievance board held a hearing in Mr. Lindsay's case. At this hearing the board ruled that Mr. Lindsay's charges regarding unjust dismissal were not substantiated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is not all. The hon. members will recall a certain chesterfield incident, the famous chesterfield—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: If it suits your purpose we can discuss anything except the hon. Attorney General's estimates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The released inmate involved there—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Honest men, ha, ha!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to establish what led up to certain guards, Lindsay and McQuillan, engaging in a conspiracy to destroy the reputation of the authorities at the Guelph reformatory—

Mr. Bryden: What has that to do with this vote?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and deliberately then cast aspersions upon how the inquest was being held and I am trying to give their motives for so doing.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Quite right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that man—

Mr. Bryden: Without bothering about the facts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That man whom, I think, was in the office of the hon. member for Yorkview and whom I interviewed at his request, was going back and forth under—I was going to say lock and key, but if an armoured car was available I think Mr. Lindsay and/or Mr. McQuillan would have arranged it.

After he was released, after his term had expired, he was kept for a few days in the home of one of those two guards while he handed out information. He was kept there even though those guards were under the impression, and were told, that the RCMP were looking for this man. These are the two guards who have been giving this kind of testimony.

Mr. Young: Why would they be looking for him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, they are looking for him now. I do not know whether they have got him yet, but this testimony, this was admitted in the investigation. They were told by—

Mr. Young: Could I ask the hon. Minister why the RCMP were looking for him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a minute!

Your friends admitted that the released inmate had told them that the RCMP were looking for him; but they thought he could fill them with all this information about contraband in chesterfields and all over the place and so they kept him there and fed the information to the hon. members of the NDP while they brought it forward here and made headlines in the House.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Your usual pals!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And these are the kind of people from whom they have been getting their information.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: That they associate with; the NDP Opposition members associate with!

Mr. MacDonald: Talk about fabricating a conspiracy—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, all I am attempting to do here is explain to the hon. members of this House why I would not hesitate for one minute in taking the word of Mr. Sanderson against this sort of person.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Now tell us something about your NDP pals.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we have just seen an hon. Minister of the Crown engage in a long deliberate attempt to assassinate a man's character on the basis of hearsay, unsupported allegations. No one knows where half this came from.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you want me to read it?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, what is particularly regrettable about the whole miserable performance is that it is totally irrelevant to the matter we are discussing, which is an inquest.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Listen to the evidence.

Mr. Bryden: It has absolutely nothing to do with that inquest—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member said it was unsubstantiated. I will read him the evidence.

Mr. Bryden: Just sit down and let us proceed. I cannot even hear you with all this noise over—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would the hon. member like me to give him the evidence? I have it here.

Mr. Bryden: I will be quite happy on another occasion to see it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that a man's name has been dragged in here, and his character assassinated; yet this matter is completely irrelevant. I will be happy to look at the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will read it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: I want to hear it, too.

Mr. Bryden: Why should we have any more of it read? What has it to do with this vote? It has absolutely nothing to do with the matter before us. It is nothing but a red herring to distract attention from the issue that is before the House and on which the government is on the ropes. They have no defence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: But they bring in every conceivable irrelevancy; apparently this man Lindsay is going to be used as a whipping boy to cover up government sins of omission and commission until the cows come home. Let the irrelevancies and the red herrings follow their normal course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not going to let you—

Mr. Bryden: Let us still bear in mind that the point that we are dealing with was not in any way affected by anything that the

hon. Minister of Reform Institutions said; in fact what he said was out of order from beginning to end. It was totally unrelated to the vote.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, allow me simply to put the matter on the record which was raised this afternoon and raised again tonight. It was simply this, that the evidence that was given in the inquest by the superintendent was: "That was the final dealings I had with him." I quoted this, and then against that I quoted the statement of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions on page 1888.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To which date was it referring?

Mr. Young: May 26. Now then, we have the statement of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. "He was not put in detention until August 10 and 11. He was brought before the superintendent on the two consecutive days on a series of charges."

This is all I talked about this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect—

Mr. Young: I have nothing to say about anybody else.

I have the floor here for a moment, Mr. Chairman. I had nothing to say about any other person or any charges made by anybody else except by the hon. Minister himself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right!

Mr. Young: I just wish to put this on the record, that is all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is different.

Mr. Chairman, with due respect all I am saying is, and this is what I was trying to clarify in the first place: You are saying Mr. Sanderson perjured himself on the basis that he made one statement and I made another.

Mr. Young: I did not. I said Mr. Sanderson made one statement and the hon. Minister made another, and this afternoon I asked the hon. Attorney General to clarify what this meant.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that does not mean Mr. Sanderson perjured himself, I just may have had the wrong information myself.

Mr. MacDonald: Can it be explained to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions that Mr. Sanderson testified that the last time he had seen Cross was in May. And the hon. Minister comes in and puts on the record that Sanderson had seen Cross two days in

succession at the time of his detention. It was impossible for Sanderson to have forgotten that he had seen Cross on those two days. Therefore, he misinformed the coroner's inquest.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe I inadvertently misinformed this House, which is quite possible. Now, when I read it—I am not quoting, Mr. Chairman, I mean in all fairness to Mr. Sanderson, I do not know the facts about this yet. It may very well be; I was reading from the report which was prepared for me by one of my officials, not necessarily Mr. Sanderson. I may have just had the wrong date.

I do not think one should say that Mr. Sanderson perjured himself on this basis. I will find this out. But I think the hon. member should be careful about making such rash charges about a man on this basis.

An hon. member: Sit down, sit down!

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister may have a point—that I should be careful in taking anything he says as factual.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well now, you are stretching it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister cannot wiggle out on this thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I cannot hear you, Mr. Chairman, for the noise.

Mr. Chairman: I wish you would direct your remarks or statement to the Attorney General. It is his estimates that are before the House at the present time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with the noise back here it is impossible to hear you, I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: I would like you to direct your remarks or statements to the Attorney General whose estimates are before the House at this time; please, from here on.

Mr. Bryden: If that applies to everybody, I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions that this is not the night to bring it up, because on April 6, we asked the same question.

Mr. Chairman: Direct your remarks to the Attorney General at this time. I have allowed

considerable leeway and I feel that, to bring order out of chaos, we should do this.

Is vote 208 carried?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, Mr. Chairman. There are a couple of matters in this estimate to which I want to address some remarks.

The first one that I want to speak about quite briefly is the fire marshal's office. As far as I have been able to figure out, the fire marshal's office is theoretically designed for fire safety and fire prevention. The hon. Minister opposite has over 30 different statutes which deal with everything, from children's boarding homes to lightning rods, I have compiled a list, Mr. Chairman, of the numerous Acts and regulations now in force which deal with fire safety and protection; it is a long list, and a rather interesting one. There is The Fire Marshals Act, and regulations under that; The Fire Departments Act and The Lightning Rods Act, Hotel Fire Safety Act, Egress from Public Buildings Act, The Fire Accidents Act, The Firefighters Exemption Act, The Fire Extinguishment Act, The Fire Guardians Act, The Public Halls Act, The Charitable Institutions Act, The Children's Boarding Homes Act, the criminal code, day nurseries, Department of Education Act, The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act, The Gasoline Handling Act, certain parts of The Highway Traffic Act, The Homes for the Aged Act, The Mining Act, The Municipal Act, Niagara Parks Act, Planning Act, The Public Commercial Vehicles Act, The Public Health Act, The Public Hospitals Act, The Public Vehicles Act, The Theatres Act, and The Tourist Establishments Act. All these, Mr. Chairman, and regulations under them, deal with various responsibilities given to people for controlling, inspecting and regulating fire, prevention of fire, and that sort of thing.

I noticed when Mr. Silverthorne, of the theatres branch, tabled his report to this House a few days ago, that one of the things he commented upon was the number of obstructions his inspectors had found in theatres. It seems to me that Mr. Silverthorne's branch examines plans for theatres as well. So they concern themselves with buildings, with plans, and with fire danger. Under the various statutes I have detailed here, there seems to be a plethora of different authorities that have somewhat similar responsibilities, but different people are doing the various jobs.

It would seem logical to me, Mr. Chairman, that the most cogent difficulty in this branch of government endeavour is the extensive geographic overlapping that exists in all of

these statutes. In most cases, the fire marshal appears to be little more than an advisor; it seems that he can step into a situation only where a specific municipality has not passed the necessary or adequate bylaw under The Municipal Act to implement their own individual fire protection and safety. Under The Municipal Act, each municipality has wide powers to determine its own particular system of fire protection and prevention. These systems vary greatly from municipality to municipality.

Sir, as we have gone on in this vote we have seen that many things—including the police function, and the votes of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, the vote of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), when that comes, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, when that comes—all of these have overlapping jurisdictions.

We have difficulty, sir, in the great multitude of authorities, the multitude of statutes, and so on. In this field of fire protection and control, we not only have it so subdivided over all the municipalities, we have it subdivided through a multitude of government departments, branches authorities, boards, and so on. It would seem to me that we could perform a great public service if there was some sort of a consolidation of all of these statutes into a uniform one which would indicate to people concerned with fire prevention and protection just what has to happen. Someone begins to ponder the various problems raised by erecting a safe building—blocking exits in a theatre, things under The Municipal Act, who controls the fire department, should it be voluntary or should it not? You have to be pretty well a full-time employee of the hon. Attorney General's department to determine which statute you go to, which set of regulations you look for and who is supposed to govern them.

If there is any validity in the argument that has been put forward about the importance of regional government and consolidation of these various public services, surely this is a topic for important discussion. The time is now that there should be a real examination of a consolidation of our fire forces to provide better fire protection. There has been serious doubt expressed from time to time about how efficient in preventing fire and in putting out fires are the various volunteer brigades. There are thousands of people throughout the province who have given yeoman service to the people of Ontario as members of volunteer fire brigades. But in this day and age, sir, I begin to wonder—no matter with what goodwill or what good

intentions—just how efficiently a volunteer brigade, which often does not have the sort of equipment a permanent brigade would have, is going to be able to control fires when they do break out.

My feeling in this part of vote 208 is that a real examination should take place of the multitude of statutes concerning fire protection and fire prevention, and that the government embark upon some sort of a policy of consolidation which will bring order out of chaos and indicate that we are moving in one direction. I would like to hear the comments of the hon. Attorney General on that, if he has any. I have one more point I want to deal with here, as well.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I readily admit that the fire marshal and his office and staff do have duties under a number of Acts, all related to protection against fire. The office is a most important one; it has been in existence I think since 1916. It maintains training courses, operates the fire college and assists municipalities.

Now, sir, I have never heard of a complaint yet of a volunteer fire force being something that should be done away with, or that it was not something to be encouraged. Perhaps it could be more efficient if the municipality in which it operates had the funds and supplied it with the most up-to-date equipment, but we have many small municipalities where the volunteer fire brigade is most efficient and the best protection that can, in the circumstances, be provided. It is all very well for the hon. member to suggest bringing order out of chaos, but I do not admit there is chaos in this situation. I think we have quite an efficient system, particularly in the larger and medium-sized municipalities, where they have efficient fire forces getting assistance, training, advice, and being encouraged to come to the fire college. They are all being visited by inspectors from the fire marshal's office, and in every way having standards raised. They are given the best and most modern methods, and I feel the fire marshal's office is doing excellent work, as it has down through the years. I cannot conceive how the hon. member thinks we might bring about the suggestion which he puts forward. How might he accomplish this in the small municipalities? What would he do—abandon all these forces? Where would he station the fire forces to provide protection for the small municipalities? I do not follow how he would carry this out in practice.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General poses three or four problems in his answer to me. He asks: Where is the

confusion? I pointed to one obvious example of the confusion when you pick up Mr. Silverthorne's report; he puts forward a section of it saying: "As a result of the inspection of my offices we found that in X number of theatres the exits were blocked, which presented a fire danger."

It seems to me a strange place—

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Not a fire hazard; it is a safety hazard.

Mr. Singer: Well, if it is a safety hazard it would be a fire hazard; and if it was a fire hazard it could be a safety hazard. It seems to me a strange place, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Just in this connection, I would say to my hon. friend, and he knows this very well, that the matter of exits in public buildings is not necessarily related to fire, it can be related to panic and all kinds of things. My hon. friend is, with his usual skill, attempting to confuse the issue a bit.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, just let us talk about the blocking of exits in public buildings insofar as they are a fire hazard and I will leave the rest of it to my friend, the hon. Minister.

It would seem to me still to be a strange place to lodge inspectors, in the theatres branch, which seems substantially to concern itself with the control and exhibition of films, censorship or noncensorship and that sort of thing. It seems to me the very argument that the hon. Attorney General puts forward is that since this has existed since 1916 it is all right.

You have a multitude of inspectors in various departments and it would seem much more logical to me that if you would concentrate these persons in one control and in one branch, that would be a more logical way to go about the various duties that are there. The hon. Attorney General says, where is the confusion? Some 30 Acts deal with various aspects of this very important problem. Surely it would be logical—and the hon. Attorney General as a lawyer I would think would be one of the first to admit it—it would be logical to find all of the provisions of our statutory powers and our regulations and so on, together in one place so that people who concern themselves with the safety of public buildings and that sort of thing, would say: Well, here is The Fire Protection Act; or here is The Public Safety Act, whatever you want to call it; this is what it says, this is what we must do.

We are concerned with the fire marshal's office; if you want to leave it with your colleague, the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity, give it all to him. But someone—one branch, one group—should be in control of this. I say the fact that it has existed since 1916 and the fact that now no one can identify some 30 different statutes where you have to look to get all of the law on that subject, indicates that there must be some confusion in the public mind.

Insofar as the small brigades are concerned, the volunteer brigades, I say, with the greatest respect to the fine work that those people are doing that as techniques get more and more advanced, as equipment becomes more and more expensive and as the persons who embark upon these—with the few exceptions of those persons who have nothing else to do during the day except sit and wait, and there are some occasions an occasional fire brigade is made up of civil servants in a municipality who can go from their job to fight the fire—as we get into these more serious problems, as we are talking about regionalization, as we are talking about bigger police forces, I think the time has come to turn the same sort of attention to the functioning of our fire prevention and our fire fighting systems through the province as has been turned upon the efficiency of police.

Now the information is not here as yet. The hon. Attorney General talks in fine terms about the availability of the fire college and so on. I do not know—there was not a series of questions this year but there will be next year, about how many firemen we have, how many have received training, how many are volunteer, how many hours and so on, how many forces there are, how many conflicting authorities there are. This is the sort of examination that is going to have to be done, because I do not believe, with the hon. Attorney General, that our system is all that fine.

I have not the statistics before me, but the rate of fire damage and the deaths caused by fire in this province I think is quite high in comparison with other jurisdictions in this country and in American jurisdictions. There have been some very tragic fire deaths in this province because on occasion, and you have seen it in the press, because aid from a municipality can only go to its borders, even though it is closer to the fire. They do not cross the borders, whereas municipality B has to go 10 miles to fight the fire. In the meantime, while they are concerning themselves about jurisdiction the house burns

down, sometimes with serious personal injury and loss of life.

This is the sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, that indicates to me that the time has arrived that we should have a real study of our whole system of statutory enactments and our regulations and the efficiency of our fire fighting services in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 208 agreed?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Chairman, there is another point in this vote; and that is the problem of—well, it is not a problem, it is a question of the Attorney General's laboratory.

I did ask a number of questions about the Attorney General's laboratory and they have been quite fully answered. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in the Attorney General's laboratory, particularly in its head in the person of Dr. Ward Smith, we have a very efficient and capable operation. The substantial problem in this branch has been that there just has not been enough money given to it over the years.

The hon. Attorney General nods his head. I suppose in any branch that we are talking about there has not been enough money given to it.

There was an article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* about a year ago which suggested the laboratory needed about eight times more space and about three times more staff. The appropriation rose from \$428,000 to \$537,000 a year ago, and this year I think it is up to, what, about \$600,000?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: \$679,000.

Mr. Singer: \$679,000. So in the period of two years it has gone from \$428,000 to \$679,000, which is a fairly substantial increase.

But with the great work that is done; and they have moved to new quarters, they have moved now to the college of pharmacy building and there have been some additions to staff; I think their money has been well spent.

As I say, I have the highest regard for the leadership of that operation. I think Dr. Smith who leads it is a devoted man who could without any trouble find similar employment in many other jurisdictions at substantially higher salaries than he is now being paid. I think he deserves to be highly commended.

But one of the problems here is the delay that some of their studies take. There is a suggestion that the scientific study of Crown

cases awaiting trial was backed up on an average of four to six weeks. This sort of suggestion is confirmed, I think, from some of the answers to the questions I have put in.

A further suggestion given to me was that technicians were working 10 and 11 hour shifts, four days a week, to cope with the problem of inadequate facilities.

So, very briefly, it is my opinion that this particular operation, which is one of the good operations that we have here, needs even more money than is in the estimates and needs the full support of the hon. Attorney General. I would have been quite happy if he had taken that money that we were talking about earlier this afternoon out of the emergency measures vote and put it in here, because in here it would be doing some good for the people of the province of Ontario. In emergency measures it is not.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, could I just say for the benefit of the hon. members of the House that the increase this year is \$142,000 in the laboratory vote, in that portion of this vote. And \$125,000 of that is to be employed in salaries. A staff increase is planned as follows: five scientists of class 1, a scientist class 2, three laboratory technicians of grade 3 and one of grade 4; and then document examiners, firearms examiners, photographers, clerk-typists. So of our increase of \$142,000, it is practically all going into increase of scientific staff.

Vote 208 agreed to.

On vote 209:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, vote 209 is the securities vote and I think that we should have a bit of a discussion on some of the things that are here before us insofar as securities are concerned and the administration of it.

We have this report—and I think it is a good one, I have commented briefly upon it before—of the hon. Attorney General's committee on securities legislation. We had the hon. Attorney General's word that it is being carefully studied and it is to be hoped that we are going to have—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is not only being studied but some of the legislation is already in draft form.

Mr. Singer: I am delighted to hear that, because that was my next question. I would have hoped—and now the hon. Attorney General has helped me along a bit—that we would see some legislation that would implement

some of the very important recommendations that are here.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: As we read about a certain investigation that is going on—and I do not want to comment on that until the report is in—it certainly should be obvious to anyone who just casually scans through it, that we seem to have a long, long way to go to put this important branch of our public business under proper control.

Some of the answers are in here, and from what the hon. Attorney General says I would hope that the statutes that he talks about being in draft form will be seen by us before this session comes to an end. Am I correct in presuming that we will?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I doubt that.

Mr. Singer: You doubt that? All right. You are drafting it and it may well be, what, a year from now?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is no childish task, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: I recognize it is no childish task.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would just say that we have—as the hon. member has said—the investigation going on by the Royal commission into certain areas of the securities commission itself and trading done by certain companies. And we have the report which has been tabled and on which we are now drafting legislation.

Apart from that, I do not propose to say very much more except that it is one of the matters which is receiving our most careful attention. There is a great deal of activity being devoted to it, and I do not think we should be discussing the field that is being studied by the Royal commission upon which we expect a report very shortly.

Mr. Singer: I do not propose even to attempt to discuss it, other than in a general way. I have been disturbed by some of the things I have read, but until I see what Mr. Justice Kelly has to say about them, and perhaps look at some of the evidence, I will reserve my comment.

In the meantime, and quite apart from what that investigation covers, there is a tremendous field of endeavour into which we have to turn our attention. The hon. Attorney General said he is drafting some legislation and this is fine. But there have been thoughts

about that. It is fine, but it would be finer if we could see it in this session.

It may well be a year before we see it, and discussions are going to take place—sides are being chosen already. There are people who trade on the street who believe the recommendations in here are far too severe. Lobbies are growing up. They are referred to frequently in the press who say, "Let us not do this, you are going to destroy initiative," and so on. There are people who say let the stock exchange control this. The exchange will be able to look after it and everything will be fine.

Mr. Peck: Where are all your party?

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has made a series of very intelligent contributions all evening to this debate, and I am certain if he wants to get up—

Mr. Peck: Where are all your people?

Mr. Singer: I am certain that if he wants to get up and make a speech we will be glad to hear him. But just to allow the House to continue on in what I think is a reasonable discussion, perhaps you could keep him quiet for a bit. I doubt it, but I think it is worth an effort, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): We have to have some stimulation.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Proceed, before there are more interruptions.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The exchange problem has been outlined to the public in more detail than ever, and I think the publicity attached to these various investigations has been good in this sense. The Kimber study of securities law has shown us the speculative stocks. It has also outlined the problems of the exchange in compelling desirable disclosure. There is no doubt that the exchange has been embarrassed by revelations of its ineffectiveness, even though much of this can properly be blamed on the pitifully inadequate provincial laws that go along with this. Particularly painful must have been the recent revelation of indiscretions in brokerage firms that were closely connected with the exchange.

But the dissatisfaction with our investment atmosphere will probably focus increasingly on primary distribution. This is still an

exchange-administered system which allows promoters to feed new company stock into the open market. Because it can be a vehicle for large profits, it is also a temptation for phony rumours, for doctored information. The higher the price can be pushed, the more chance the promoter has for profit.

Mr. Peck: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. Singer: In the past, the exchange has taken an attitude which suggested it does not like this system much but it knows of none better. Under the rising pressure for change, its opposition to reform of primary distribution has hardened. Many brokerage houses are so closely connected to the penny mining market that they will fight to the last ditch to retain the present system.

The exchange has pointed out correctly that no detailed workable alternative has as yet been put forward. The exchange is rapidly tightening up its standard, it has done much more than the government has to improve the climate, and it is rather interesting that the exchange should be able to move more quickly when public record has been made clear, and when they have been embarrassed.

I would have enjoyed seeing the government move equally as quickly as the exchange seems to be doing in certain of its phases. But we are still studying this report. We are drafting legislation which will come before us, not in this session, but in due course.

There is the very serious problem, Mr. Chairman, as my hon. friend knows, of making staff available to Mr. Kimber. You have only just put Mr. Kimber on full-time duty at the exchange. You have to give him staff, and you have to give him money to hire staff, and you have to give him enough money to hire good staff, because if you are serious about securities reform, you have to give someone the tools to do the job.

It is only now, in the last few weeks or months, that you have moved Mr. Kimber into the position and given him the full-time job and the full-time responsibility. How good or how bad he is we will see in due course, but in the meantime you have to give him the money to be able to have the staff to do the job.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): That is a profound statement.

Mr. Peck: Who wrote that for you?

Mr. Singer: Well, I think it is profound, and I will tell you why. If you look back

through the estimates over the last half dozen years, you will see that this government, of which you are a part, has paid no more than lip service to controlling or attempting to control the administration of securities. There has been very little research done in the companies branch, and there has been no real effort until crisis descends upon us, and until scandals appear to be obvious, or until Royal commissions have to investigate a particular problem, to have a new revolution insofar as the province's exercise of control. The duty of the province is to force disclosure, to control insider trading, to deal with take-overs, to deal with wash trading. All these things which our neighbours to the south have been dealing with much more effectively over many years, have been ignored in this jurisdiction. And over the years again—if you will look back into the record of debates on this particular estimate—you will see that there has not been any real encouragement at all from government to embark on this kind of an effort. It is true we have made some very substantial progress. We have a pretty good report here. No doubt, the hon. Minister has dozens of good reports cluttering up the pigeonholes all over the—

Mr. Eagleson: Put the axe on and grind it.

Mr. Singer: I would like to see some action on this statute, and I would like to see the reform in the exchange we have been talking about. I would like to see some sort of time limit, because the state into which our investment market has come is a pretty grim one. The public is losing their faith in it. The public does not believe that they are getting a fair break, and in many cases, when they read about stocks shooting up and then falling down again they wonder just who has been making the money, because obviously it is not the ordinary investor who tries to get information, who tries either to take a reasonable gamble or to make a reasonable investment in the securities market.

In general terms, that is all I want to say at this moment about the securities vote in this estimate. But I think it is a matter that deserves priority in government intentions, and in government thought.

This report did not arrive here until March—about six or eight weeks ago—and there are opposing views as to what should be done with it. All the recommendations here are far from being accepted, and there are many things here in this report that the report passes over quite lightly, that perhaps should have been examined at greater length.

But let us get a starting point, and let us get it before the next session of the Legislature; because we are not going to get it this time. One of the first statutes that we would like to see are amendments to The Securities Act and to The Companies Act that will start to implement some of these things.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 209.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this vote I have a few comments I would like to make about the Kimber report, and on related matters to try to put before this House our position.

I would like to say, first of all, that we would like to see the recommendations of the Kimber report implemented, and implemented as quickly as possible. I have the sensation that the government, and probably the hon. Attorney General in particular, will be subjected to a substantial amount of pressure on two or three of the recommendations made by the Kimber report to make certain that they are not implemented.

There is already abroad some feeling that the recommendations of the Kimber report should not be implemented, but that the whole matter of securities legislation should be turned over to a conference of the Attorneys General throughout Canada for the purpose of coming up with a uniform code of securities regulation and legislation.

We would like simply to state our position on that. We are not prepared to wait until some distant date on which such a uniform code would be either drafted or acceptable to all the provinces in Canada, or until such a time as it would be possible to have a national securities code, desirable as that would be.

I think one thing which the Kimber report very clearly does, is to state that regardless of the constitutional problems involved in the implementation by Ontario alone of certain corrective measures about securities legislation, for practical purposes the legislation will be effective if the Ontario government puts it through, simply because of the importance of the Toronto security market to the security industry throughout Canada.

Having said that, I would like to indicate that to us the Kimber report failed on two counts, having nothing to do whatsoever with the personnel of the commission—because there were some very able men on the commission—but it failed because it chose not to deal with the general terms of the reference that was made to it. It simply limited itself

to the five specific items that were listed, together with the question of the constitution of the Ontario securities commission itself.

The second count on which the Kimber commission failed was that it carried through its work, and its study, only on an analytical and comparative basis, and did not produce by way of questionnaire or surveys or studies any investigation in depth of just exactly the way in which the securities industry in Canada, and particularly in the province of Ontario, does operate. I think one of the results of this analytical comparative method that was adopted by the committee is that the government is going to be more open to pressure against the acceptance of these recommendations, because people are going to be in a position to say, well, you have not studied it thoroughly enough to come to the conclusions that you have come to.

I think the one example that is perfectly clear is the decision that primary distribution through the stock exchange of speculative securities for practical purposes was ruled out as an acceptable procedure, simply because it had been ruled out some 25 or 30 years ago in the United States, and because it had been ruled out some 65 or 70 years ago in the United Kingdom.

There is certainly some validity in adopting a practice which the two leading securities markets in the world have adopted, but there is no study in depth about whether or not this particular method of financing in Canada for speculative mining issues has, in fact, a real value in terms of the development of mines both in Ontario, and of mines in other countries in the world.

I think that most of us in the House are quite aware that the Toronto stock exchange and listed mining companies are used not only for the development or the raising of money for the financing of mining operations in Ontario, but also for financing operations in other countries of the world. I think the classic example at the present time is, of course, the financing of mining operations in Ireland.

Now, this leaves a very difficult area for anyone to argue effectively against when one does not have the kind of studies which should be available before the decision—which is undoubtedly the right one—is reached in the way in which it has been expressed in the Kimber report.

I would like to comment, before returning to the Kimber report, on the question of the Windfall inquiry which is proceeding at the present time. I would hope that we would not accept the Windfall inquiry, or other incidents

which have led to this kind of investigation, simply as isolated violations in a securities market which otherwise is operating properly. I think that most of us are becoming convinced that the events which have led to both the Attorney General's committee report, and the events which have led to the Windfall inquiry, are ones which are exaggerated, but are exaggerated only in the sense that they do reflect deficiencies throughout the whole of the marketing structure, and the organization of the securities industry in the province of Ontario.

I think that on this question of financing, and without referring again to the Windfall inquiry at all, but simply to the study which was prepared for the Royal commission on banking and finance by E. K. Cork headed, "Finance in the Mining Industry," there is a tremendous amount of information in that study about the methods of financing in the mining industry. I would comment very briefly on Chapter 5, which is headed, "Financing with Junior Exploration Companies" which explains in some detail the method by which financing takes place by primary distribution through the Toronto stock exchange. It comes up with some very interesting comparisons of the number of dollars which are raised, the number of dollars which are in fact spent for exploration.

It has been estimated, he states:

That of the total funds received by the broker-dealer in primary distribution, on an average perhaps 60 per cent goes to distribution costs and profits, and only 40 per cent to the corporate treasury. The cost of raising capital by a listed company is less than for an unlisted one, but it is still substantial. The net profit to the underwriter can be greater because of the wider scope of the operation.

He goes on to compare the actual funds which are raised in Canada for exploration expenditures, and he compares those with the total expenditures that were used for mine exploration and he comes to the conclusion—despite the difficulty of the comparisons involved—he comes to the conclusion that no more than about \$150 million—this is during a period, I believe a seven- or eight-year period in the recent past—no more than about \$150 million apparently was spent for exploration by the junior companies which raised funds from the public, even though \$340 million were raised for the purpose of exploration.

The magnitude of the discrepancy is too great to be brushed aside merely because of possible weakness in the figures. The

discrepancy is large enough to cause concern whether a significant portion of these funds might have been diverted to the benefit of promoters and other insiders rather than for the benefit of the shareholders. Only a series of detailed audits following through on the use of funds raised from the public would provide definitive answers and this is beyond the scope of this study.

I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General that kind of definitive study certainly deserves the attention both of the hon. Attorney General and of the hon. Minister of Mines to ascertain to what extent the moneys which are raised for mining exploration in Canada are in fact used for that purpose, and for what purposes is the difference, between the amount raised and the amount actually expended, for what purposes is that money used. I think this strikes to the question which has been raised in the minds of many people about the adequacy of the traditional method of financing mining development in northern Ontario by junior exploration mining companies.

Without commenting or without expressing a view one way or another, I think it is significant that in the United States the junior mining company has for practical purposes disappeared; first because of the high cost of financing exploration and second because it is subject to similar regulation under the securities and exchange commission as are companies in lines of business other than the mining business.

The Kimber report was rather a curious report in the sense that it ignored the principal term of reference entirely and dealt almost exclusively with the following specific problems: Take-over bids, insider trading, disclosure of information, proxy solicitation and primary distribution of speculative securities. One need only comment that a great number of the matters which were recommended in the Kimber report are matters which to anyone reasonably conversant with business operations and investment procedures would think: Well, why are we so far behind in adopting a great many of these recommendations? It is in that sense that I think there is a very real urgency for the hon. Attorney General to bring forward legislation.

I was disappointed to hear that it was unlikely legislation would be brought forward. I think particularly in the field of proxy solicitation it should be possible for the hon. Attorney General to bring forward the legislation in this session, because the deficiencies in our corporation law and the

deficiencies so far as the exchange requirements for proxies are concerned are so great; and yet the examples of what could be done are so readily available that it should not be difficult for the drafting to be done immediately on the solicitation of proxy requirements.

Indeed, with minor changes the provisions for solicitation of proxies under The Securities Exchange Act in the United States are in substance the recommendation which was made and it is available in detail from the SEC rules. This one particular topic, in my view, could be dealt with immediately and would be, I think, a tremendous advantage as a first start towards proper and complete information to shareholders about what takes place within the framework of corporate organizations, of what the management of those companies are doing and the extent to which they are fulfilling their obligations as management.

The report itself did not make any statement about the working of securities legislation in Ontario in the light of modern business conditions and practices, which of course is its main term of reference. It simply, as I stated, dealt with the five specific topics. There is very little reference to existing legislation, either to its adequacy or inadequacy in the areas which it covers. It simply goes on to say that there are a large number of things which should be covered, without commenting in any way except indirectly on the existing legislation.

The committee departed from its terms of reference to deal with the Ontario securities commission itself and it calls for the commission to be re-established as an independent administrative agency competent to perform its role. I think that one need only say that what they are in substance calling for is a securities and exchange commission or an Ontario securities commission similar to the securities and exchange commission in the United States.

One of the three further studies recommended by the committee is an independent study of the structure of the commission itself.

Certainly one of the matters which we hope the hon. Attorney General would comment on tonight is whether one or more of these three studies which have been recommended by the Kimber report are going to be undertaken, and if so at what time are they going to be undertaken.

The gaps and the inadequacy of the study—again in the framework within which it was carried out—is not a reflection on those men who served as members of the committee; but its inadequacy is shown in that there was

no study whatsoever made of the relationship of the Ontario securities commission to the Toronto stock exchange and its members, of its relationship to the investment dealers and to the broker-dealers, let alone to the inter-relationships of these various organizations which are at the heart of our whole securities industry. Similarly, no study was made of the mechanism of the Toronto stock exchange as a market or of the other security trading markets.

The committee in its second study recommended an immediate special study by the Ontario securities commission of market manipulation in all its phases. The inadequacy of the Ontario securities commission as it now exists is highlighted by the committee when it urges that special staff and legal counsel be temporarily attached to the commission to facilitate this study. I would suggest that that study, if it is going to be undertaken, should not be in terms of market manipulation in all its phases, which bears a connotation which I think is most unfortunate, but should be a study of how the securities market in Canada and in the province of Ontario in fact operates.

Similarly, no consideration was given to the Toronto stock exchange, to the broker-dealers' association or to the investment dealers' association as self-governing institutions and their responsiveness to the public interest; and little consideration was given to the continuing responsibilities of security issuers.

I think the whole of the report raises very serious questions about whether the statutory scheme of self-regulation is at the present time sufficient or adequate in any way in terms of the way in which the Toronto stock exchange appears to have been governed. Indeed, there is no clear-cut recognition in the record of the public interest involved, apart altogether from investor protection.

The committee recommended that primary distribution through the facilities of the Toronto stock exchange be discontinued. It was discontinued, as I say, 30 years ago in the U.S., and over 70 years ago in the U.K. The report recommended in substance the adoption of the proxy rules of the security and exchange commission. It recommended, so far as prospectuses and financial statements are concerned relating to disclosures, that in substance the SEC procedures, rules and requirements be adopted. Its recommendations for take-over bids were simply a statutory code of procedures adopted from the U.K. rules, and from the code of procedures to be applied in connection with

take-over bids of institutional investors and stock exchanges which was promulgated in 1963.

With respect to insider trading, it simply recommended that public reporting take place substantially, as in the United States, under the securities and exchange commission, and defines the term "insider." It recommends civil liability for improper use by insiders of confidential information not available to the public.

I think when the actual recommendations of the committee are stated in as simple terms as possible, which I have tried to do, it will indicate that it is not a phenomenal task which the hon. Attorney General is asked to undertake in terms of implementing the recommendations of that report. I think those recommendations, unless there are substantial questions of policy which the government is considering, can be implemented quite readily, and that the hon. Attorney General and the Ontario securities commission should be concerned with getting on with the unanswered matters of the securities industry in Ontario and of its operations in Ontario, so that we can have an up-to-date and efficient security market.

When one really looks at companies in terms of the people who have invested money in them, really all that an investor asks for, or indeed is entitled to, is complete financial disclosure. Second, he is entitled to be satisfied that there is no fraud or overreaching within the management group in the corporation itself. Third, that he have a reasonably stable market in which he can dispose of his investment, or exchange it for another investment.

I think that placed within the context of investments by individuals or by institutions in corporations, there should be no hesitation about the government adopting rules, both for the Toronto stock exchange and for the over-the-counter markets in Toronto and elsewhere in the province. And there should be no difficulty, if one adopts those principles, as to what an investor is entitled to receive in making the necessary amendments to The Corporations Act, and whatever other related statutes are involved.

I would hope that there would not be any undue delay in adopting as many as possible of these recommendations, and getting on with the three studies which have been recommended, the last of which is the study of mutual funds which today, of course, account for a substantial amount of the individual person's investment in the securities market.

I would hope that the hon. Attorney General would feel free to comment somewhat more than he has tonight on some of these questions, and let us know what future plans there are in connection with the other recommendations that are included in the Kimber report; about the three subsequent studies which should be made, and, I hope, are underway at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair that I should make some brief comment, particularly on the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale.

I would say this, and I will try to be brief in my reply, that in the vote requested to furnish the Ontario securities branch, we are asking mainly for funds for the purpose of increased staff, an increase of 13, which will increase our staff from 44 to 57. In the staff I think it is interesting to note, we are asking for a securities analyst as one of the members of that 13, someone who will be able to analyze securities and make studies of the nature that the hon. member mentioned, and to come forward with suggestions and conclusions and advice for the commission. In addition, five security auditors and financial analysts, two investigators, and clerical assistance, and secretaries, and an additional legal officer, and it is intended to increase the commission itself, the personnel of the commission. The Act that was introduced in the House the other day, the amending Act, makes provision for a commission that could consist of at least five members.

On one of the other points that the hon. member raised, I would inform the House, that early last year, a study was directed by the securities commission itself into the trading in securities, the business of raising funds, primary distribution and the methods that were used and how much of the funds raised by these methods went into the development, particularly in the mining companies, of the properties themselves. This study was going forward, and had advanced quite a distance when the Windfall inquiry was begun. We then felt that should stand unfinished for the present. Then with the report of the securities commission coming forward, I think these all will fit in together, but that study will be completed.

With respect to the legislation, I could just say this. I think the hon. members realize that not only is the securities Act affected, but in large measure, The Corporations Act, because many of the things and many of the recommendations will naturally have to be incorporated into changes in The

Corporations Act, if they are to be brought about. I can only say this, as I have already stated, the legislation is being drafted.

Naturally, when it is in shape for study, it will then be submitted, and while some of the features could be implemented piecemeal, I think that is not the better way to do it, and some of the recommendations may very well be matters which will need to be discussed as matters of government policy. So I think it is impossible to ask in the circumstances, on the receipt of this report, all the surrounding circumstances which are still obtaining in this field, that we should present legislation within the next week or so.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word or two about this vote, and I hope I will not repeat words that have been given by the hon. member for Downsview, and the hon. member for Riverdale.

Since I have been in this House for the past ten years, I really think, after due consideration, that there is no issue of which the public could be more critical of the government sitting on the opposite benches than in their running of the securities commission of the province of Ontario, which controls the Toronto stock exchange.

Since I have sat in this seat on the Opposition side, there has been much criticism of government, in all departments of government. Some of it has been justified, and some of it unjustified. But in dealing with the securities legislation and the securities commission which, as I say, controls the major trading device of the securities and stock transactions in Canada, I can think of nothing where the government has left itself open to more criticism than in this field.

I think it would be fair to compare the running of the Toronto stock exchange to the New York stock exchange. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Attorney General, with his colleagues in the Cabinet, that when they are drawing up legislation that will affect the securities commission which completely controls the Toronto stock exchange, they will read carefully the legislation that our friends to the south have, in New York and other stock exchanges in the United States of America. I can think of no similar circumstances where the government—and this has been going on for many years, of course; and I do not accuse this government particularly, because it has been going on I suppose for 100 years, ever since the Toronto stock exchange came into being. But I can think of no organization where there

is so much legalized gambling, that actually steals from the public, as in some devices that are used to dupe the public, and which are allowed by the securities commission, which is controlled by this government, and run by the Toronto stock exchange.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact last fall I was in Europe and I went to several gambling casinos over there. Many hon. members of this Legislature have been in places such as Las Vegas and they go to the races—for example, whenever the hon. Prime Minister allows us to have a night off. When we go to the races here in the city of Toronto we know that we are going to pay 17.5 per cent to the Ontario government, to the jockey club and to the federal government.

We know that we have to be exceedingly lucky to walk away from there at the end of the night and make any money. But when you walk into the Toronto stock exchange—and I am talking more particularly, Mr. Chairman, of the mining issues of the Toronto stock exchange which are controlled completely by this government—you do not know really whether you are going to come out with one nickel or not, because fortunes have been lost on the Toronto stock exchange and they have been allowed, many of them, have been allowed by the actions of this government.

Without reading the Kimber report—and I do not want to go into what the hon. member for Riverdale has said or repeat what he said, which I thought provided a very good background—without suggesting that the hon. Attorney General should accept the recommendations, many of the recommendations, of the Kimber report, may I remind this honourable House that the securities commission already has many rules which have been completely tossed overboard by the securities commission and this has been allowed to take place by this government. There are many rules as far as the Toronto stock exchange is concerned that I have here in front of me, rules and regulations that have not been kept.

I would just like to repeat for one minute what the hon. member for Riverdale said, and which was answered by the hon. Attorney General, as far as staff on the securities commission is concerned. Of course, you have not enough staff, you have not enough staff in numbers and you do not have enough in quality, with all due respect to the members who are sitting there now, whom I know do their best indeed. It is not my intention to read many articles from the

paper, but I would just read one paragraph which came from the *Toronto Telegram* of only a few weeks ago, which says this:

In the past few years the Ontario securities commission has been treading water in a desperate attempt to keep its head above water. Existing staff has dwindled through death, retirement, resignation, while replacements have been hard to find.

The biggest stumbling block has been the necessity to process applicants through the regular civil service red tape machine with its low pay ceilings on high responsibility jobs. For instance, last fall an advertisement appeared in local papers for investigators. The head appeared under the trillium logo of Ontario, province of opportunity. The salary? \$5,000 to start, rising by annual increments to \$6,000. The job? To conduct investigations into the operations of individuals and companies engaged in security transactions.

Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely and completely ridiculous. Here we are asking people to work for \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year, to investigate into the operations of individuals and companies worth millions, and, yes, billions, of dollars. You, sir, are asking these people to investigate such companies as this.

This is utter nonsense. I would hope that the hon. Attorney General means it—which I believe that he does—means it tonight when he says that the staff is going to be increased. Mr. Chairman, I beg him to get quality, and necessarily quantity, in the Ontario securities commission. Then when the rules are laid down by this commission that the government, of which the hon. Attorney General is a member, back them up 100 per cent right down the line.

If you do, there will not be the legalized robbery of the hundreds and thousands of people, not only in Ontario but all across Canada, and indeed, in the United States, who have gambled in many instances not through their own wish by any means, gambled their life's savings on the Toronto stock exchange.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a letter from the Toronto stock exchange which gives the listing requirements for many companies—oil and gas companies, and industrial companies—but the one that I am going to speak about for just a few minutes is the minimum listing requirements for mining companies. I quote from their own list, the rules of the Toronto stock exchange controlled by the securities commission, con-

trolled by this government. One of the rules is this:

As a general rule, a minimum net working capital of \$100,000 shall be required which may include an underwriting payable forthwith on approval for listing. The required minimum net working capital shall be earmarked for the exploration and development programme as recommended.

Mr. Chairman, my question to the hon. Attorney General is this: Is this \$100,000 as laid down in the rules and regulations of the Toronto stock exchange, is that money always put in the bank before it is listed on the Toronto stock exchange? I would appreciate an answer now.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that very briefly. The Toronto stock exchange operates under its own rules. Those are its own rules and I would expect the exchange would enforce them, but I cannot tell you whether they do or not.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the answer of the hon. Attorney General, but is he indicating that the securities commission does not control the Toronto stock exchange?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There are certain areas where it does not.

Mr. Whicher: If you wish—which I know would not be done—but if you wished, could this government not put the Toronto stock exchange out of business?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I presume we could pass an Act to put any corporation, any organization in this province out of business, if that were deemed desirable.

Mr. Whicher: Without passing an Act, could you not suspend their trading tomorrow morning if you wished?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No.

Mr. Whicher: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think so.

Mr. Whicher: As a layman I would hesitate to disagree with someone like the hon. Attorney General, but I suggest that you could very well suspend the Toronto stock exchange in trading tomorrow morning or any other morning that you wished. Certainly the chairman of the securities commission suggested that the securities commission

could control the Toronto stock exchange and you, of course, control the securities commission. Would you care to elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The exchange has the licence or consent of the commission, and I suppose it is conceivable that could be cancelled if one wanted to act precipitately. You asked me could it be done tomorrow morning; if the commission decided to cancel its consent, to cancel the consent that has been given, that could, I presume, be done.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. Attorney General this: In this democracy of ours where we live by the laws of this government, is it not right that such a huge corporate effort as the Toronto stock exchange should obey its own rules, the same way as I, as an individual citizen, have to obey the laws of the province of Ontario?

This, Mr. Chairman, is the trouble. For years and years this large financial institution, a corporate body if you wish to call it that, the Toronto stock exchange, has not obeyed its own rules which are controlled by the securities commission of this province, which is controlled by the government of this province. They have not obeyed the rules, not only in one instance, but in dozens of instances. For example, in their rules and regulations under "Public Distribution," which I received only a few days ago, they say this:

Before any company can be listed on the Toronto stock exchange—

and I am talking only of mining companies, I assure you:

—a minimum of 1,000,000 shares shall be issued and at least 333,000 free shares shall be held by a minimum of 200 public shareholders, each holding one board lot or more. A substantial number of shareholders shall be residents of Canada.

These are the Toronto stock exchange rulings.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. Attorney General this: As the ruler of this body, what steps does he take to guarantee that a substantial number of any shareholders of any company listed on the Toronto stock exchange are Canadians, as their rules regulate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is a rule of the exchange again, which the government does not look at and we are not expected to enforce that rule as a government. It is a rule

of the exchange which they lay down, which they may adhere to or may not. I do not think there is any rule or legislation we have in Ontario which requires that a person must be a Canadian to be a stockholder or shareholder, director or officer of a company.

I will say to the hon. member that he is aware of what we have been discussing here tonight. There is a study going forward of the whole securities world, the industry of our securities here; recommendations have come forward in the report; there are other types of investigation under way at this present time; I have informed the House that legislation attempting to formulate into law the recommendations which have come forward in the report is being prepared. These proposals will be submitted to government and then, in due course, presented to this House.

A number of the recommendations, I think the hon. member is aware, have a bearing on securities, their handling by the exchange and to what extent it should be—the exchange itself, should be controlled—and how this should be done. I think I would have to leave it at that. The matter is being studied; legislation is being formulated.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I certainly accept the hon. Attorney General's word. Unfortunately, the people of Ontario are not too concerned with the future; they are very much worried, Mr. Chairman, with the past and the present, and the present includes tomorrow, the next day, the next week and the next month. Until this legislation that you promised us is coming comes, and from what I can see it is not going to come until next January, when there will be another sitting of this Legislature—much damage can be done by this large financial corporate body that this government controls and has done practically nothing to look after in the past X number of years.

I have every confidence in the present hon. Attorney General; I know perfectly well that when he stands up and tells us that the studies are going to be looked into and that legislation is coming forth, he means business. But, Mr. Chairman, there are many of us in this Legislature who have been sitting here for many, many years. If you read these criticisms of the securities commission and of the stock exchange, you will find that it has been going on for a long time. We are no further ahead now than we were ten years ago, when I first walked into this Legislature.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us not just come

forth with words of what is going to happen in the future; let us have an intelligent discussion; let us acknowledge the fact that the Toronto stock exchange, as far as the mining issues are concerned, is the biggest crap game in the whole world.

Mr. Bryden: Crap games are honest.

Mr. Whicher: Some of them are honest, but this is more than some of the things that happened in the Toronto stock exchange. The word Windfall has been mentioned. As a matter of fact, as a layman and one who has nothing to do with law, I do not even know whether I have the right in this Legislature to talk about something that is under an investigation such as that. But there have been other issues besides Windfall and what has happened was this. The participants of various scandals dealing with stock market manipulations, and so forth, on the Toronto stock exchange have been nothing but crooks and robbers, uttering legitimately under the laws of the province of Ontario, laws which endorse the securities commission which, in turn, endorses the Toronto stock exchange, allowing these people to legally walk inside a vault, take out a million dollars and walk out again. Then they give him a pat on the back. But the only thing, Mr. Chairman, is that they have not taken the million dollars from a cold vault in one of the banks of Canada; the million dollars comes from stockholders—in many instances, little stockholders, little people in this province. I would say that the hon. Attorney General and the government of the day should be very interested in this.

Companies listed on the Toronto stock exchange and, indeed, on any stock exchange in the world, have certain obligations. One of the obligations is that they run what is called an orderly market—in other words, if it goes up or it goes down too fast, they owe an explanation to the public; not in a week, or a month, but immediately. If it goes up too fast, they also owe an explanation to the stockholders, through advertising or through the newspapers, but this is not done.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General and many of the hon. members of this House know full well that all they have to do is read the papers for the past year. We will go back to the Timmins discovery, and they will see that many, many companies have jumped up and down like a rubber ball on the stock exchange and there have been no explanations to the public whatsoever.

The hon. Attorney General should give an answer to this; I would certainly hope that he

means business when he says that he is reading the Kimber report right through, and that he intends to act on it, because this is something that causes anxiety to all good people—not only in Ontario, but in the whole of Canada.

I remember when the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) was giving his report to the House for his estimates just a few weeks ago. I think that he gave the indication that we, as Canadians have not got too much stomach for risk capital. Mr. Chairman, this is complete and utter nonsense. Millions and millions of dollars are thrown into the Toronto stock exchange every day in risk capital, but in putting millions and millions of dollars in, in many instances they are not taken out again. It is no wonder that we, as Canadians, are a little bit leery in putting our money into risk capital for which, in many instances, there is no exploring or drilling, as far as planning is concerned at all. It is very interesting to know that since the Texas Gulf discovery in Timmins, dozens of mines have sprung up overnight and were listed or re-listed on the Toronto stock exchange. But to my knowledge there is only one other mine that has done any real exploratory work there, and where a shaft has been put down.

Thousands and thousands of dollars, Mr. Chairman, have been taken from the public through people sitting down here on the stock exchange; various people who are members of the Toronto stock exchange have taken it from the good people of this province, and if a man goes in and holds up a bank tomorrow morning, with or without a gun, and takes a couple of hundred dollars, he is put in jail, as he should be. But these people are not interested in a couple of hundred dollars; they are interested in hundreds and thousands of dollars and up to now they have been successful in their endeavours.

Mr. Chairman, I, together with all hon. members of the Opposition and, I am sure, all the people of this province, wish the hon. Attorney General and his government every success in cleaning up this mess, because mess is the only proper word that really describes it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that anyone would ever accuse the hon. Attorney General of precipitate action. He proceeds always with due deliberation and I have no doubt that, normally, that is a good quality in an Attorney General. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, it can become a vice. It can reach the point where it is barely distinguishable from merely contem-

plating one's navel. The hon. Attorney General does not want to proceed precipitously, as I understand it, in implementing the recommendations, or in considering the implementation of the recommendations of the Kimber committee. I would point out to the House, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing new in any of the committee's recommendations of the Kimber committee. The recommendations contained there have been put forward on the financial pages of the newspapers and in the financial press and, to a considerable extent, in this House for years. So it could hardly be said that the hon. Attorney General, who is a knowledgeable man, was caught by surprise, was faced with a radical, new report that required long, careful study and consideration. He was faced with a knowledgeable committee, placing its imprimatur on recommendations that have been in the public view for a long time and which, in my opinion, ought to have been acted upon by this government long ago—or most of them, at any rate. The question arises as to how long are we going to go on considering the same matters that have been considered for years? I would consider it regrettable if legislation to implement the principal recommendations of the Kimber committee were not introduced at this session of the Legislature. Now that does not mean they will necessarily be introduced next week. I have no idea how long the session will go on, but I suspect it will go on till the middle of June at least, and I would think that the hon. Attorney General ought to be prepared to have legislation before this House before that time.

It may be that he will have to give still further consideration to the legislation and bring forth further amendments next year. I cannot see anything wrong with that. Let us proceed with what we know on good authority to be well-founded amendments in the law. Then if further amendments are found to be necessary, we can proceed with them later.

For example, the recommendations of the committee—well, on any of the items that other gentlemen mentioned; insider trading, take-over bids, and so on—why can they not be proceeded with now?

It is possible, I do not feel this way myself, but it is possible that we may not at this moment eliminate primary distribution on the Toronto stock exchange. I think we should; but whether we should or should not, surely we can at least do something about dormant and inactive companies. Something can be done about that and this is one of the keys to this whole gambling racket about which

my hon. friend from Bruce was talking. The Kimber committee states on page 60:

Inherent in the existing system are the dangers among others, of market manipulation, false rumours, artificial excitement and inside advantage by promoters, brokers and floor traders.

Now, I do not think we really needed the Kimber committee to tell us that situation existed, but there it is at any rate. It has now been confirmed without any doubt that it exists. Are we going to sit back, contemplate the matter, think about it while the people of this province are still open to that sort of skulduggery?

It is not necessary here, I think, to go into the Windfall inquiry. There is a commissioner at the present time who is considering the matter, but enough has come to light in connection with that inquiry to underline again the sentence that I just read from the Kimber committee's report.

Why do we have to wait to have action taken to correct that sort of thing? On a number of occasions in the past, people have described the Toronto stock exchange as nothing but a gambling casino. I notice that both the Toronto evening newspapers, within the last few days, have editorially used that type of terminology in referring to the exchange. Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understand the operation of regulated gambling casinos where they are permitted to operate lawfully, at least one has an even chance. There is nobody monkeying with the roulette wheel or slowing it down or directing it to a certain spot.

This is not a gambling casino, it is a real clip joint. People who gamble their money do not have a chance. I am not myself much of a man for gambling, but I believe that if somebody is going to gamble, he should have an even chance. He should have as good a chance as anybody else around the table. That is not the way it is on the Toronto stock exchange.

The practice and policy in the past has been to permit, and indeed encourage, a substantial degree of self-regulation by the exchange. I do not object to that principle as such. I think there is a lot to be said for trying to encourage a group of people engaged in a particular type of business to regulate themselves according to certain standards of ethics and to interfere with them by law and to regulate their activities by law only as much as is necessary. But surely it is self-evident, Mr. Chairman, that the Toronto stock exchange and its directors have

not lived up to the challenge of the trust bestowed upon them. They simply have failed. They have failed to show themselves capable of self-regulation.

We saw not long ago the incredible episode of this gentleman, Ketchen. I do not know if there is any significance in that name, but we saw a gentleman called Ketchen, a vice-president of the stock exchange, indicating that he had bought certain stocks on a tip of a certain gentleman who wanted certain favours from the exchange, and that the stocks had not panned out very well and that he sold them back to this gentleman at the price he had paid for them. That is certainly not a privilege that very many people would enjoy. In my opinion it is incredible that a vice-president of the Toronto stock exchange would be prepared to say openly in public that he had received this sort of benefit from a person who in return was seeking and obtaining benefits from the exchange, and would say it brazenly and openly without apparently any consciousness that anybody might consider there was anything wrong with it.

That was incredible enough in itself, but then the totally incredible thing was that the board of directors of the Toronto stock exchange rushed into print the next day to say this was fine, there was nothing illegal about it at all. Well, unfortunately, I presume there is nothing illegal about it. But certainly it is—

Mr. Whicher: Legalized robbery!

Mr. Bryden: My hon. friend says it is legalized robbery. It is one phase of it; I suppose this was a particularly small phase. But it certainly demonstrated, I think, beyond all conceivable doubt that the Toronto stock exchange is incapable of regulating itself. It is incapable of enforcing a code of ethics, because it does not understand what ethics are. It has not the vaguest conception of morality; otherwise it could never have condoned the conduct of vice-president Ketchen.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I fail to see how we can continue to permit the Toronto stock exchange to go through a mock procedure of regulating itself. It is obvious that the government has to step in. It is obvious that it has to step in as quickly as possible—before the end of this session—to impose some sort of standards of conduct on these people, since they seem incapable of arriving at reasonable standards of conduct themselves.

I think that the hon. Attorney General and the government are derelict in their duty to

the people of the province when they fail to bring legislation in at this session to implement all or most of the recommendations of the Kimber committee. I cannot see that there can be any legitimate excuse for inaction.

It is not as if this was something new. There were no proposals put forth here that the government could not have contemplated before now. It has before it now authoritative support for recommendations that have been put forward on many occasions in the past; it ought to act upon them. If it fails to do so, if we have to wait yet another year before there is any action, then one or two things are bound to happen, and I think there may be a combination of both.

We run a great risk that more suckers may be taken to the cleaners at this crooked gambling joint. What is probably even more unfortunate, even in terms of the total development of the country, people will lose confidence in the stock exchange altogether and its legitimate activities will suffer; the legitimate activities which the Kimber committee stressed as being highly necessary in a country which has reached the stage of development which has been reached here, the activity of providing a secondary market for the exchange of securities that have been demonstrated to have a market value. That will suffer, yet in the kind of system under which we operate it is essential that there be such a market. If people lose confidence in that market, then I think that we will have serious consequences to face.

The government by its inaction, its refusal to accept the plain evidence before it, is running the risk that this situation will develop.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, there is a company called Black Cliff Mines Limited that issued a prospectus dated May 7, 1963. It was accepted by the securities commission. A few days after it was accepted, a prominent solicitor who practises in this city wrote to Mr. Kimber suggesting that he had some substantial doubts about the prospectus; he asked Mr. Kimber if the matter could be investigated. Between that date and early 1965, I am not too familiar with what happened; but in any event, just prior to January 8, 1965, the same solicitor again wrote to Mr. Kimber, enclosing an affidavit in relation to this prospectus.

The affidavit indicates that there is substantial evidence—in my opinion, in any event, seems to give substantial evidence—that sections 3, 14 and 20 of the prospectus might not be true. That is the story, and it is a very brief one, Mr. Chairman.

To date, people complaining about the authenticity of this prospectus—people who have offered evidence that there is substantial doubt about the above-mentioned three clauses of it, have received no answer; they are not aware of whether any investigation is going on; whether there has been agreement with their allegations. There has been no cancellation of the registration of this company and it would seem to me, sir, that where this matter is drawn to the attention of the securities commission in this fashion, the commission should be prepared to say, within a reasonable time, whether or not they accept the charges that are made.

The evidence is here, and it is in the hands of the commission. I do not know if the hon. Attorney General at this moment can give me an answer, but the allegations that are set forward here are quite serious and there has been no answer at all, although the complaints have been before the commission in one form or another for two years, with better evidence since early January of this year.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General if he would acknowledge if the government has some responsibility where a prospectus is given that is not correct?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Of course we acknowledge such responsibility. I think I heard the hon. member say that the letter actually was May 3, 1965?

Mr. Singer: No, sir.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: When was the last—

Mr. Singer: The letter forwarding the affidavit was January 8, 1965.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I may be able to give the hon. member an answer in the next few moments.

Vote 209 agreed to.

On vote 210:

Mr. Singer: On vote 210—that is the insurance office, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, in view of the hour, and since the hon. member has some questions in regard to this item, I would move that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow

we will continue with these estimates and go on to The Department of Public Works, Treasury, the civil service commission and Agriculture, in that order.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Report, standing committee on agriculture, Mr. Hamilton	3025
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	3025
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	3025
Estimates, Department of the Attorney General, Mr. Wishart, concluded	3026
Recess, 6 o'clock	3055

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1965

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Lampedia honour students, Brock district high school, Cannington, and Wells Street public school, Aurora; and in the east gallery, St. Theresa's separate school, New Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. M. Hamilton (Renfrew North), from the standing committee on agriculture, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 135, The Milk Act, 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a considerable number of amendments, mostly of a tidying-up nature. I think that perhaps the more important ones relate to some of the functions of municipalities and municipal councils, and also the dissolution of police villages under certain circumstances, and power to establish boards of control in towns of over 45,000 in population. Other amendments deal with the acquisition of land for various purposes, including land for parking lots, the matter of licensing of certain kinds of businesses, and a considerable number of matters of this type, including provisions for stopping up highways, other amendments

authorize municipalities to permit the owners of property abutting on sidewalks to have certain rights over a portion of the sidewalks.

In due course, sir, this bill will be referred to the committee on municipal law.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I stand in my place on a matter of personal privilege. A Toronto newspaper yesterday carried the heading: "Sopha criticizes liquor board as dictatorship."

This heading was on a news story relating to the presentation of a brief by myself before Mr. J. C. McRuer, sitting upon his Royal commission inquiring into civil rights.

In my brief, I did not use the word dictatorship.

In reference to the liquor licence board, I did not use any words which would justify the innuendo contained in that heading. I have too great a respect for Judge Robb, the chairman of the liquor licence board, who has given many years of valuable public service to the life of this province, to use such a term of opprobrium.

In my brief, I used the liquor licence board as an example of a tribunal from which there is no review in the courts on the merits of the decisions tribunals make. The same observation applies to most of the 100 other tribunals, courts, commissions and agencies operating in this province.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the 1964 annual report of the workmen's compensation board of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, if I may with your indulgence, and that of the House for a moment make further reference to the amending bill to The Municipal Act, and advise the House that I omitted to mention that among the amendments proposed were amendments relating to the matter of store closing hours within municipalities. There has been a considerable amount of interest in this impending legislation, I might say, so in order that hon. members will know that the amendments are contained within this bill, I thought it would be desirable that I

should mention it, because it will be several days before the bill is printed.

Under section 379 (A) of The Municipal Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What section of the amending bill?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: It is known as 28.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The sixteenth order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

(continued)

On vote 210:

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with vote 210; as we were closing the debate with respect to vote 209 in the House yesterday, the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) had raised a question under vote 209 with respect to the Black Cliff Mines Limited, and an inquiry or a complaint which had been made to the commission, to which it was indicated an answer had not been received. I undertook to get information on the question and to give an answer. I should like to do that at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I have the information, I think, in satisfaction of the inquiry.

I might say that the matter involved in the question first arose in connection with a prospectus filed by Black Cliff Mines Limited with the Ontario securities commission on April 22, 1963. In that filing, the company showed as part of its assets, claims in the province of Quebec. While the prospectus was being processed by our commission, certain information was received from a prior owner of the claims in question, and in attempting to reconstruct that information, the facts appeared to be that a company called, Twentieth Century Mining Company Limited—I think that is the complainant that the hon. member referred to—had staked the claims in question in 1961, and had held them until October 1962. These are the Quebec claims.

At that time The Department of Mines in Quebec treated the claims as having become open for staking. Claims were staked by other individuals, and Twentieth Century claimed that the new stakers then sold the claims to Dysart Holdings, who in turn sold them to Black Cliff Mines Limited. The sug-

gestion was made that the transactions were not at arm's length, but that Dysart and Black Cliff were the alter ego of the stakers.

The information was conveyed to us by the solicitor for Twentieth Century, and he advised that an application was being made to appeal, under the provisions of The Quebec Mining Act, the decision of the Minister of Mines of Quebec, which decision had confirmed the ownership of the claims in Black Cliff Mines Limited.

On receipt of that information, the securities commission of Ontario contacted the solicitors for Black Cliff and received an opinion from Quebec counsel that the Minister's decision—that is the Minister of Mines for the province of Quebec—not having been appealed from within the proper time, was final. This confirmed the letter previously received from The Department of Natural Resources in Quebec that Black Cliff Mines Limited had a clear and unencumbered title to the claims. That letter was sent by the registrar of mines of the province of Quebec.

In addition to that, the securities commission made contact with the Hon. René Levesque, Minister of Natural Resources in Quebec, who answered by letter and telegram, advising that the position taken by the Minister on the subject is final, that is, that the claims belong to Black Cliff Mines Limited.

He also advised that he had no authority under the Quebec law to reopen the matter. On the basis of that information, the prospectus of Black Cliff Mines Limited was accepted on May 21, 1963.

The prospectus so accepted was effective for a period of one year; consequently in May, 1964, it lapsed. A further prospectus was presented for acceptance in July, 1964, and again during the period that the prospectus was being processed by the Ontario securities commission, certain information was received respecting the claims in question, which was to the effect that Twentieth Century had taken injunction proceedings against Black Cliff relating to the title to the claims. Those would be the claims that were in the province of Quebec.

These proceedings were commenced about July 20, 1964, and in those proceedings there were joined as parties with the stakers, the registrar of mining titles of Quebec and other civil servants. Two limited companies which had been the subject of purchases from the stakers—including Black Cliff Mines Limited—and the Hon. René Levesque, were also made parties to the proceedings.

Part of the allegation was that one of the original stakers had conspired with other

persons to bribe an employee of the Quebec government so that he would refuse to renew the claims in the names of the plaintiff, Twentieth Century. Upon being advised of this court proceeding which was being taken, apart from The Mining Act of Quebec, the prospectus which had been received—the second prospectus—was not processed further by the Ontario securities commission.

The commission was also advised at that time that one of the stakers and the mining recorder were being prosecuted for fraud and bribery. Those are officials of the Quebec government.

In addition, a request was made to the Ontario securities commission to investigate certain allegations to the effect that a false prospectus had been filed. The commission requested that the allegations be verified by an affidavit, upon which an investigation order could be based under section 21 of our Act. This was, I may point out, Mr. Chairman, our commission requesting the complainant to file an affidavit to support the allegations.

The affidavit requested by the commission was not received and, by a letter from the chairman of the securities commission, Mr. Kimber, dated August 14, 1964, this oversight was pointed out to the solicitor of Twentieth Century. Here we have the commission seeking support for the allegation.

An affidavit dated January 8, 1965, was eventually supplied, which substantially supported previous allegations. Certain inquiries were made and information received. Part of this information was by way of affidavit from officers of Black Cliff Mines Limited, denying the allegations. These inquiries are proceeding. They are not likely to be completed until the determination of the civil proceedings in the province of Quebec which raised the very items to which our investigation is directed.

The prospectus filed in July, 1964, is still being held in abeyance. The criminal proceedings dealt with by the Quebec court and the criminal proceedings which were taken have been dismissed; we are informed that the judge rejected the evidence of the complainant, Twentieth Century.

So the matter, in brief, is that we are investigating; civil action is proceeding in the province of Quebec; criminal proceedings based on allegations made by the complainant have been dismissed; and the commission has found itself in the position of seeking from the complainant information supporting its allegation. So that far from not answering the inquiry, the commission is

in the position of seeking further information from the complainant.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I thank my hon. friend for that information. He has filled in some of the blanks. On the basis of what he tells me, it seems to me that the matter is proceeding satisfactorily.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 210.

Mr. Singer: Is vote 210 the insurance vote, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks about The Department of Insurance. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, by reason of the reorganization we have had, and the fact that vote 210 deals solely with The Department of Insurance, that there has, in fact, been a physical separation of the catch-all duties that were attached to that department in previous years. Am I correct in that, Mr. Chairman? We have now severed from it used cars, real estate and mortgage brokers and all these other things, so that The Department of Insurance now goes back to its traditional role, looking after insurance for the province of Ontario.

I happened to be glancing through the *Parliamentary Guide* not too long ago and I noticed that one of the hon. Attorney General's predecessors took great pride in inserting into his biography the fact that in addition to all of his other duties, he was the Minister for The Department of Insurance. That looked nice in the biographical sketch, but it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that even though The Department of Insurance has existed for a considerable number of years, or insurance responsibility has been accepted by this government for a considerable number of years—going back close to 1900, and there are some references to the government being concerned in it even in the 19th century—very little has been done except to place on the statute books a long and complicated statute to have a staff called The Department of Insurance, but really not to give that staff the equipment and machinery, the personnel and the money, to do a proper job.

I would think that anyone who has concerned himself at all about insurance in recent years would notice that there has been something less than overwhelming enthusiasm among the public and the press generally for the way insurance companies appear to be operating. There have been questions

asked, and in this day and age when we talk about pension plans, about the role of insurance companies in pension plans, and we are now ready to talk about medical care insurance plans, there is great concern in the minds of many people about what the role of insurance companies is going to be. There has been great discussion about the role of insurance companies so far as automobile insurance and fire insurance is concerned.

When the hon. Attorney General first came into this House as a private member, I recall that we were discussing with the Minister of Transport of that day—I am not sure whether it was the present incumbent (Mr. Haskett) or not—the recommendations of the select committee on automobile insurance. I recall, as well, that the hon. Attorney General, when he was a private member, asked for a copy of that report and I sent it across to him.

We have been hammering away at the hon. Minister of Transport in regard to the recommendations in that report and he has seen fit to cause more investigations to be conducted. We have become very impatient about this and we have suggested from time to time that the recommendations are abundantly clear and should be implemented. But it occurs to me as this vote comes for discussion, Mr. Chairman, whether our criticism was not being addressed to the wrong department, and whether logically it should not go to the Minister who is the head of The Department of Insurance.

What does The Department of Insurance do? Does it supervise, examine, or control existing insurance companies? Is that all they do? Or do they advise the government in connection with its insurance policies? It would seem to me that perhaps they should do both. It would seem to me that they have a supervisory jurisdiction; they should concern themselves about the practices of insurance companies and what is in the policies; how insurance agents are licensed; whether, in fact, the product being sold is as represented, and that sort of thing.

But I would think that they would have an additional role; they should be general adviser to all of the government departments about their insurance practices and about their insurance policies. In fact, sir, the Minister at the head of The Department of Insurance should be the person who would substantially recommend to his colleagues in Cabinet what insurance policies should and could be.

It has been my strong feeling over the years that The Department of Insurance really

has not adapted itself to this role, and to a very careful examination of the role of insurance companies in all of these various fields. It would seem to me that The Department of Insurance should be right in the middle of this sort of discussion. There have been long and substantial criticisms in this House and other places about the action of certain insurance companies. I have yet to hear anyone rise in this House and say that our administration in the government of Ontario so directs, controls or suggests to insurance companies that this sort of thing does not happen.

What I am urging, Mr. Chairman, is a greater responsibility in The Department of Insurance for getting into the control and supervision of insurance companies. It must have come to the hon. Minister's ears that people are unhappy about premium rates for automobile insurance; I am sure he is in no different a position than his colleague in Alberta, the Hon. Mr. Gordon Taylor, the Highways Minister, who quite recently assailed surcharges on car insurances. We have heard that sort of thing here many, many times. This sort of control and jurisdiction lies properly within The Department of Insurance, but to date the department has neglected not only to take advantage of the powers that it has, but has really seemed to pass this whole problem by on the other side.

I have referred on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, to those sections of The Insurance Act that give to the government the power and the duty to supervise, control and listen to complaints about premiums. Those sections, as I am sure my hon. friend is aware, are sections 336, 337, 338 and 339 of The Insurance Act. Sections 337 and 338 of The Insurance Act have been in that statute since 1924, and section 339 has been there since 1930. Each one of those three sections has as a part of it which does not come into force until a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor by his proclamation. In other words, those three sections mean absolutely nothing until the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has chosen to proclaim them. From 1924 to 1965 is 41 years, and from 1930 to 1965 is 35 years, so those sections have sat moribund on the statute book for, in the one instance, 41 years, and the other, 35 years.

One can hardly escape the conclusion as a result of this, Mr. Chairman, that the government seriously has not been interested in the powers that are given in these sections of The Insurance Act, because through all these many years no government has ever chosen to proclaim these sections as being in force.

There was a nine-year period where there was a responsibility other than with the representatives of the party opposite today. But certainly for the last 22 years, the responsibility has resided with my hon. friends who presently occupy the government benches, and they have not chosen to exercise their discretion to proclaim these sections.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is a big task to be done. I had the privilege and opportunity of addressing a group of underwriters in this city a few days ago. They asked me to come to them and be as critical as I could, and I was very critical insofar as my understanding of their approach to the business. It was my suggestion that they have a real task, in co-operation with government, to set their house in order; to have government help them set their house in order, because I do not think it does any good at all to allow this continued harping and criticism to go on in this very important industry without any remedies actually being effected.

In this, there is a clear distinction between our views and the views of our hon. friends on the left. They say the government could run the insurance business far better, and I am sure that before the afternoon is over, my friend, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) will be elaborating on that and I do not want to make his speech for him. He will do it for himself.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is an important industry. We believe there is no reason for the government to get into this business unless it turns out to be such a dismal failure that this is the only way to save it. We see no necessity to put the government into business where it is going to take away—and the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) should be interested in this—the livelihood of perhaps five to eight or nine thousand agents; deprive their families of positions that they are entitled to because of the work of the breadwinner and so on. But we do believe that there is a lot of work to be done within the insurance business itself, and within government, to set the house in order and to bring this industry into the public reputation that I think it deserves.

But when we look at these sections in the Act and see that in over 30 years they have not been proclaimed, we wonder about the government's seriousness in their approach to this industry.

I am sure the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) will remember with me when we sat on a committee which the hon. Provincial Treasurer chaired, and we brought the then superintendent of insurance before us, and

we asked him what his role was in examining new rate schedules. He said, "Well, I look at them." And we asked him whether during the number of years he had been in office he had ever questioned them. He said, "Well, occasionally I asked a question." And then we asked him, "Have you ever suggested any change?" He could not recall any change ever having been suggested.

When the industry comes to the superintendent of insurance with their rate schedules—and I think they only do it as a courtesy because the pertinent sections here in the Act have never been proclaimed—they are armed with what they call their "little green book," and they are also armed with the assistance and advice of actuaries. It is very difficult, I think it would be almost impossible, Mr. Chairman, for anyone in the office of the superintendent of insurance to competently or adequately argue, criticize, suggest or recommend, in the face of the best advised and best informed actuarial talent that is available to the industry, but is not available to government.

In other words, what I am saying is that I think it is a shocking omission in the government's conduct of this office of The Department of Insurance that there is not a government actuary on full-time strength of that branch, so that he can prepare a competent and an adequate analysis of the various matters that are presented by the actuaries of the insurance companies, and so that he can be in a position adequately to advise government insofar as their course of conduct should be.

I think this is obvious. I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the actuaries for the insurance companies cook the books, or that they deliberately present the wrong picture. But I am suggesting that since those people are employees of the industry, they are going to present their facts in the light that will look best for their employers, and you cannot blame them for that. These are well-trained people. They are unique in their field. The government is not able to cope with this because the government does not have the same sort of advice. In fact, when the government gets into this kind of a discussion it goes with one or both hands tied behind its back. It really is not competent to discuss rate schedules or rate structures at all.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that now that The Department of Insurance is standing by itself, the government has a duty to place in that department at least one well-trained actuary so that he will be able to advise, to suggest and to criticize.

These sections that I referred to in The Insurance Act have been noted by the committee that I also referred to earlier, headed by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and at least on two occasions—possibly three—the committee unanimously recommended that these sections be proclaimed.

I think the sentiments I am expressing in this regard, and the type of government supervision that I am suggesting, is endorsed by the hon. Provincial Treasurer; certainly this is the impression I gathered from listening to his remarks on this committee. I think that the government would be well advised to accept the responsibility for this type of an investigation, because in that way the government will be accepting its role and its responsibility as set out in The Insurance Act. It will be fulfilling its role insofar as the public is concerned. It will be saying to the public, "We think these rates are reasonable and logical."

But we are not going to get this sort of thing. So we must go on assailing them, as the Hon. Mr. Gordon Taylor has assailed in Alberta, as the hon. member for York South has assailed here many times, and with good reason. It is very hard to understand and explain some of the peculiar structures that exist, particularly in the automobile insurance business. And fire insurance is another aspect. It is very hard to understand and explain, Mr. Chairman, even though the insurance industry nominally has said, so far as automobile insurance is concerned, "We will give insurance to anybody whom the Minister of Transport allows to go on the highways."

What does that mean? If they give insurance to anybody whom the Minister of Transport allows to go on the highways, you would think they would give it at a rate which is within the reach of those people to whom the Minister of Transport gives a licence. But in so many cases that come to our attention, we find that the surcharges—the additional fees involved in getting into the assigned risk, the involvement in the various categories; the insurance company's checking insofar as points are concerned—make it almost prohibitive for an individual to buy insurance and continue his right to drive on the road.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to take a very serious look at this whole procedure, and the nominal titles under which it parades at the moment, which in many cases, mean absolutely nothing.

It would seem to me that when the surcharges get above what is a reasonable

rate, and what an individual driver can be reasonably expected to pay, that the insurance companies are saying, "You cannot get on the road because we are going to make your premiums so high that you could not possibly afford to have insurance."

Then, I think I want to deal just for a moment with the general recommendations made by the select committee. As I say, it has been my experience, having tried two or three years now to get an opinion from the Minister of Transport, that the hon. Minister of Transport is really loath to give any opinion on it himself. Perhaps my remarks should have been addressed to the office of the Attorney General all along. Sir, you have had the opportunity to read the report, and in its recommendations up to a point—with a minor divergence by the hon. member from the NDP who wanted to go somewhat further in one respect—it is a unanimous report that there be a system of compensation without fault established, and it be in accordance with a schedule.

The facts are fairly simple. This committee worked long and hard and it was an excellent committee. It received opinions in this particular field from a committee of the benchers of the law society. It received opinions in this regard from the insurance industry itself; it received opinions in this regard from all of the people who could be concerned with this particular aspect of the development of insurance. Those opinions were substantially unanimous, Mr. Chairman, and were unanimously reflected in the report of the committee. Yet two or three years have now elapsed, and all we are getting is a statistical analysis emanating, apparently, from The Department of Transport, because the hon. Minister of Transport I am afraid, has gotten himself into something that either he does not like or he does not understand. So he is finding excuse after excuse for not dealing with it.

I make an appeal, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Attorney General. For goodness sake, if there is not going to be any action on this report out of The Department of Transport, let The Department of Insurance take over. Let one of its roles be as adviser to the government in connection with insurance; let it do something about this report.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the government has at hand a vehicle—The Department of Insurance—which it has inadequately used over many, many years. The time is now that the government should accept its responsibilities under The Insurance Act; that it should accept its responsibilities insofar as the public is concerned; that it should concern itself

with the way the insurance business is being carried on to a far greater extent than it does; and that in co-operation with this important business it should begin to explain to the public the government's concern about how the insurance business is run.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, in this day of the locust when death and suffering stalk our highways to an extent greater than in any previous period in the history of this province, I wish to point to what I conceive to be an injustice in respect of giving compensation to persons injured on highways within The Insurance Act. I am told from a person of great authority that in Ontario only approximately 43 per cent—I emphasize that figure—of those who suffer injury to themselves, or sustain property damage on our highways in Ontario, recover any form of compensation. Only 43 per cent.

The majority—57 per cent—of those who sustained injury, loss and damage on the highways received nothing. Of course, in the 57 per cent, there is a large number of gratuitous passengers. In this, enlightened Ontario, the province of opportunity, the hub of the country, is the only province of ten that gives no relief to gratuitous passengers.

Even Newfoundland gives relief to gratuitous passengers; only Ontario denies them recovery. It is interesting to know the history of how that came about. I will take leave to relate it.

My predecessor in this House, the Hon. Charles McCrea, in 1933 chaired a select committee which looked into much the same matters of reference as the select committee my hon. friend from Downsview just referred to. He recommended that gratuitous passengers be put outside the ambit of those who recovered—that is to say, until 1934 gratuitous passengers could recover in Ontario. The government of the day took no action on the McCrea report. Mr. Hepburn acceded to the office of Prime Minister in 1934. The story goes that in 1918—no, after the war; around 1921 or 1922—Mr. Hepburn had given a lift to two soldiers who were hitchhikers. They thereupon became gratuitous passengers. He was in a motor vehicle accident. They sued him and recovered a judgment. Hardly was he in office in 1934, with my hon. friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver), when he enacted the recommendation of the McCrea report to put gratuitous passengers outside the ambit of the law, where they have remained ever since.

It is an interesting story. I am told it has

great validity, and that that is how it came about.

Fifty-seven per cent of people in Ontario recover no form of compensation for injury loss and damage sustained on our highways. I have no responsibility for Mr. Hepburn; I take no responsibility. Let history judge him. This is a new era. Let me tell you about one group that recover nothing under this Insurance Act. I wrote to the hon. Attorney General about this group. As is usual, he kindly replied; he had taken the matter up with his officials. I know that within the bureaucracy—I do not use bureaucracy as a term of opprobrium; I mean those who work in the civil service and administer the affairs of government—there is an ingrained resentment of suggestion from outside about changing statutes. They do not like people to suggest omissions or improvements. I have come to believe that. The hon. Attorney General's letter indicated to me that the bureaucracy did not see the problem, or did not feel that the problem needed rectification. I am going to relate the facts against this background.

Every owner of a motor vehicle in Ontario is liable for loss and damage caused by the operation of that vehicle on a highway in Ontario; unless his—the owner's—vehicle is out of his possession without his consent, he is liable. The owner takes out an insurance policy for public liability and property damage. The Act provides, in section 213, that every person who has the owner's vehicle with his consent is an unnamed insured. That person is insured as if he were named in the policy. That is what it says in 213. The person driving the vehicle is insured.

Previous to the enactment of that section in the 1930s, there was a case which went all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. The court, bound by the classical stultifying concepts of the law of contract, held that the insurance company was not liable because the person driving the motor vehicle was not a named insured—that is to say, there was no privity of contract between the driver and the insurance company. That was a very unjust decision. But the court was bound by the hoary law of contract, which had been in that state for at least 300 or 400 years. So the Legislature changed that and said that everybody who has an owner's vehicle with his consent is insured by that policy of indemnity, whether he is named in the policy or not.

There is another section that provides that the person injured through the driver's

negligence may bring an action against the insurance company to pay the money under the policy over to him, and be credited against the judgment that he has won against the negligent driver and/or owner. Against that background, the person who has sustained damage through another's negligence—the widow at home waiting with supper for the husband who is killed by the drunken motorist on his way home—may maintain an action against the insurance company for that money.

Now I turn to the part of a PL and PD policy known as medical payment. Many hon. members of the House have paid an additional premium under their policy for a medical payment, usually in the sum of \$500; that is the normal sum. The reason for that coverage, of course, is to provide some relief to the gratuitous passenger who is riding in the vehicle. The insured, being a responsible citizen, protects himself for a coverage normally of \$500 so that if the person riding in his vehicle was injured he can take that money, go to the person and say: "Apply this toward your medical and hospital bills."

That, of course, is a responsible action. The sad part of the story is that the company, having taken the premium for the medical payment coverage and undertaken that medical payment, cannot be made to pay it. That is the state of the law. Nobody can enforce it. If the company takes the position that they do not want to pay the \$500 for medical payment or, indeed, toward the cost of the funeral of a gratuitous passenger who may have been injured, it does not have to. If it pays the \$500, it is purely *ex gratia*; purely something akin to a charitable act on its part.

Within this statute, there is no place that gives the gratuitous passenger any right to enforce the payment of the medical payment coverage to him. If he sues the driver, he being a gratuitous passenger, then he is met with section 1051 of The Highway Traffic Act—I hope that is the right section—that denies recovery to a gratuitous passenger. The defence of the company is that we pay only for legal liability; there is no legal liability to a gratuitous passenger, accordingly we do not have to pay the \$500 medical payment coverage. If he sues the insurance company for the \$500, there is no comparable section in The Insurance Act to the one I have referred to where the third party with a judgment for indemnity—that is, the person outside the car, the person hit on the street by the drunken motorist—may maintain his claim against the insurance company directly.

I state that with some assurance, because I know of a case where the gratuitous passenger died in an accident. The driver also died. Nobody took out letters of administration for the driver, he having no estate. Three days before the limitation period expired, which is one year, the father of the gratuitous passenger consulted his solicitors. Three days is too late to have an administrator *ad litem* appointed for the deceased driver; you cannot do it in three days.

The only alternative if any recovery was to be gained was to sue the insurance company directly, to attempt to force payment. By analogizing from section 213 over to the later sections, around 220 to 225, analogizing the right of the injured third party to the gratuitous passenger—I hope I have made myself clear—an action was brought against the insurance company. They had accepted the premium, there was the coverage of \$500 and by analogy and by argument that the Legislature must have intended, the Legislature permits companies in this Act to have the medical payment feature. They are not put in there at the instance of the company, it is permitted by the Legislature to put that medical payment feature in this Act.

The Legislature must have intended that if a company sells coverage and accepts premiums for the coverage, then somebody must have the right to force payment of it. That would seem to be a logical proposition. "Ixnay," said the court. "No," said the court, there is no privity of contract. Listen to the two propositions on which the case fell.

There is no privity of contract between the gratuitous passenger and the insurance company. The gratuitous passenger did not pay the premium for the medical coverage feature; he is not named in the policy. The company never heard of him before. No privity of contract. Accordingly, the action must fail on that ground.

Secondly, the gratuitous passenger could not sue the owner for payment of the medical payment coverage because of the section in The Highway Traffic Act which absolves the owner from liability to the gratuitous passenger.

Thirdly, if the owner-driver of the vehicle survived, or indeed his executors or administrators standing in his shoes, they could not sue the insurance company nor could he sue them. The owner, the driver, cannot sue the insurance company to compel them to pay over to his gratuitous passenger the \$500 medical payment, because there is no liability. The owner-driver has no liability to his gratuitous passenger.

What kind of a ridiculous system of law is that? Where does all that redound in common sense? If insurance is sold and premiums are accepted for it, surely it must follow in mandatory fashion that somebody can enforce the payment of the insurance coverage sold? There is the state of the law in regard to this medical payment feature.

Compare it to life insurance. My policies are payable to my wife. I pay the premiums. She did not make the contract with the insurance company; she had nothing to do with it. She never puts up a dime for the payment of my insurance premium. When the day comes that I go to my great and eternal reward, and if the company does not promptly pay my insurance, my wife may maintain an action.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): She is named in the contract, though.

Mr. Sopha: Not necessarily. Suppose my policies are made payable to my estate. My executors may come forward and maintain an action. That is in this Act, too. So I say my plea is that if the medical payment feature means anything at all in that policy, let somebody enforce it. Give somebody the power to enforce the payment of it.

It is appropriate that I should name the company. You have all guessed the company that resisted the payment of the \$500. I give you three guesses and almost everybody in the House knows the name of the company. Other companies, without argument, would pay over the money rather than fight about it. But Allstate takes a rigid line. They go to the great extent of sending lawyers from Toronto into the north to argue about \$500.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member would permit me to ask a question? I understood earlier in your remarks that you were citing what I thought was an actual case. I wonder if I could have the citation of that? I am very interested.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. A district court action commenced in the district of Sudbury, Calben against Allstate Insurance Company. Tried at Sudbury, decided by Hugill, a great and old friend of the hon. Attorney General, the district court judge of Rainy River.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And when?

Mr. Sopha: Decision rendered in late 1964. The decision is in the record at Sudbury.

I am not going to make a security council case out of this. I merely say let us amend the statute in respect of that. All it requires

is a little amendment somewhere around section 220 to say that the gratuitous passenger may maintain an action against the company for the payment of the medical payment feature.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what luck we are going to have with the hon. Attorney General in the broader considerations that were raised by the hon. member for Downsview, or the specific considerations raised by the hon. member for Sudbury, but I want to come back to another area of specific consideration. The hon. Attorney General will not be surprised to learn that it is car insurance.

After I put on the record half-a-dozen of the cases that had been drawn to my attention throughout the period from last fall until the end of January or early February this year—I put them on the record during the Throne debate—I was rather curious at two reactions. One was the hon. Attorney General's personal comment to me afterwards that he was a little surprised that all these reports came to me and not to him. Also a number of other government hon. members who may or may not be in the House today said that they had received a great many letters indicating the kind of abuse that I had put on the record; they felt something should be done about it.

I want, at the outset, Mr. Chairman, to make this basic plea. The hon. member for Downsview is correct that there is a distinction between the desirable objective as sought by this party in terms of car insurance, namely, a public car insurance policy in which the insurance would be sold along with the licence, and the policy of the Liberal and the Conservative parties, which is to handle it through the private insurance companies.

In my view, what is happening today represents the growing body of experience which justifies even more conclusively the case for public insurance. However, before I get into detail I would like to urge the hon. Attorney General or the hon. member for Downsview and others—all those who wish to live within the framework of the existing system—that even if you cannot see your way clear to move towards a public car insurance system, something must be done within the framework of the existing system to cope with these obvious abuses that have emerged.

Without going into all of the detailing I did during my Throne speech, in essence what has happened is that the car insurance companies are increasingly resorting to the practice of finding out, by the \$1 payment

to The Department of Transport, the driving record of a person, then of notifying him directly or through his agent that as of such-and-such a date his policy is going to be cancelled because they have come to the conclusion that he is a bad risk.

In those letters that I placed on the record, there were specific cases of people who had no more than four, five or six demerit points. In some instances they had not made a single claim on their insurance policy, yet their company saw fit to get this abstract of the driving record from The Department of Transport and to arrogate unto itself the right to arbitrarily decide that this person could not henceforth get insurance at the normal rates. By their action he, in effect, becomes blackballed in the fraternity of the insurance industry, and the only way he can get coverage is to go to assigned risk at two, three or four times the normal cost. I gave a specific case of those costs where they sometimes go up to \$400, \$500 or \$600.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, what has happened is that the car insurance companies have set up their own demerit system. They are above the law as established by this Legislature. They make the decision as to when the insurance is going to be cut off, and it has no relationship to the driver's legal right to continue to drive on the highway. In practice, their law supersedes the law of the province of Ontario.

Even if I went no further, surely here is the situation that the hon. Attorney General should take a look at. I do not know by what argument or by what reasoning one can tolerate the proposition that any group of people, essentially irresponsible in that they are responsible to nobody other than themselves, can set up their own law which shall supersede the regular law of the province.

Let me give you a few new cases to refresh the memory of the House and the hon. members of the kind of thing that is happening. I have here a letter received from a man in Cobourg on March 8. I am not going to give his name, but I would be glad to pass the letter to the hon. Attorney General if he wishes it. Let me read this letter, or parts of it:

I am a Canadian citizen. I have driven a car and truck since 1924 and have never had an accident. Never been stopped by the police nor even a parking ticket against my licence.

I would interject here, Mr. Chairman, that here is just about as close to the perfect driver as I have heard of.

I carried liability insurance with an insurance company and had a fire. On getting it fixed I was charged 25 per cent of the cost, so the agent and I had a few words, so I said I would insure with somebody else. He then told me if I did he would stop my insurance wherever I got it. Since then I insured with Allstate and paid the premium and within the month I was turned down as a risk.

The word had gotten around in the insurance fraternity.

I then insured with Canadian Home Assurance of Montreal and was carried for three years. Now they have stopped the insurance and as I have to have a truck for my work, I need the insurance. I have been to the police here to see if they could give me any reason for the cancellation and they have shed no light on the situation but the chief of police has said he would gladly write a few lines stating that there is absolutely nothing against my licence. The car and truck were always in perfect running order; the wife and I are the only drivers. She has had a driver's licence since 1925 and has never had an accident or a mark against her licence either.

I am a painter and have to rely on the truck for my living and I need insurance but feel I should not have to pay for risk insurance when I have no demerit points against my licence.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that that case is solid, that this man has been done an injustice and if the insurance companies are acting illegally, I think the hon. Attorney General should take a look at the law.

Let me give you one or two other cases. This is from Toronto earlier this year, and I am going to refer with initials to two people in this letter. Again, I would be glad to show it to the hon. Attorney General, but I do not want to involve the insurance agencies.

I might say to my hon. friend from Downsview who referred to the 8,000 insurance agents as being opposed to public insurance that he might be astounded, together with the hon. member for High Park, to know the number of insurance agents today who would be delighted to get out of car insurance; who are fed to the teeth with the problems involved in car insurance, and who are so increasingly indignant at the injustice involved in some of the practices in car insurance that as loyal members of the industry they would like to rescue the

insurance industry from the kind of opprobrium it is falling into because of the practices in the car insurance industry.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Impossible.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not, and that is one of the reasons why they suggest that we get out. The answer, of course, to my hon. friend over here as to why they do not quit is because they want to stay in the insurance industry and they know they can make a living out of the remainder of the coverage being sold.

Mr. White: The hon. member for Woodbine gave a long speech proving how highly profitable it was—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): When was that?

Mr. MacDonald: This letter has reference to Mr. A and Mr. B. Mr. A is a man who came from Europe; I learned for the first time that apparently insurance companies look with a jaundiced eye on an application for insurance from anybody from Europe or the Near East, on the assumption that if they come from those areas they are automatically bad drivers.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Were you ever in Rome or Paris?

Mr. MacDonald: I am quoting from the experience of only one insurance agent. I add that because it may not be the general picture, but in his experience he has found it increasingly difficult. In this instance, the man finally got insurance through some pretty vigorous efforts on the part of this independent insurance agent. On January 26, 1962, he had property damage for \$35. This occurred when the insured hit a car in a parking lot. Two and a half years later, July 11, 1964, he sustained a serious accident; there was a rear end collision and there was \$900 damage. Admittedly, this is a serious claim, but this kind of thing is happening more and more frequently on our crowded highways. The insurance agent received a notice from the insurance company saying that as of such-and-such a date, this policy is going to be cancelled. But, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to consider this: There was a friend of Mr. A, whom I shall call Mr. B, who also came from across the seas. He got his insurance coverage because he was a friend of Mr. A, and through the intercession of the insurance agent. When the company cancelled

the policy of Mr. A, they also, in the same paragraph in the same letter, said:

Regarding the file for Mr. B, we note that when this was written last October, the reference was made on the application to this policy for Mr. A, and in view of the experience under the A policy, we would ask that you please return Mr. B's policy number . . . for pro rata cancellation.

In other words, he had his policy cancelled through guilt by association—no result of accident, and no relation to anything else.

Mr. Chairman, how far above the law can you get in terms of unjust and discriminatory action than that? And what does our Department of Insurance do when that kind of thing exists and is drawn to their attention? At the moment, the answer is nothing, as far as I know.

I have here a copy of the March 10 issue of the *Northern Times*, a paper published in Kapuskasing, so that we will not be ignoring the north. This is delightful; let me read it. It is a vignette of life in the north:

Several weeks ago we commented on the inequities of a law which would convict a person who failed to render assistance to a policeman when requested to do so, particularly if that assistance happened to be required to quell a brawl.

Readers will recall that such a case arose in Kapuskasing. A young fellow was sitting in a restaurant drinking a cup of coffee and minding his own business—or trying to—when a fight broke out on the other side of the premises. The proprietor called for the police and a lone officer appeared. He was unable to handle the miscreant and he asked for help from the observer. As would be the case with most people, the lad gratefully declined the invitation to fight and he was promptly charged with failing to assist.

In his subsequent court action he was convicted and sentenced. He now has a criminal record, but that is not the end of the story. Last week the insurance company which covered his car learned that they had a desperate criminal on their books. It matters not that the car was not involved in any way in a court action, the insurance company cancelled his insurance anyway; on general principles, we presume.

Like a lot of other insurance company regulations, this move would seem to put the private citizens in the situation of always giving and never receiving anything but unfair treatment, that is.

I know the hon. Attorney General could not and would not defend that kind of action, but it is happening, and with increasing frequency.

The cases that I put on the record in January and February are not the rule as yet, and I am not going to suggest that they are; but certainly they happen with increasing frequency.

Here is another case. I am not going to defend the driving record in this instance, Mr. Chairman, but I have just sent a note to the hon. Minister of Transport over there because there is one angle that comes under his department that rather intrigues me. This is the instance of a man who wrote to me with regard to his son who had his driving licence cancelled for a six-month period for loss of 11 demerit points—not 15—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! I am curious to know on what grounds, legally, The Department of Transport can cancel it at 11 demerit points. I understand that all losses were with regard to speeding; it was not drunken driving, or impaired driving or anything of that nature.

However—

Mr. Singer: Without any demerit points he can—

Mr. MacDonald: He can?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe he did exercise his discretion. He looks like a kindly man, as I see him reclining in his seat over there, but maybe he has his vicious moments.

Let me proceed. This insurance company wrote to the father and indicated that they were willing to give collision insurance to the three cars involved in this family—the husband, the wife and the son, who was working and who drove, incidentally, as part of his work. But since the husband had car insurance for his and his wife's car elsewhere, he was not interested in this big deal that was offered to him. But the big deal involved this, Mr. Chairman, and it is to this that I draw the attention of the hon. Attorney General. The Department of Transport cancelled the licence for six months, but the insurance company arbitrarily said that they would not give them collision coverage for a year. In other words they say, in effect, that—by what right or by which law, I do not know—that they are going to extend the legal cancellation of this government, through The

Department of Transport, for another six months. It is in the category, once again, of this being above the law—they are making their own law.

Let me give you another example of how far this has gone, Mr. Chairman. I will not quote the agency, but the date is April 1965. I will name the company—it is Canadian Indemnity—which wrote to a certain agent in the city of Toronto. Let me read the second paragraph of the letter:

In the past two years our automobile experience has not been satisfactory and as a result we are no longer writing as new business any persons who have been involved in an accident during the last three years.

So there they are arbitrarily saying—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): What is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: I will come to that in a minute, if you do not grasp what is wrong with it.

Mr. Cowling: I will wait.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Bryden: You would not grasp—

Mr. Cowling: I will get it.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Do you never get any nice mail over there?

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean? Do you mean mail saying that this is a fine government or something? Is this your definition of nice mail?

I am sorry, my capacity to live on thank-you letters is a little limited. I get a little sick after a while; it is a thin diet. I am glad to get letters that reveal to me the realities of the difficulties of living under a Tory government in the province of Ontario—because of their sins of omission and commission—

Mr. Cowling: The hon. member is the only one who gets them.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I would not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: I would feel flattered if—

Mr. Cowling: I wish the hon. member for Woodbine would wake up—

Mr. Bryden: Do not worry, I am usually awake.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in addition to drawing to the attention of the hon. Minister in these specific cases—the fact that now insurance companies are, in effect, saying they will give no insurance to anybody who has had an accident for the past three years—I draw to his attention something else. I must confess, once again, this is something I was not aware of.

I received from somebody in the industry—

Mr. Cowling: They must be dumb, the people who send you letters.

An hon. member: They must be.

Mr. MacDonald: No, they went to the insurance underwriters' convention and they watched some of the leaders in action and they came to the conclusion that they were dumb, and they are smartening up now.

An hon. member: Imagine that.

Mr. MacDonald: If I may quote from this letter: "The assigned risk plan, however, is not the only market for these risks."

In other words, what I have been saying up until now is that a man was forced to go onto a signed risk when this arbitrary action was taken by the car insurance company.

Mr. Cowling: Maybe he should be off the road.

Mr. MacDonald: But this is not the only market for these risks. About three years ago, a company called the Adanac—which incidentally is a subsidiary, a division, of the London and Midland Insurance Company, located at 376 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. I quote:

About three years ago, a company called the Adanac began writing insurance for any driver who was having difficulty getting insurance due to accidents or convictions. The advantage of this company over the assigned risk market is that the insured can also get collision coverage, along with the minimum limits of \$35,000 for public liability and property damage.

The premium is based on points figured from the number of accidents, convictions, etc. For example, a young man picking up a careless driving charge, one speeding ticket and an improper parking conviction would have a premium of \$344.00 for bodily injury and property damage. If there had been an accident at fault in the last three years, the premium would be \$448.00.

Within the last year—

if I may skip further down the letter:

—we have a new company writing this type of insurance.

In other words, this is a second company that has emerged in the field writing insurance specifically in this high risk area of people who have been shoved out into this assigned risk plan, or that is the only other alternative.

It is called the Pacific Automobile and Fire Insurance company and is located at 60 Yonge Street, Toronto. On their prohibitive list is anyone who has not had an accident or a conviction record—

Mr. Cowling: Well, what is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: It indicates that you have insurance companies that will exploit every area.

Mr. Cowling: That is all right; that is fine.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

The premium for a conviction as shown above will be \$328; without an accident and for two accidents within the three-year period, the premium would be \$410—

and so on. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. Attorney General this high risk field has developed until you have a group of insurance companies that are coming in and offering insurance at the high risk area, throwing in collision coverage so there is an alternative to assigned risk, and even refusing to take insurance from anybody except a person who has been designated as a high risk—

Mr. Cowling: That is fine; the others should maybe not be on the road.

Mr. MacDonald: Now I come to some suggestions and conclusions that I want to raise with the hon. Attorney General.

I want to suggest to the hon. Attorney General that within the framework of this system with which he presumably is happy, he and the Liberals along with him, even within the framework of this system something has got to be done. Whether the hon. Attorney General wants to do it through the superintendent of insurance or not, I do not know; and what conclusion he wants to come to, I do not know. But I would suggest at least this: We should remove the anomaly of insurance companies being able in effect to establish their own demerit system and establish it above the demerit system of the province of Ontario.

If the province of Ontario, in its wisdom, decides that a person who has not acquired 15 demerit points, retains the right to drive on the highway, I would suggest that the insurance companies should not have the right to arbitrarily cancel policies or arbitrarily refuse to grant insurance to people who have had an accident within the last three years. In effect they should have to live up to the law of the province as it is established in this provincial Legislature. It seems to me that this is plain common sense. That is point one that I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister.

The second thing that I want to query him on, because I am increasingly puzzled about this, in a reply to a question that I put on the order paper, the last sentence of the reply reads as follows, in reference to insurance companies' costs:

These surveys that have established that on an average 37 per cent of the premium dollar is required for expenses which would include a profit margin or not more than 2.5 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the fact that it says "37 per cent of the premium dollar is required for expenses." This is from a survey.

Now, two years ago, as I noted in my Throne speech this year, my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, asked of the hon. Attorney General's predecessor, Mr. Cass, some questions with regard to car insurance. After he had asked them, the then Attorney General sent him a copy of a reply he got from the then superintendent of insurance. In that memorandum, a copy of which Mr. Cass sent to the hon. member for Woodbine, dated December 26, 1962, the final paragraph reads as follows:

The allowable amount required for expenses has been established at 37 per cent of the premium income.

Now I am curious, Mr. Chairman. This year's reply says that "surveys indicate that the charge is 37 per cent"; the statement of two or three years ago indicated that "the allowable amount was 37 per cent."

I have spoken to people who are familiar with the insurance industry, including the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) who says he knows of no law that requires that companies cannot go beyond 37 per cent for expenses.

Mr. Singer: Those sections I referred to would give them the power, but they have never proclaimed it.

Mr. MacDonald: All I am saying is that they have not specified any limit for expenses.

Mr. Singer: No, they have not any right to until they proclaim those sections.

Mr. MacDonald: If I interpret that statement of the superintendent of insurance three years ago as meaning that the department had formally or informally, legally or illegally, fixed a limit of 37 per cent, I again draw to the attention of the House the record of the last two years, for which figures are available.

In 1962, the loss ratio, that is the percentage of the premium dollar that was paid back in claims—was 69.5. The expenses for that year were 40.3, for a total of 109.8. In other words, Mr. Chairman, what the insurance companies as a whole are claiming is that out of every dollar in premium that they took in, they paid out either in expenses or in claims \$1.09.8.

In 1963 the loss ratio, namely, what was paid back on claims out of the premium dollar, was 76.2. Their expenses that year were 42.1, for a total of 118.3. So, Mr. Chairman, the insurance companies would have us believe that in 1963, out of every dollar they took in they paid out \$1.18 on automobile insurance. This, incidentally, does not take into account investment revenue that they got perhaps on premiums and things of that nature, so that this is not the whole story.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): On automobile insurance!

Mr. Singer: It does not take any of it in.

Mr. MacDonald: In short, the insurance companies are losing money! If they are losing money this badly, what puzzles me is why they are so desperately anxious to stay in the field.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): They do not all.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, in a few instances they have been instructed by the superintendent of insurance that they had better get out. I was told by one of the officials in The Department of Insurance that two or three companies in the last year were advised that their financial position was coming into jeopardy and they were advised to get out of car insurance. I do not imagine that they can be legally forced out. I do not know what the power of the superintendent of insurance is in this connection.

But what I want to draw to your attention—apart from this very intriguing situation as to how much the insurance companies are losing, Mr. Chairman—is that if that memo of the superintendent of insurance three years ago was fixing a limit of 37 cents as the allowable maximum for expenses, the fact of the matter is that in the two years to which I have drawn attention they had gone beyond that allowable limit. In 1962 their expenses were 40.3, and in 1963 they were 42.1.

Now, finally—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder if I could interject here.

When the hon. member uses the word “allowable” I think it should be clear that this was not something that was fixed or established by any department of government as an allowable margin at all but simply, if I may use the word “marginal,” a marginal percentage on which they could do business and make a reasonable or fair profit. They have now reached beyond that and are losing, not making the profit which was considered to be allowable or reasonable, if you accept that as the percentage which should be allocated to the expense of doing business. It is not in the sense that it was fixed or something by which they had to remain by virtue of any law or any ruling, it is simply their own business margin.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am near the end of my comments, but I want to make a few general observations in drawing some conclusions from this up-to-date picture of the car insurance industry at the present time.

I repeat, I think that for those of you who want to retain this system the obligation is on you to clean up these abuses. But the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that this experience, to my mind, is the most convincing evidence for a public car insurance policy in the province of Ontario. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, as a general rule—and this is particularly in reply to the interjection of the hon. member for High Park a few moments ago—that when private insurance refuses to service the market, they themselves have given conclusive evidence that they have outlived their usefulness.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): That is not right!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am asserting it for the moment.

I am saying that when private insurance

refuses to service the market; when they deliberately cut insurance policies off; when they send letters out and say, “We will give nobody any coverage that has had an accident in the last three years”—in short, when they refuse to service the market; then somebody has to service the market at other than exploitive premium prices. When you get to that stage, I think the answer is a public insurance policy.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I think it goes—as the hon. member for Downsview alluded in passing during his comments—not only to the field of car insurance, but I think it goes to the field of fire insurance. For example, in the city of Toronto in much of the residential area that lies between Parliament and Spadina up to Harbord or up to Bloor you simply cannot buy fire insurance from any company at all. Now, to what extent this situation obtains in other cities across the province of Ontario, I do not know; but I can assure you as far as we are concerned, in the New Democratic Party, we are going to find out, because I think the case is being built up—by the failure of the insurance companies to provide fire insurance to people who are entitled to it—for public ownership of fire insurance. Moreover, it would be public ownership not only in the high risk areas, because any plan that is set up by a government should not be pushed into just the high risk areas.

The only persons who would do that are the Tories in medical insurance; have the government take the high risk and leave the insurance companies the lower risks. Any public plan will have to sell all across the board.

This is the situation that has developed in the heart of the city of Toronto, it is the situation that is emerging in the car insurance field. I submit to the hon. Attorney General that the insurance companies have to face up to the fact and that he, through his Department of Insurance, has to make them face up to the fact.

For example, if we in society, through any one of our levels of government, decree that a building in the heart of the city of Toronto is fit for human habitation—in other words it is a building that is not going to be condemned, is not going to be torn down, human beings have a right to live in it legally—I suggest to you that those human being have the right to buy fire insurance. The fire insurance companies have not the right to say, in effect, “We will not sell in this area, because it is a high risk area.”

Those people are being discriminated

against. In other words, the insurance companies are not servicing the market. When the private insurance companies cease servicing the market, then the case has been conclusively made for the government acting in establishing public insurance.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment on the driver whose licence has been suspended, to which the hon. member for York South has referred? He thought the licence had been suspended at the 11-point level. I have checked with our records, and as I think the hon. member did not put the name of the driver on the record, I shall not mention it; but the person about whom he asked me, in the two-year period up to January, 1965, had 13 convictions—two accidents, two warning letters and two interviews. He was suspended at point accumulation level in 1963 and again has reached the 17-point level, when suspension is mandatory, and has been suspended for six months.

Mr. MacDonald: I thank the hon. Minister for the explanation. I will pass it on to the family.

Mr. Singer: Is the hon. Attorney General going to make a reply?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I perhaps might take a moment to answer some of the comments or at least speak to them.

Perhaps I might first advise the hon. members of the House that in the organization of The Department of Insurance in 1964, the department was divided into two separate branches with the registration and examination branch being a separate branch of The Department of the Attorney General. The superintendent of insurance, or The Department of Insurance, administers these Acts: The Insurance Act, The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act, The Investment Contract Act. I think hon. members are aware that insurance companies—and this is a large field of the insurance industry—companies which are federal or Dominion companies are administered, supervised, inspected by the superintendent of insurance in The Department of Insurance of the Dominion government at Ottawa. So that a very large part of our insurance industry is a federal area, and in that sense a federal responsibility.

Mr. Singer: That is substantially in relation to financial matters.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right, and a very important area, too.

I might say to the hon. members of the House that we have applications now coming forward from companies which seek to get provincial charters to come into the provincial field, to be incorporated in the province. There are other companies from other provinces seeking to be chartered or incorporated in another province of Canada, to gain admission by extra-provincial means into the province of Ontario.

This entails a problem of how they are to be supervised, how they are to be administered, how to be supervised and inspected, and the necessity of either having a policy that they should come under the Dominion supervision or an actuarial branch set up under our own Department of Insurance to properly see that they carry on business in a way which is sound and satisfactory. That is one of the problems which is before the department now, and I thought the House would be interested in knowing this, and one that is receiving immediate attention.

The sections of The Insurance Act to which the hon. member for Downsview referred, I can only say, as he has related to the House, have been on the statute books for some 41 years. As someone pointed out, they have been there through the administration of different governments in this province; and I must say to the hon. members that it is not the intention to have them proclaimed, as the Act provides they may be proclaimed, at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I think they are there for the purpose of use if rates, insurance rates, become out of line. They are there for immediate application as and when it is deemed necessary. At the moment I have to say to the House that it is not deemed necessary that they be proclaimed.

Mr. Singer: Shame!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I wonder if the hon. member, when he was talking to the insurance companies the other evening, told them he thought they should be proclaimed?

Mr. Singer: Yes, I did.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He did not tell the House exactly that, although he urged that the government do it.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I was a signatory of that report. The hon. Provincial Treasurer was. He agreed with it. Several of the hon. members over there agreed.

Mr. MacDonald: A split in the Cabinet apparently.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister without Portfolio from Lanark (Mr. Gomme), he agreed with it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was the main burden of the hon. member's remarks to the House, and I simply have to tell him that it is not intended to proclaim the sections at this time. I say they are available, as they have been available, for use when and if it is deemed necessary to make them applicable.

Mr. Singer: Again I say: Shame!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must, with respect, congratulate the hon. member for Sudbury for what I thought was a very excellent and certainly a very correct and clear presentation of the law as it relates to certain phases of insurance. But I have to draw to his attention the fact that the gratuitous passenger situation is something that is in The Highway Traffic Act. Likewise the motor vehicle accident claims fund is in The Department of Transport. It was taken out of The Department of Insurance when it was known as the unsatisfied judgment fund, moved over to Transport and given the name of the motor vehicle accident claims fund. I do not think that it is the responsibility of the Attorney General to start commenting on the administration of the gratuitous passenger legislation which is in the Act of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Highways, or on the motor vehicle accident claims fund, which is in The Department of Transport.

Mr. Singer: You have a problem fractionalized and nobody is responsible.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Fractionalized, if you like that word. It certainly is set in the department where I think it belongs and there it is administered and there I think it should be administered. The hon. Minister who is responsible for that department, I am sure, can comment with respect to it.

I am in agreement with the hon. member for Sudbury. The law, I think, should have a different approach to the third party situation. It is something, I may say to the House, that will be represented at the meeting of superintendents of insurance; we approve of the suggestion which was put forward and it will be urged that that situation be corrected.

I will agree with the hon. member for York South that there are problems now arising in the insurance field. I am aware of them and many letters such as he has received have come to my desk—complaints of cancellations, complaints of the difficulty

of getting insurance when a cancellation occurs and of the manner in which it is done, and of the lack of notice with which cancellations are received.

But I must say, in fairness to all concerned, that this is not a company doing something which is illegal. I do not think you can use the word injustice. Perhaps it verges on what the individual may feel is an injustice to have his insurance policy cancelled, but this is a right implicit in a contract written by a free agent in the contract field with another free agent, to take or refuse a contract of insurance and to cancel the contract—

Mr. MacDonald: You might pass a law that they cannot do this, as you are going to do in medical insurance.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We might do this. When I say we might—

Mr. MacDonald: Under certain conditions.

Mr. Singer: We want to control the—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: When I say we might do this, I want to put it in this light. We have the right, of course, to do this and it might well be done in the sense that we have the power to do it, but at the moment that right is not in the law. The legislation is not there saying you must, having written a contract, stay with it.

Mr. MacDonald: The law was written by the insurance companies, and passed by the government.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The law was passed by the government. The contract, at present, is a contract between two free parties, with the right of either one to cancel.

Mr. MacDonald: What is free about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is nothing illegal, I want to make this clear; there is nothing illegal about it. Perhaps the hon. member feels it is an injustice. I will go so far with him as to say that a problem arises now in the insurance field, in the light of the difficulty which insurance companies are having, particularly in the motor vehicle field. I think this is quite apparent, with their reluctance to take risks which are bringing about losses on their ledgers.

I think I must say that the problem is before us, but I do wish to make it clear that this is not an illegality that is being allowed by the government. There is nothing illegal about the contract being cancelled, and the

company has the right. He gave the citation of the company that would take only a certain type of risk, and then the other type who wanted the bad risk, because they got, I suppose, a higher premium. These are quite free and proper endeavours in our society, and in our system of enterprise. So let us be clear that there is no illegality here.

I must take issue with his words. Companies have not set themselves above the law, and there is still the assigned risk field, so that even if the policy is cancelled there is the right to go over and get insurance, at an increased cost. I am not sure that I can find it in my mind to say that that is wrong, or that is injustice, or that there is not good reason to justify the assigned risk basis of contract.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the hon. Attorney General permit me to intervene? Here is a man who has had no accidents, and has accumulated five or six demerit points. This is cancelled, legally, and then he is forced to go onto the assigned risk plan and pay two or three times more. Surely that is not a defensible kind of proposition? They are above the law in the sense that this man has only five or six demerit points, and he can go to 15 before he is denied his driving rights on the highway. This is what I mean when they are above the law. They are making their own laws. It is operative in terms of who is going to be able to get insurance to be able to drive on the highway.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, might I also add just one further point here? The letter I have in my hand is an illustration of it, that we buy and pay premiums for insurance for protection in case of accidents. This is the purpose of it. So for years the premiums are accepted, and then something happens. We have the accident against which we were insuring ourselves and then we find that the company is not willing to carry us beyond that.

This letter tells of a man who has been driving for 35 years. His wife has been driving for ten; the son for six. Two years ago, the son had an accident and smashed up a car—his own car. No other damage was done to persons or even to himself. The husband then had an accident which involved a whip-lash, \$130 damage, and then the whip-lash cost \$1,800. That was two years ago. Now the insurance is cancelled by one company. He has tried, and I have the names of eight companies here. They all refuse insurance. The Royal at first declined,

but now covers him with a 21-day binder, whatever that is. Perhaps the hon. member for High Park can explain what binder is. I thought it referred to cheese, or something like that.

Mr. Cowling: It refers to the NDP. They are kind of binding. Most of the time.

Mr. Young: I see. In any case, the New Democrats are covering these people for 21 days then, this is what you mean? I am glad to know this. They are being covered now for this period of time, but what will happen then? Perhaps they go into assigned risk, high-cost insurance, if they are going to get any.

Mr. Cowling: The best thing to do is get off the road.

Mr. Young: But this is the problem. These people paid premiums over all these years against a possible accident, then the accidents occurred, against which they insured. Now the companies say because you had these accidents two years ago, no insurance. This is the problem.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, if I could just get into the debate—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, I am an insurance agent. I am not speaking for the companies; I am speaking for ourselves, and I have been debating this with the hon. member for York South since 1955. Naturally, I feel that the private insurance companies can do a better job on insurance of any kind than the government can. I say, of any kind. Now you mention all the problems of—

Mr. MacDonald: That is why you opposed hospital insurance, even when your own government brought it in?

Mr. Cowling: I voted for hospital insurance and I supported this government, but I spoke against it many times before that. You know it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: I wish the hon. member for Woodbine would go back to sleep. Would you do that?

Mr. Bryden: I do not emulate you at any time.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Will you address the chair when you are speaking?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, will you ask him if he is in favour of the Canada pension plan?

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I agree that there are some problems in the automobile insurance business, but there are a lot of problems in every business. We have a lot of problems right here in this House; there is no easy solution to them, and certainly I would not be in favour of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: I simply say this, Mr. Chairman, that as difficult as the automobile insurance business might be for the industry today, it would be a lot more difficult for the government. Believe me, I know that. You have heard from three, four or half-a-dozen people—including insurance agents, and I do not know why in the world they would write you. Because you have heard from a few of them, remember there are hundreds of thousands of insured people in our province who are quite satisfied with their insurance and their coverage and the way the insurance industry is operating. Hundreds of thousands, so you read us two or three who are not. It is something like we had last night about Guelph reformatory.

Mr. Young: Are they satisfied, or are they just keeping quiet because there is nothing else to do?

Mr. Cowling: They are perfectly satisfied.

We must remember, Mr. Chairman, that the insurance companies do not make the rates; the driving public make the rates. If you will refer to an article of two or three days ago in one of our papers about the increase in the accident rate this year over last year, this first three-month of 1964, is simply fantastic. It has gone up 51 per cent. Are the insurance companies supposed to be responsible for this? I say that if we are going to do something to cut this great accident rate, one way we can do it is by much stricter enforcement of the laws as they are today. If somebody is driving at 35 miles an hour in a 30-mile-an-hour zone, they should be stopped and hit really hard for disobeying the law and I think in that way we are going to do something to cut down on the accidents and subsequently cut down on the insurance premiums.

But the question was raised this afternoon, why car insurance policies are cancelled. Well, there is a very good article in the *Timmins Press* and it is headed: "You Won-

der Why Firms Cancel Car Insurance." I think it is very apropos here, Mr. Chairman. It goes on to say:

Are you a highgrader, a habitual drinker, a speed lover or open-handed when it comes to lending your car? Are you a poor driver? Do your neighbours call their children into the house when it is time for you to drive home? Do you have a police record? Are you considered an undesirable character? Does your wife talk too much to strangers?

If the answer is "yes" to any of these questions, you may have your driving insurance cancelled without any reason given.

Insurance companies never give a reason for such action. After all, if they put it in writing, there are not enough courts in Canada to handle the resulting actions.

The driver who suddenly gets such a notice is the first to scream that there is no reason for it and members of his family and his friends take up the cry. Of course, the fact that he has a heart condition, suffers from some disease that makes his driving dangerous to the public or may have defrauded the company on a claim, never gets mentioned.

I had this very personal experience just a few days ago. A young lad said to me that he had to pay \$60 on his car insurance. He wrote to The Department of Transport and said that he had never had anything wrong; he had never had a summons; he had never been stopped for speeding.

So I went to the department and in his name were two convictions for speeding. I went to the young lad and asked him if he had been speeding on such-and-such a day on Lawrence Park and on such-and-such a day on Spadina. He replied that he had not been, but he had a couple of brothers and suggested that maybe it was them. So a few days later I talked to him and he said that it was not him, but one of the brothers had taken out the car and was involved in the speeding accident. Is that the responsibility of the insurance company? I do not think so.

The reasons for a company wanting to terminate a client are many, but the basis for all of them is the same. The company is in business to make money. If it loses money on certain types of drivers, it retires from the risk.

However, the general rule is that if you have a driver's licence, you can get insurance. It costs money, though. If the company feels that you are going to cost it money under the normal insurance rate it cancels the policy

and lets the assigned risk provide the insurance at higher rates.

Human nature being what it is, when a person has his normal policy cancelled, he usually switches companies. If he tells the truth, he obtains insurance under the assigned risk plans at higher rates. If he does not tell the truth, he has provided another company with an excuse to cancel the policy.

Now, I do not say that all people operate that way, but I say in most cases where you find that there has been an increase in insurance premium rates, there is a very justifiable reason for it. I say with this, Mr. Chairman, that the insurance rates on an automobile are not predicated by the insurance companies, they are strictly up to the driving public. If we are going to do something about this situation, we are certainly not going to take over the automobile insurance business. That is ridiculous!

One way that we can help to at least hold the line on rates or reduce them, is stricter enforcement of our laws on the highways.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would say something about the allegations that were made by the hon. member for York South when he said that there was a large block of buildings in the city of Toronto on which no fire insurance could be bought. To me this is an incredible situation where buildings are used for human habitation and yet insurance cannot be bought at any price. I would just ask the hon. Attorney General to look into that situation, and if it is true, I think that something should be done about it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I am only able to say to the hon. member at this time that this is the first I have heard of this situation. I am glad that it has been brought to my attention, I shall look into it at once.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Attorney General is looking into it—I know it exists in Toronto, there is no doubt about it and coming from Sault Ste. Marie he has not been exposed to some of the horrible things in Toronto—but would the hon. Attorney General find out to what extent, if any, the same situation obtains elsewhere across the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes, I shall, Mr. Chairman. I will give an undertaking, it shall have my close attention. I will certainly look into the matter.

Could I ask at this time—and this is all I wish to say—I would like to have the com-

plaints which hon. members have mentioned, which they have in their possession in the insurance field generally.

Vote 210 agreed to.

On vote 211:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, vote 211 is the vote dealing with the law reform commission. When this bill was brought in just a couple of years ago, we generally greeted the advent of the law reform commission with approval. But we did try to get from the Attorney General of the day its composition and the particular fields of reference to which its attentions would be directed.

This information was not forthcoming at the time the bill was introduced. Much of it is available now, certainly the composition of the law reform commission is known to us.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: And the terms of reference, if I may call them that, are in the bill.

Mr. Singer: Well yes, all right; perhaps my choice of phrase was not the happiest one. The terms of reference, as in the bill, pretty well say that the government can refer anything they want to the law reform commission. You can pretty well ask them for their opinion on anything that comes within provincial jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is right.

Mr. Singer: And ask them to do studies and to make suggestions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think the first, if I may say—I have not got the bill in front of me—but there are four things. The first three are things which they are directed to do: The study of all the laws, the statutes or common law, the courts, rights generally, procedures and so on. And then, fourth, if I recall, any matter referred to the law reform commission by the Attorney General; but it is a broad field of study.

Mr. Singer: That is right. That was the point I was making, the hon. Attorney General has perhaps phrased it *better than I*, but they can do almost anything that the government wants them to do.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Or that they want to do.

Mr. Singer: Or that they want to do. What we were concerned about was that they be directed reasonably immediately to certain urgent problems. That was number one.

The other thing that we were concerned about was the personnel. Now, the govern-

ment decided that Chief Justice McRuer, former Chief Justice McRuer, would be the head of that commission. At the same time they have given Chief Justice McRuer one of the most comprehensive jobs that has ever been given to anyone in the province—and as a matter of fact if anyone sits and listens to these debates one would imagine that Chief Justice McRuer is going to rewrite, in his capacity as commissioner of the civil rights investigation, rewrite almost all of the laws that are wrong in the province. The ones that he has missed, apparently, he is going to be able to look after under the law reform commission.

I have the greatest respect for this gentleman and I think the intelligence, training and knowledge that he brings to his task on the civil rights commission is of inestimable value to the people of Ontario. But it would be my thought that he has got enough on his hands for the next several years to fully take care of his time; it would be my additional thought that the time that is going to be ably devoted to the proper direction of the law reform commission, perhaps, is not available. I want to make it abundantly clear. I am in no way criticizing him! I have the greatest respect for this gentleman. I think that being seized of the one task that he has his hands full for some considerable time to come. As I say, when you add to that what we have heard here in the debates of the number of things he is considering, and the government does not want to decide upon until they have heard his opinion on them, his task in the civil rights commission is a mammoth one, Mr. Chairman.

At the time I made these remarks when the announcement of his appointment as head of the law reform commission became public, it was suggested to me that perhaps the two jobs went hand-in-hand, and it would be better if the same person, or the same direction, applied in both fields. When I heard that suggestion I said, let us wait and see how it works out. Well, the law reform commission has laboured mightily and they brought forth a mouse, I think, in the form of their first recommendation—a very important one—the one that deals with the law of perpetuities. As the hon. member for Sudbury says, he can hardly find a voter in his constituency who does not ask him about the state of the law of perpetuities as he walks around his riding. I have found the same thing in Downsview, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has found the same thing, too.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Never heard of it until today.

Mr. Singer: But as important as this field is, and as a real concern as it is to the community of Ontario, I think it is well known to anyone who is at all familiar with this subject that there is one man in the province of Ontario, sir, who knows all about the law against perpetuities. In fact, he is the man who is the prime consultant, one of the foremost legal scholars not only in Ontario, but in Canada and the whole of North America, in the Commonwealth system.

Mr. Sopha: Give us the name.

Mr. Singer: Dean Caesar Augustus Wright.

Mr. Sopha: Cecil Augustus Wright.

Mr. Singer: Cecil Augustus Wright. Now, he is the man who did it; he is the man who wrote the report; he is the man who reframed the statutes. The law reform commission read it over very carefully, I would think, and adopted his report almost in toto. I am advised that they looked at his statute references and they came to one section in one of the statutes, and said: "Maybe your wording in that section is a little vague. How would it be if we changed it this way?" And Dean Wright is reported to have advised them: "I think that is a good idea. I was not too happy with that wording myself."

As important as this is, surely the services of Dean Wright were as available to my friend, the hon. Attorney General as they were to the law reform commission. So, while all of this time was being spent by the law reform commission on reviewing what Dean Wright did, and being very sure that what Dean Wright had to say in this field, was going to be the last word in any event, surely there should have been some direction to take them into such questions as the law about divorce, or the law about securities, or the law about fire enforcement and control that I was talking about last night. Even the suggestion of the Katzman committee which they are presently reviewing, I understand, about the law of personal property. But there are things that really cry out for this sort of a body to get at, and these are the things the hon. Attorney General keeps telling us he is investigating, and in due course we are going to be able to bring a statute before the House.

To my mind, sir, and these remarks are very brief, the performance of the Ontario law reform commission, to date, has been disappointing. There is a real task to be done by this commission, and to date the indications of their having grasped that task have escaped me in any event.

Mr. Sopha: By sheer coincidence, yesterday in Sudbury when Mr. McRuer was holding his Royal commission inquiring into civil rights, the Sudbury law association, comprising all the members of the Bar, tendered him a luncheon. He spoke for three-quarters of an hour or more on that occasion and, in his introductory remarks, he said that it would be inappropriate for him to make any comments on the nature of his inquiries into civil rights before he submitted his report to the government. But he felt free to make some comments upon his activities as chairman of the law reform commission. He outlined the nature of the work, the approach of the commission to its task, and he told us that they had had this significant addition to the staff of W. B. Common, who apparently is devoting most of his time in the capacity of counsel to the commission. The vice-chairman of the commission is Dean Leal, of Osgoode Hall, and there is Mr. W. Gibson Gray of Toronto, a member of the commission. He informed us that it was never intended that the commission itself would be a research body; the commission was merely to identify the fields where inquiries might be made to ascertain whether reform in the law was necessary. To that end, the commission delegated Dean Wright to look into the rule against perpetuities which, of course, is a very archaic and well-encrusted body of law that has grown out of the common law. It has had a great inhibiting effect upon the carrying into effect of testators' intentions. To the layman, this has been a prolonged discussion by lawyers, but if one told the layman how outdated this rule against perpetuities was an illustration would be that the rule against perpetuity holds that a woman can have a child at 95 years of age; which, of course, in the light of modern medical science and modern knowledge, is a biological impossibility.

It is interesting to note in the amending statute that for the first time, certainly in the law of this land, we are going to enact by statute, as if we were all biologists, which we are not, we are going to enact and enshrine in legislation that no male can father a child under the age of 14, and no female can bear a child under the age of 12 or over the age of 55. This problem, I say to the hon. Minister of Highways who looks up in startled fashion, this problem of at what age a woman can have a child has vexed the law lords for a good many centuries. In reading the decisions of the House of Lords, one might say that there is no subject that the law lords are more

familiar with and are greater authorities on than sex. Of course, all that is going to be abolished now, when the law against perpetuities is going to be melded into reasonableness, as it should be.

The commissioner told us yesterday that the law reform commission is not a research body, they farm out the projects. He said the next one they have begun to farm out is in the realm of family law. The person who prepared the hon. Attorney General's estimates here got it down wrong. That person, whoever prepared this, put it down as domestic relations project, and that is not quite an accurate description of what the law reform commission is looking into.

Family law is a much broader subject than domestic relations. Some domestic relations are not in the field of law at all, have nothing to do with the law, but they are going to look into the matter of separation allowances, the handling of cases of deserted wives in the family courts, the care of children, particularly neglected children; and they are going to look at this vexatious question of dower.

Maybe there will be a government with sufficient courage some day, whether it be Conservative or Liberal, that will have the courage to abolish dower. Now I am not saying today that I am advocating the abolition of dower. I do not want to receive 5,000 letters next week from women's groups in this province. I am just saying it is a possibility in the future that dower may be abolished.

I just want to say this in conclusion—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: What about courtesy?

Mr. Sopha: Well, courtesy, I do not think men, now that they get the first \$20,000 of the wife's estate, I do not think they would be worried if it were abolished.

I just want to say this, that in James Chalmers McRuer we have one of the finest judicial minds that ever practised law or sat on the bench in this province. He is now approaching his 73rd or 74th year and I hope that he—I fervently pray—that he is granted many more years to address himself to the tasks that have been assigned to him. He had a very able career at the Bar before he was appointed to the bench and then of course after he succeeded Chief Justice Rose as chief justice of the high court he had 20 years as chief justice of that branch of the supreme court of adjudication.

He is a very dedicated man in that he would never assign one of his fellow judges to try a case that he would not try himself,

and over and above his duty of administering the supreme court of adjudication he never relented in the application of his own time and talents to the trial of cases himself. We are indeed fortunate to have this man of the very highest integrity and the strongest intelligence and endowed with a great sense of wisdom, to address his talents to this task.

One might say in conclusion that law reform, of course, is an area, a significant area, where we are much behind the British. We are usually, as I calculate in my mind, we are usually about a generation behind the United Kingdom in making reforms to our laws, just about a generation.

For example, they had their Law Reform Act in respect of real property in 1924, I think it was, where they did away with all these silly and useless rules such as the rule in Shelley's case and that type of thing and revised the whole law of real property and made much of it statutory. Now here it is 1965 and we have not even begun to approach that task in Ontario.

He was telling us yesterday—this is an anecdote that should be put on record—he was telling us that he discovered in some of his researches that there are statutes in this province that are in force, are viable, that one cannot even find the statute, all one can find is reference to the fact that the statutes are in force. He said he is looking desperately for a statute that is in force in this province that adopts the law of the reign of Henry VI—and Henry VI, if I am not mistaken, was one of the Lancasters, perhaps just before Richard III, and that would put him in about the early 15th century. He said before his life expires that he is going to find that statute that adopts the law of the reign of Henry VI into this province.

He says there are many others, and indeed anyone who practises law is perfectly aware of that, that all of the statutes in force in this province by no means are printed with those several hundreds that are in the revised statutes of Ontario. There are many more over and above those.

I share the view of my friend, the hon. member for Downsview, that there are many urgent areas in which inquiry ought to be made. One of the ones that always strikes me as being very necessary is whether some research might not be made to reduce the number of statutes in force in the province. I counted them up and my memory serves me ill but I think there are about a thousand now. We have been passing statutes at a rate that is properly described as geometric proportion; that is as the years go by we

pass a greater number of statutes per year. It is not an arithmetic progression, it is a geometric progression. In another ten years—I figured it out one time—if we keep on at the same rate, at the time of the next revision in 1970 we will have something like 1,700 or 1,800 statutes in force in the province. Well, when you get a body of law like that, the layman, the citizen, is in a bewildering state of confusion.

Now just one additional thing. Mr. McRuer told us that after the law reform commission was set up in Ontario two years ago the Parliament of the United Kingdom, following Ontario's example, set one up. They allocated to it the task of reforming their law, which has never been revised. They do not revise their statutes in the way we do. Let us remember that William Joyce, Lord Haw-Haw, was tried under a statute of 1351, The Treasonable Offences Act. They do not make any effort to revise them. He told us that in the United Kingdom they voted the equivalent sum in sterling of \$750,000. Well, if we can give \$60,000 or \$75,000 to the thoroughbred horse society, then perhaps—

Mr. Singer: Thousand dollars! It is half a million.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, and half a million dollars to the emergency measures branch, which is a matter of federal jurisdiction. I was not here for that vote, but I just wish the hon. Attorney General would go down and tell Mr. Hellyer that comes under national defence; a federal matter, his responsibility.

Well, then, if we can do that, I would think that I would be one that would be in favour of increasing the vote to the law reform commission in order that perhaps several projects could be going on at one time, rather than farming out just one at a time. If we farm them out just one at a time, it may take us a couple of decades until we get all the law reform that ought to be reformed in the province.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would not take the time of the House to reiterate the points which have been made by the hon. member for Downsview and the hon. member for Sudbury, but I would ask the hon. Attorney General to let us know what fields are presently under review by the law reform commission, to find out whether or not they are realistic and have any relevance to the matters which are of concern to the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, this is one vote in which I am sure we have the support of all hon. members of the House, moneys that are being allocated for the studies of the law reform commission. I will come to the answer of the question of the hon. member for Riverdale in a moment, but I would like to just take a brief moment to let the hon. members of the House know the terms of reference, if I may use that again, given to the law reform commission by the Act which was passed last year, 1964, chapter 78. It was empowered and instructed to inquire into and consider any matter relating to:

(a) Reform of the law having regard to the statute law, the common law and judicial decisions.

(b) The administration of justice.

(c) Judicial and quasi-judicial procedures under any Act.

This is something that the hon. member for Sudbury was speaking about in the House a few days ago, and saying that there should be a study of procedures and methods of carrying forward hearings before boards and commissions. This is item (c), one of the matters referred to the law reform commission by the Act which incorporated it—one of the things it is doing.

(d) Any subject referred to it by the Attorney General.

Now, Mr. McRuer was appointed as chairman of that commission in June of last year. Dean Leal of Osgoode Hall law school was appointed in July, and then three further members, who have been named here today, in November of last year.

The hon. member for Downsview asked in his question number 90: "Inquiry of the Ministry, Will the Attorney General advise." Now, this is one of those famous questions which is numbered 90 but breaks down into (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), into seven parts and (g) is again broken up into two more. So I think we have actually nine questions here in the one. But in item (d) he asked: "To what projects has the law reform commission directed its attention?"

The answer to that, as tabled, was as follows:

Item (d) of question 90 sub-(d): The Perpetuities Act. The Accumulations Act. The Trustee Act. The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act. The Judicature Act. The Wagers Act. The Securities Act. The Personal Property Law. The Family Law. The Law of Condominium.

The new concept—I am sure the hon. mem-

bers are aware of this law coming forward and being proposed—

The Wills Act. The Uniform Wills Act. The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Several of these have been referred to the law reform commission by the Attorney General's department. Several they have undertaken as a study of their own. I think I would say that the large project, the main chief project, which is being carried forward now by the law reform commission is the whole field of family law, which, as the hon. member for Sudbury says, embraces separation, perhaps divorce, custody and access to children, support, maintenance, dower, and all the things which relate to family relations, family law generally.

I think it would be proper for me to say, particularly in view of the suggestion that has been made that possibly the law reform commission and the human rights study is too much to combine and to carry on together—and I do not think the hon. Mr. McRuer would mind my saying in this House, although I have heretofore kept quiet when I have seen these suggestions put forth—I think he would not mind my saying that the two are closely related and that the one sheds light upon the other and that they should be carried on together. Furthermore he feels quite capable, with the staff we have given him—and we will give him more if he needs it—of conducting these two studies, these two researches, and that is what they are, side by side. So I would like to make that clear at this time.

I refer to the law reform commission as what I like to call a continuing research facility into the law. And when the hon. member for Sudbury says that we are behind the United Kingdom, I am quite prepared to give credit where it is due and always have felt that there is a very capable and excellent conduct of the law, both in the Bar and the bench over there, and in Parliament, but I think it is only fair to say that the law of real estate, particularly, and many of the other laws of the United Kingdom contain ancient vestiges of law which we never had in this country.

There were estates entailed and so on, which we have never had to contend with here, so that perhaps they need to do some reform. But it is a fact that in this instance, the United Kingdom has followed us and it is only this year that a law reform commission has been established in Great Britain. We are a year ahead. Our law reform commission was underway a year before the United Kingdom's.

I can recall, and I cannot recite the words, but I remember reading in *Hansard* where the hon. member for Downsview said—and he said this last year, I am quite certain, possibly the year before—“Why do not you do something about the reform of the law? Why do not you get your bright young students from the law school; why do not you get your law professors; why do not you get the best legal brains you can get from the law schools and do some research?”

Now, I am sure that he is not taking objection to the fact that the law reform commission has, as one of its members, Dean Leal of Osgoode Hall law school—

Mr. Singer: I just want you to speed up the—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: —and that it retains eminent persons from every law school in this province, members of the staffs of all the law schools are being retained, and their services made use of by the law reform commission and that young graduates, bright young lawyers, medalist men, are being employed to do researches in all these fields and there is no lack of personnel. And I think there will be no lack of support for this commission, in its continuing research. One of the things in which I am very interested and of which I am very proud, is the accomplishment that we have it going forward.

Could I just say that when you see there the item of, I think it is called “family law”—which is probably not the right name—when you see \$35,000 allocated to that, this is a continuing research which will certainly take two or perhaps three years and it may run, before it is finished, to perhaps 130, 140 or \$150,000 in that one great field of law. For this year's purposes, I think the amount we have asked for will probably be sufficient.

That is something of the work of the law reform commission.

Vote 211 agreed to.

On vote 212:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, vote 212 deals with the Ontario police commission, and I think it is most important that we comment on what appears to have been the requests of the Ontario police commissioner, addressed to his Minister and which the Minister either rejected himself or perhaps passed on to his Cabinet colleagues and were later rejected.

I am sure the House will recall that in 1961 there was a study conducted by the Northwestern University traffic institute—in fact, there was some \$67,000 paid for that

study—into the sort of policing that might be recommended by that important institution.

Now, it was indicated that our force was short—in the opinion of these people—our force was short in staff, and at that time the force had some 1,880 men, or rather 1,888 men in uniform and 321 civilians. The study suggested that 797 civilians were needed and that the force should be increased to some 3,366 men.

In addition, it made several recommendations about administrative procedures. As far as I can understand it, most of the administrative recommendations were adopted, but the big problem comes with the increase in staff as recommended by the force and as requested by the commissioner of police. It would seem that he asked this year—based on that report and based on the aggravation of the situation which was investigated, the aggravation being the increased number of vehicles that are on the road—he asked for some 500 more officers and 200 more civilians. In fact the increase in budget that is being granted to him will allow the employment of only some 200 additional recruits and 140 civilians.

The hon. member for High Park earlier this afternoon made mention of the fantastic increase in traffic accidents in the first quarter of this year. The deaths in the province are 272 in the first three months, as against 261 last year, and this is something that causes alarm to all of us.

It would seem certainly from the studies that have been done and from the requests that have been addressed to the Cabinet and to the hon. Attorney General, that one of the answers could well be the availability of more provincial police, the availability of more civilian help in the office of the OPP. Naturally, to get that increased police and civilian strength, there are going to have to be an awful lot more dollars.

I noted with some interest that the hon. Minister of Transport sent out onto the highways and bylaws examination units and they are conducting compulsory examination of vehicles—those vehicles they happen to find in the far east end of the province and the far west end of the province. I hope that this will have some effect, but I think that, as the Northwestern traffic institute discovered and as we talked about in this House many times, one of the best ways, as the hon. member for High Park mentioned this afternoon, one of the best ways in controlling traffic to limit the number of accidents is in better policing. As our roads get longer and wider and bigger, and as we get more and

more vehicles on to the roads, surely, Mr. Chairman, it must be obvious that we need more policemen to properly control that traffic.

The travelling public needs to see policemen in their uniforms and in their vehicles and recognize that there are constant patrols on the highways. In so doing, and I suppose most of us in this Chamber drive our own cars, in so doing I think you will agree with me when you see a uniformed policeman and you see a recognizable police vehicle, if perhaps you are going over the speed limit or perhaps have a tendency to cut from one lane to the other, the idea that a policeman is there, whether he is doing nothing more than sitting by the side of the road and watching the traffic, will bring under control the careless driving habits of most of the drivers that I know.

But to do this properly, Mr. Chairman, to do this properly, there has to be available to the police arm of government, to the Ontario provincial police, enough money to hire enough men to do the job. The study that we paid for, the study that the people of Ontario paid for, indicated in 1961 that we were far short. The request that was addressed to the hon. Attorney General indicates today that the money that is being asked for this afternoon is not enough to do the job properly. The statistics are there; the first quarter of 1965 is the worst yet, a shocking increase over the first quarter of 1964.

Mr. Chairman, in this field above all I would have hoped that the hon. Attorney General would have come forward with a request for enough money to do this job properly. It would seem to me that he has not and I think, even at this last hour, there should and could be an amendment upward of the item in this vote which would provide more policemen and more civilian help so that the OPP can get on with the job.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Royal commissioner was inquiring of Superintendent Whitehouse, the commanding officer of District 13, how many detachments, sub-detachments he had—maybe the word is detachments—he had in his district headquarters. First of all the commissioner asked him what the dimensions of his district were, and Superintendent Whitehouse told him it was 300 miles long by 200 miles wide. Now I am a member of the Macaulay school, and perhaps somebody would tell me how many square miles that is—60,000? Sixty thousand square miles and he said he had 14 detachments.

Now, I would not think—it is my personal opinion—that is enough for appropriate policing. He has one or two or three or four on Manitoulin Island; he has one at Chapleau and one at Espanola; one at Folyet and one at Gogama—that is in the boondocks, the far-flung outskirts. Sometimes those detachments are policed by one or two officers, but within the environs of the city of Sudbury, the large metropolitan area, there are virtually—I can think of only one detachment outside of the district headquarters I referred to this earlier. They travel long distances to get to the area that they police.

I would think that the commissioner ought to be directed to establish one somewhere in the township of Rayside, to look after a fairly heavily populated area—Blezard, Rayside, Dowling, Balfour; then perhaps the town of Chelmsford, if it moves to give up its policing activities.

Another comment that the Royal commissioner made—and we will not wait for his report for me to relay these to me, Mr. Attorney General, which I think are of interest. The commissioner asked the superintendent whether he would have any objections if the officers in the detachment had the power to grant bail, which is quite a departure from established notions of granting of bail. We know, of course, that provincial police officers using common sense grant bail now. They grant bail in the sense that they let the fellow go home.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is an interesting idea, but a curious idea when we have just finished saying that a justice of the peace should not have any connection with the police office at all. He is the party to grant bail today.

Mr. Sopha: As I was saying, we know that provincial police officers in many cases exercise an extra quasi-judicial function in effect by letting the offender go home, when they know him and he is not likely to run away.

They take him in on a drunk charge or something like that, then let him go, where a justice of the peace might require bail. No one objects to that.

Now the thing I want to ask, and it is the very last word I want to say on these estimates—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member might say—I thought he was coming to this when he described the 60,000 square miles, with 20 men or 16 men or whatever it was—that he would have

made the point that that was a very law-abiding area.

Mr. Sopha: It is known as such. It is famous far and wide, except for the large number of crimes of violence which we have to try at every fall assizes.

I want to tell the hon. Attorney General that before he came into this House—perhaps he does not know it—but the amendment to The Police Act that established the Ontario police commission, and to some extent re-organized the Ontario provincial police, that we in this party voted against that Act.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: All of it?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, we voted against it on second reading and we voted against it on third reading.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: You could find nothing good in it?

Mr. Sopha: No, we could find nothing good in it. But I want to tell him that we do not bear the responsibility for the relationship of the Ontario police commission to the provincial police. Then at a subsequent time, when we were expressing our anxiety about how it was working out, how the nexus between the police commission and the provincial police was working out, I believe it was here—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Could I get this clear, Mr. Chairman. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he voted against the entire provincial police Act, or just one section or so of it?

Mr. Sopha: We voted against the amending bill that established the Ontario police commission, that is the one.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, I see.

Mr. Sopha: I think I sent for it, and that is the statutes of 1961-1962, chapter 105. When we inquired at some subsequent time, and I believe it was in this House, how the Ontario provincial police commissioner was getting on with the police commission, the Attorney General once removed, the one from Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass)—two of them have been removed but the once removed is the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas—told us that he found it necessary to separate the police commission and the commissioner of the provincial police by a floor of the building. When they first started out they were next door to each other, then they put one on one floor and one on the other—they made a geographic separation

between them which leads to certain logical inferences which I do not have to detail to men of intelligence such as sit in this House. I would like to hear from the hon. Attorney General, I would like him to give us his assurance that the relationship between the police commission and the commissioner of the provincial police is one that is devoid of friction, that is to say, that there is good rapport between them in the administration of their responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can give the assurance immediately and completely and without any reservations; it is excellent.

Mr. Sopha: Fine.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, following up the hon. member for Downsview, I would like to ask of the hon. Minister whether any serious consideration is being given to the matter of a significant increase in the size of the force of the Ontario provincial police? The hon. member for High Park is very concerned about the automobile accidents and I am sure he would back up any move of this government in adding to that force to a point where it becomes effective in cutting down this accident rate. I think we should have an answer to that from the hon. Minister.

Also I would like to call to the hon. Minister's attention, another matter which to me is rather serious, and that is the low salary scales within the force. I have here some figures which compare OPP salary scales with the Metro police force, and they are rather illuminating. They run on an average of about \$1,000 a year below the Metro police scale. A constable, probationary, for example, in Metro earns \$5,300, and it is \$4,200 on the OPP. A constable: \$5,700 to \$6,500 in Metro; in the OPP it is \$4,500 to \$5,400; a corporal: \$6,600 to \$6,900 in Metro; and \$5,600 to \$5,900 in the OPP—running just about the \$1,000 below. The staff sergeant: \$7,500 to \$7,900 in Metro; and \$6,800 to \$7,100 in the OPP—a little less difference. An inspector is \$8,200 to \$9,700 at the Metro level, and it is \$7,200 to \$7,500 in the OPP. A chief inspector runs from \$10,800 to \$12,400 in Metro, and from \$9,500 to \$10,000 in the OPP. Now unless there have been some adjustments to the salary scale in very recent days, these are the salaries that are being paid, starting at \$4,200 with a probationer constable and going to a maximum of \$10,000 for a chief inspector.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to this problem. We

hear a great many stories about the bleeding process, where men go into the OPP and then they come into the Metro force and other places, and in many cases we are told that the salary scale is not adequate for the job, to hold them there. Whether or not there is a real problem here I do not know, because this kind of information is difficult to get, and perhaps the hon. Attorney General will give us some information on it.

It may be difficult to raise the standard as far as numbers are concerned with these salary scales or it may not, because there are always young men who are intrigued by this kind of life and the challenge of this kind of work and young recruits are more easily obtainable, perhaps at lower salaries than older men, but those young recruits, once trained, should be held by the force and the salary scale has something to do with that. So I would ask the hon. Minister if he might comment on these two matters which I have raised.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the recent history of the force, personnel-wise, if I may use that expression, and with respect to the increases in votes in the development of the force, I would just like to give the House these figures: The amount voted in the estimates for the Ontario provincial police in 1961 was \$12,800,000; today I am asking the House for almost double that amount in the amount of \$23,907,000. Last year the vote was \$20,300,000; the increase being asked today is \$3,607,000; that is an increase in this particular estimate of 18 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: Is it adequate?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think that hon. members will agree that this is a fairly substantial increase in any estimate.

Mr. Singer: Do you increase it by a percentage in trying to reach an adequate amount?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, a percentage is just one way of measuring things as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Bryden: But is it not a better way to make a determination of the requirement?

Information has been published in the press to the effect that outside determination of the requirements, and also the determination made by the commissioner of the provincial police, indicate that the increase you have made is not sufficient. I think it was suggested that it is about \$2 million less than these experts in the field consider to be

sufficient. I do not know if these reports are true, but that surely is the question to which the hon. Attorney General should be directing his attention.

Is the increase he proposes to make sufficient; is it in line with the advice he has received from outside studies? I do not want to inquire into his internal relationships with his own officials, but is it a fact that the Treasury board has simply cut down what was recommended as necessary?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I had not quite completed my answer, Mr. Chairman, on the personnel of the force. I wanted to draw the attention of the hon. members of the House to this: I had taken the year 1962 as a base, at which time the police personnel on the strength of the force was 2,051. In 1963, there were recruited and added to the force 500 personnel bringing the total to 2,551 in the one year; an addition of 500 police personnel. At the same time 65 civilians were added so that the force in 1963 was recruited up to the strength of 2,551 police persons and 466 civilian staff.

In 1964—last year—there was added to the force 250 police personnel, bringing its strength to 2,801, and 47 to the civilian staff, so that the force last year was recruited to a level of 2,801. Now, bear in mind it was 2,051 in 1962; it had increased to 2,801 last year, with 513 additional on the civilian staff.

Mr. Young: Can I ask the hon. Minister, does this mean that this is a net increase of 250?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: A new group taken on strength of 250.

Mr. Young: A new group taken on strength. During that same period, how many resignations would there be, how many people leaving?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is the net gain.

Mr. Young: That is the net gain?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Mr. Young: Have we any record of the number of people who separated themselves from the force?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can say that substantially more than 250 were recruited, but that the net gain was 250. Perhaps the commissioner may be able to tell me the number recruited. The loss was about 4 per cent, I am told, which is quite a low figure.

I think the figures showing a net gain in the year 1963 of 500 police personnel, and 250 last year; 750 gained in two years on that force, or about a third of its strength in 1962. This indicates, perhaps, the nature of the answer to what the hon. member for Yorkview asked as to salary. I do not think you would have succeeded in that recruiting programme if the salaries were so very unsatisfactory. I must say I am not satisfied with them, but in addition to that I can tell the House that the salaries were revised upwards last year as part of our programme, and quite substantially so, and the matter is still under further consideration.

Mr. Young: Revised upward to these figures which I gave?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Right!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. Minister has answered the real question at all. He has indicated that there has been an increase in the force as between 1962 and 1964, he has not said anything about the more recent period; he may not have figures on that. What period of the year were you talking about, were you talking about the end of the year or the beginning of the year?

At any rate, the figures he gave show that there has been an increase and I think that is common ground, I do not think anybody questioned that. We were all well aware of the fact there has been an increase.

But the criticism that has been made and which the hon. Minister has still not answered is in two parts really: (a) the increase has not been sufficient in relation to the need; (b) the current plans of the government in relation to the strength of the police force are not sufficient to meet the need.

These are the matters that are causing concern and I think we should have a clearer statement from the hon. Minister than we have received to date as to how adequate the current plans are. As I indicated to him a minute ago, it has been stated in the press that the increase in funds he is asking for this year is approximately \$2 million less than is required to bring the force up to the strength that the experts apparently consider necessary. I firmly believe that no one in this House and no one in this province would object to the expenditure of an additional \$2 million for this purpose. This is a basic, a vital need, and \$2 million, I regret to have to say it, is really small change in the Budget of the province of Ontario as it now exists. It is a very small percentage indeed.

I certainly do not think that \$2 million should stand between us and what may be considered to be adequate police protection in the province. The answer the hon. Minister has given up till now simply does not touch on that question at all. He evades the whole problem.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think anyone would admit that policing is one element in traffic control and in accident control, but I do not think it is the whole answer, I do not think it is the whole cause; I do not think it is the whole cure, to put policemen on the road. I think it is a very important element to have proper policing, properly trained traffic control policemen on our highways, but I do not think I would accept and swallow as the whole answer the thought that all the traffic deaths were due to the fact that there were not enough policemen on the highways.

Mr. Bryden: Who has suggested that?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There seems to be a fairly strong implication.

Mr. Bryden: It was the hon. member for High Park who brought that in.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As I have pointed out, the money that we are obtaining in this vote is an increase of 18 per cent in this estimate. I have pointed out there has been a very substantial increase in that estimate over the recent years and a very substantial increase in recruitment. There was a 250 net gain in the force in 1964 and 500 in 1963. Our estimate this year will enable the force to be brought up to the 3,000 mark, whereas in 1963 it stood at 2,051. I think the figures themselves give the answer to the House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the statement—

Mr. Chairman: Order! This member has the floor.

Mr. Bryden: That is all right. It does not matter, I will get my word in.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the point was this, that in my remarks, the remarks at the beginning of this vote, I suggested that the department's own advisors, in the study that they undertook with the Northwestern University in 1961, indicated that there were certain grave deficiencies in the policing done by the OPP.

In addition to that, it has been made clear in the press, and the hon. Attorney General has not seen fit to deny that these stories are correct so we must presume that they are

correct, it has been made abundantly clear that there was a request for \$2 million more to do this job properly. If the outside experts so advise and if the requests have come from his own officials surely, whether or not there has been an 18 per cent increase one year and a 25 per cent increase the next year or a 1,000 per cent increase the year after, surely the question has to be, Mr. Chairman: Is the job being properly done?

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Your argument is based on 1961.

Mr. Singer: If my hon. friend wants to go into the figures a little more thoroughly, it is worse today than it was in 1961 and it has not kept up—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): It is ridiculous.

Mr. Singer: All right, it is ridiculous. In line with that, if it is all so ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, why did the commissioner of police come to his Minister and say, "Give me \$2 million more than this \$23,907,000," unless he felt that he needed those men? Why did all the opinions indicate that this was necessary?

Now it is all very well to say it is not just policing that is going to prevent accidents. Of course it is not, there are a lot of things that are going to do it; but policing is a very important role and I would suggest, before this vote is carried, the hon. Attorney General still has the power to ask this House for an extra \$2 million to do the job properly. I am sure he will get it without a dissenting voice.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just to underline the point that the hon. member for Downsview has made, the hon. Attorney General was given the opportunity to deny the stories that appeared in the press and I think it was incumbent upon him to do so if they were in fact untrue. This is a matter affecting the safety and welfare of all the people of the province. If there are stories abroad indicating that insufficient attention is being paid to the problem, insufficient money is being made available to do the job adequately, then I think it is most important that the hon. Attorney General should set the record straight. He persists, in response to our queries, on giving information that does not relate to the real question at all. The real question is not the size of the increase as between 1962 and 1963 or between 1963 and 1964, the question that has been raised, and which I think this House

and the people of the province are entitled to have answered, is: Is the amount he is proposing adequate for the job? That is the real question.

The hon. Attorney General, after three attempts, has carefully refrained from answering that question. The only conclusion I can draw is that the statements in the press must be true, that insufficient money is being made available and that it apparently was cut out by the Treasury board from an idea of economy, which is false, especially when one considers that in relation to the total Budget the amount of money is not large. This must be true, otherwise I am sure the hon. Attorney General would have taken the first opportunity to deny the statements made.

I can appreciate the embarrassing position in which he probably finds himself in having to defend an indefensible policy, but that still does not answer the question. I agree with the hon. member for Downsview that this vote should be held until the government has a chance to reconsider the position in which it finds itself.

One can only conclude that inadequate funds are being made available for the provincial police. This is not exclusively a matter of traffic control by any means, although certainly traffic control, as the hon. member for High Park indicated, is an important facet of it. We can agree with the hon. Attorney General that proper police supervision is not the only answer to the problem of accidents. We would agree with all those things, but the basic fact still remains that he has not answered the question. The only conclusion one can draw is that he does not have an answer.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, let me disabuse the hon. member's mind that the Attorney General is embarrassed, and trying to defend an indefensible position. That is the first thing I should like him to know.

Mr. Bryden: Well, you certainly have not answered.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The second thing I should like him to know, as I have stated before in this House, is that I do not feel called upon to get up and deny everything that appears in the press, and I do not propose to start that policy. I will let my own actions and my policies as I state them, speak for themselves. I do not propose to answer reports in the press.

The third thing I would say is that the estimate I have asked for today from this House of \$23,907,000, which is \$3,607,000

more than last year, will allow for an orderly development of recruitment and training within our limitations in this province, and will allow for an orderly advancement of the force—adequate to take care of what I consider to be the situation we face in the province.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay this question unduly and if I might just speak for a couple of minutes we might get this vote over with, I do not know.

I would just like to support the hon. members in their feeling that we should have an increase in the personnel of the provincial police in this province to effectively police the traffic behaviour on the highways. And I want to talk about a stretch of highway that I travel twice a day and have observed for some years, and that is the stretch from Hamilton to Toronto on the Queen Elizabeth highway.

Now I raised this question with the hon. Minister of Transport last year; I had noticed during that session that the signs that restricted truck traffic to 55 miles an hour were missing, and I questioned him about it, because I observed that trucks were travelling at a higher rate of speed. At that time it was 55 for trucks and 60 for passenger car traffic. I was told by the hon. Minister that they had changed that regulation and trucks could travel at the 60 mile an hour limit.

I was quite surprised at the illogical reasoning to this because this did tend to have some effect on the increasing truck traffic on that stretch. I do not think anyone will disagree that more trucks are travelling on that stretch, and I might include Highway 27 to 401 and 401 to the city limits, as being one of the most nerve-racking trips that a passenger car can take.

I am not blaming the hon. Attorney General for this situation, but it leads up to my question. The traffic at that point, where the limit was 60 miles an hour for passenger cars and 55 for trucks, was moving at between 65 and 70. This would seem to be the going speed, and I predicted at that time, that with the lack of any control, it would increase gradually, and today this has happened.

Passenger cars now have adopted a speed of between 65 and 75 and because there is no

differential, the heavy trucks are keeping up with them. Now, on a short strip where there are many spots of merging traffic from three lanes to two lanes and an approaching access, this is too high a speed for trucks carrying from 20 to 50 tons of cargo. I predict that we are going to have a rash of serious accidents on that stretch if there is not more policing done.

I do not blame the police force who are assigned to that area, but maybe because of the shortage of police you can often drive from Hamilton to Toronto and not observe one police car. I am sure that experienced passenger car drivers can put up with this, but they have to keep their wits about them, and any kind of a timid driver, or an aged driver, as I have observed in the past few weeks, almost does not know where he is going.

I have noticed, and followed, two trucks passing one another for five miles at a stretch, both of them hitting over 70 miles an hour. Now certainly there is a need for more policing on these stretches of highway.

I think there should be a differential between the trucks and cars, and again this is not the business of the hon. Attorney General—it is in The Department of Transport's area—but it should be policed. This is the responsibility of the hon. Attorney General's department and I would urge him to make a survey of just what is going on on that stretch, because it is getting worse all the time.

I am sure that the truck drivers are rough, burly people, they are adventurous, they are good drivers, they know the laws, but they still push those trucks to the limit and when passenger cars creep up to driving as a habit between 65 and 75 mph, the trucks now, because there is no differential, are going to do the same thing. It is just not the type of thing to be taking place in that type of a stretch of highway and I would appeal for more policing to slow them down to the regulation speed.

Vote 212 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 18, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 18, 1965

Estimates, Department of Public Works, Mr. Connell, concluded	3059
Estimates, Department of Civil Service, Mr. Allan	3080
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3088

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, if my arithmetic is correct, this is the seventh time I have had the privilege of going through the Public Works estimates. This has been a long two weeks. I have never had the privilege of being an expectant father, but I have sat up with a couple of mares for several nights this winter waiting for them to foal. It certainly is nothing compared with these past two weeks waiting to go on with my estimates.

However, I would like to compliment the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). I do not think this is usually done by another Minister, but in the 14 years that I have been around here, I think the last two weeks have been remarkable, as far as I am concerned. The fact that the hon. Attorney General, who has been in this House for what might be a session and a half—I am not sure yet—has to have the knowledge of his department and—I would not say the grilling—certainly with the questions that the Opposition have thrown at him, I think he has shown a remarkable knowledge of The Department of the Attorney General. I only wish the rest of us had the ability to restrain ourselves under extreme provocation that the hon. Attorney General has.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You were doing fine until that last phrase.

Hon. Mr. Connell: This session has been getting rather lengthy. I sometimes wonder if the good working quarters that the Minister of Public Works has provided around here has had anything to do with making things so comfortable that it has added up to this long session, but I assure you that we could still change things around a bit here if that could be the cause.

I would like, before I start, to compliment my own staff for their loyalty and their hard work. I call myself the janitor, and we are the janitor department. But I have a faithful group of people in my department, and I

would like to take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to them.

You have had my annual report on your desks for quite some time; I think you will see many of the things that have been done during this past year or so, and I would not care to repeat on any of that at this time. However, I think it only right that we, in Public Works go along with our building at all times. I do not think we realize just how much money the department or the government is spending on many of these important buildings. If you would bear me with for a few moments, I would like to mention, for the record, half a dozen or so. First of all, of course, is our own Queen's Park project, which is nicely under way, and our Treasury building extension, which is better than 60 per cent complete. I think it might be of interest to the hon. members, if you have not taken the opportunity to look, to go in the north wing and find a completely renovated area; it is remarkable. I had no idea that the space was available there myself. We are hoping the hon. Provincial Secretary will be able to utilize that section completely.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Open house next week.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Under Agriculture we have, of course, the chemistry and microbiology building, and the poultry and virus research institutes, both of which are practically complete. Under Education, we have the London vocational centre, the Ottawa vocational centre and the Sault Ste. Marie vocational centre, two of which are open and the other is about complete. Of course, we also have the London college of education and second stage of the Milton school for the deaf.

Under Health, we have the Ontario psychiatric institute, which we have heard about for 20 years around here, now about 63 per cent complete, as of a month or so ago. We have the Toronto central lab, the Porcupine Ontario hospital, a 300-bed hospital, and the Palmerston, which is just about complete; and the first stage of the London Ontario hospital. Under Highways we have the regional and district office building.

The list is by no means complete, but these are some of the larger ones.

Much of the work that we are proposing to get on with will be called for tender this year. That would include the institutes of technology at Hamilton, Kirkland Lake and Windsor, vocational centres at Hamilton and Welland, a bilingual teachers' college at Sudbury, a college of education at Kingston, and an adult educational centre at Toronto.

Under Health, we have stage two of the London Ontario hospital, the clinical services building at North Bay, the regional lab at Palmerston, new hospital units at Penetanguishene, the alcohol and drug addiction research and treatment clinic in Toronto and, of course, some alterations to the station at Edgar, which we purchased last year.

Under The Department of Lands and Forests we have the district office building at Cochrane and Kenora, a chief ranger's office at Terrace Bay, and an office and laboratory building at Wheatley.

Under The Department of Reform Institutions we have a building to replace the Andrew Mercer reformatory for women; we have the Hagersville RCAF station, which we recently purchased for a boys' training school, and a new boys' training school in northern Ontario—actually, we think that will be in the McFarlan Lake area, and in southern Ontario, to establish and provide facilities for a reception and diagnostic centre.

Under The Department of Tourism and Information, we have a reception centre at Sault Ste. Marie, one at Homer and, of course, the new centennial project in Metropolitan Toronto.

Under The Department of Transport we will be constructing a new field centre at Port Arthur.

As I mentioned earlier, most of these buildings will, more than likely, be called for tender some time during this year, or early next year.

My own budget is up a bit this year. We are asking for \$922,000 more in our ordinary expenditure, and about \$8 million more in our capital expenditure. Strangely enough, this is the first year that we have spent up to our full budget; in fact, we are a bit over. This is the first time it has happened in a good many years.

I think that pretty well completes my remarks at this time. I have often heard that brevity is a sign of virtue; I do not know whether it is in my case, but I would think it would be a good time to bring virtue back into its proper state.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

On vote 1801:

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the hon. Minister this evening, and I must say that he was very brief in outlining his estimates. However, I must say to the hon. Minister—he is a very fair man to discuss problems with, with regard to his department, and I can also say that he is a very friendly man—but it is with continual amazement that we have observed the antics of The Department of Public Works.

During the estimates of this department last year, my colleague to the left of me, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) made reference to the fact that there were \$85 million unexpended in the estimates of this department over the past five years, and criticized the lack of planning which this amount indicates. Has the hon. Minister attempted to rectify this situation?

I would say that according to the public accounts for 1964, there is no indication this has been so because we see a surplus this year of over \$5.7 million. I also would say that The Department of Public Works is not a profit-making organization. Its success is not measured by the surplus which it shows at the end of each fiscal year. I would say that its success can only be measured in relation to its ability to meet the needs of the people of the province of Ontario. How well are these needs being met? In several areas the government has been negligent of the legitimate desire of the people they are meant to serve.

The late president of the United States, John F. Kennedy said: The next question to war and peace is: Will man live? The second problem of civilization is: How will man live?

While other Legislatures and governments may have it within their power to control the first issue, it is certainly within the grasp of our provincial government to aid a great deal. On the achievement of the second, Professor Galbraith wrote a noted book, "The Affluent Society." By the way, Professor Galbraith was born in the riding that I have the honour to represent. In his book he made reference to this expansion of investments in this public sector.

I might say about Professor Galbraith, that he also wrote another book, "The Scotch", and for the benefit of my constituents, I wish he had not.

The problem is how this growing invest-

ment is to be handled. I would say that this government has given up its responsibility in regard to the proper handling of funds in the construction of public works. This can be illustrated in many ways, Mr. Chairman. All these criticisms serve to underline the lack of effective planning which this department displays.

The blue book here provides the untrained reader with what seems like a great account of action, taken by a dynamic department of government. In fact, it hides a great deal more than it reveals. Let us break the blue book down into only three sections—projects completed, projects planned or underway, work being done on individual projects. In the section projects planned or underway, there is no way of knowing which projects are actually underway and which are merely in the planning stage.

In the section of planned projects requested, there are several unanswered questions. Where, for example, does the department indicate priorities which it places on various works? Why have several projects remained requested and listed for a number of years? Is the hon. Minister confused in deciding whether or not these projects are worthy of the taxpayers' support? Surely he could not be delaying because of the lack of funds, as his department shows a \$5.7 million surplus.

This is a perfect illustration that the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing, while projects remain unattended to.

The hon. Minister boasts a surplus. Whether this is merely inefficiency or incompetence, or simply an example of political arithmetic, I would say that this is a cruel game to play when the needs of the people of Ontario are so great. There are several examples of such phenomena which I could give. After 326 projects shown as requested in the 1964-65 blue book, there were still 159 of these not acted upon in any way, as shown by the 1965-66 blue book. That is approximately 49 per cent of the requested projects, over one year ago, that have not yet been acted upon.

Let us consider the 51 per cent of projects on which some decision has been made over the past year. Of these 167 requested projects, only eight have been completed, and only 45 are in the planning or the construction stage, while the majority of the 114 projects have completely disappeared from the blue book.

The hon. Attorney General's department provides an excellent illustration. I refer you to the blue book of 1964-65, page 30. Here we find that this department requested 30

new projects. However, upon examination of the 1965-66 blue book, I find that, in fact, none of these projects have been completed, while seven have been completely dropped and the remaining 23 have not yet reached the planning stage. With illustrations such as this, it is no wonder we have delays in construction of new buildings.

Another illustration of delay is in the police college at Aylmer, Ontario. The Ontario police commissioner recommended that serious and immediate consideration be given to the erection of a new permanent building to replace the present inadequate temporary accommodation. I know that the hon. Attorney General is aware of this problem, as he has made reference to this section of the police commissioner's report. How long must the people of Ontario wait until some action is taken on this important matter?

Again, this year we find such new buildings listed in the blue book under projects requested. The new police college, so urgently required, has not reached the planning stage, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister shows surpluses. The hon. Attorney General commented recently that the replacement and extension of the police college is on the capital programme of The Department of Public Works. I cannot say, of course, that the police college is in the estimates for this year, but I think I can say that the government seems to be stalling on this structure. The hon. Minister says that they are moving; I would ask, Mr. Chairman, in what direction?

This is one example of the inefficiency and apathy of this department. If this blue book is to become a meaningful and useful document, many changes must be made. There must be a priority list, a construction timetable for all projects—projects requested, projects being planned or being constructed. For all projects in construction stage and projects completed, the blue book should also list the name of the successful bidders, the date of the tenders which are signed, tender price, date of completion and the final cost. Only then, Mr. Chairman, would a layman such as I be able to understand what is taking place. Only then will this blue book become a genuine source of information, instead of a publicity booklet for this government.

Another area of concern is the question of leasing. We see the government continuing to pour hundreds of thousands of dollars into rental of private buildings in order to provide office space needed for the various departments. In a few years, when the government

buildings are ready, the department moves into them, and the government will have nothing to show for these huge leasing expenditures. If, on the other hand, the government had purchased these buildings they could have derived some profit from the sale when they no longer required the use of such excess space.

Take, for example, The Department of Economics and Development. It was driven from its home on University Avenue to its new site at 950 Yonge Street. When we investigated the ownership of this building, we found it to be in private hands. I would ask the hon. Minister to make public the leasing contract for this particular building.

I take with dismay that in the estimates of 1964-65, The Department of Public Works requested \$2.5 million for leasing purposes. In the 1965 and 1966 estimates, this request jumped up to \$3.2 million, an increase of 28 per cent. It is unfortunate that expenditures of this kind, where there are no future returns for investment, must continue to expand. Had the department been properly co-ordinated with the other departments, it would have been aware of the needs of the other departments and could have had new facilities ready as the need arose.

For example, regarding The Department of Economics and Development, it should have been possible for the department to make one move from University Avenue to the new Queen's Park extension. Instead, the lack of proper planning has led to a situation where two moves will be required, and the taxpayers of Ontario will be required to bear the expense of these two moves, plus the years of rental, because The Department of Economics and Development was slow to express its needs, or because The Department of Public Works was slow to act upon them. And still The Department of Public Works shows a \$5.7 million surplus.

A recent report by the noted Canadian architects, John C. Parkin and John G. Spence—I want to say, Mr. Chairman, no relation whatsoever to me—

Mr. Singer: But a fine fellow, too.

Mr. Spence: A good fellow—complained about the lack of concern for beauty in the design of public buildings in the province of Ontario. They observe that for the most part, Queen's Park is simply a traffic impediment. The citizens in Toronto have been given no tangible awareness of their city as to the capital of the great province, nor reminded of the privileges of their position in

the capital. For most people living in Ontario, Queen's Park is a place to visit either in gloom or discomfort. The citizens of Ontario ought to be given a coherent grouping of buildings whose quality would give pride and identity.

We congratulate the hon. Minister on finally beginning to give the people of Ontario this grouping of buildings, but we ask him where is the quality that the people of Ontario have the right to? These upended shoe boxes are typical of the dull nature of this government.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Spence: It is one thing to integrate the design of government buildings to those which surround them; it is another thing, too, to so closely imitate the grey drabness of University Avenue that the government buildings completely lose their character, and the people of Ontario have nothing with which to identify them.

An hon. member: There are some characters in them.

Mr. Spence: Surely we have the right to expect to be able to tell the difference between our government buildings and our hospitals? If the city of Toronto can hold a world-wide competition for design of its city hall, can the province do less?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): What would it cost?

Mr. Spence: What of the one original building that we have—this, our Parliament building or our Ontario Legislature, a building where much history has been written? As we approach the 100th birthday of our nation, and also the 75th anniversary of Queen's Park, I suggest to the hon. Minister that on our 100th birthday it will be time to think of giving this Legislature building a facelifting.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Spence: There is great beauty hidden by layers and layers of dirt, dust and decay. This building should be sandblasted and restored to its natural colour for the 100th birthday of our country in the year 1967.

Another matter which many hon. members notice is the paved walk which runs through the park in front of the Legislature. I know that the members who use this walk will agree with me that if such a walk, with its broken slabs, pit holes and dabs of new cement—an attempt to repair—came under The Department of Highways it would immediately be slated for upgrading.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Public Works that he take a stroll down this walk some night, after a late sitting, and I am sure that after such a walk in the dark there would be an order not just for an overhaul job, but for a completely new walk.

An hon. member: Or an action against the Crown.

Mr. Singer: He would not be covered by insurance anyway.

Mr. Spence: At present, it is a disgrace to walk on it, or over the beautiful flower beds that used to grace this walk. They have never been restored since they were removed for the subway construction. These flower beds added much to the appearance of the front of this historic building.

In criticizing the government for inadequate planning by The Department of Public Works, there is another point I would like to make. In this report of Mr. Parkin and Mr. Spence, they refer to the value of decentralizing public buildings in the province. They discuss what they call the human love of symbolism. This again stresses the point that the people want something specific with which they can closely identify their government.

Therefore within the limits allowed by efficiency, the location of government buildings should be more evenly spread across the province of Ontario. Is it really necessary for all government departments to be located within the Metropolitan Toronto area, or even within the Golden Horseshoe?

To quote again from the architects' report:

The provincial government can greatly assist the development of culture values in our principal cities by planned grouping of government buildings, in cultural centres, rather than permitting uncoordinated scattering of provincial buildings throughout communities.

I might say here, Mr. Chairman, that not all the government departments are going to be brought back to Queen's Park after the new complex is completed. I might suggest there is the Ontario hospital services commission, maybe Ontario Hydro, maybe the junior farmers' loan board, and maybe this new medical plan which is being considered by this government. It might be located outside this metropolitan area or the Golden Horseshoe, in a rural area where it would be of tremendous benefit.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Chatham.

Mr. Spence: That is right, Chatham. The Department of Public Works should not only plan for Metropolitan Toronto, but for the whole province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give credit to the hon. Minister of Public Works. During the session of 1962 and 1963, many complaints were brought to the attention of the hon. Minister regarding the offices of the official Opposition. We had cramped quarters, not enough space for the official Opposition to carry out their responsibilities.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Your hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) said you were quite pleased about the changes that had been made.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Give him a chance.

Mr. Spence: I was just saying that many complaints in the past—

An hon. member: You can change your text.

Mr. Spence: That is right, I will change it. I was just going to give credit to the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): I just want to get it on the record that I am not at all satisfied with our new office space.

Mr. Spence: I want to say this, this was in the past—

An hon. member: Under the Hepburn government.

Mr. Spence: No, under this government. The hon. member for Sudbury stated that top agriculturists allot more space for a steer than this government allotted for 24 members of the Loyal Opposition, before these offices were improved. That is what I am trying to bring to your attention.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Well, this beef business is big business.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Kind of bull.

Mr. Sopha: Bulls need more room.

Mr. Spence: Mr. House Leader, I was always afraid before the changes were made in our offices that the humane society would call and investigate this crowded condition, and this government would be brought into court. At the beginning of the present session, however, I must say we have new offices, new desks, new telephones for every two members, new lighting, brightened up rooms,

new caucus rooms and new chairs. Our leader has a bright new office, which is a great improvement. I wish to commend the hon. Minister of Public Works for the improvements made in the northwest lobby, too—new rugs, new chairs, attractive lamps. I can advise the Minister that we now have a place where we can take constituents who come from our ridings—

An hon. member: It has been entirely overdone, no doubt about that.

Mr. Spence:—and also visiting delegations and other groups. It is a credit, and we certainly do appreciate it. It was long overdue.

Mr. Singer: Do not overdo it.

An hon. member: I do not remember it that good.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It was not meant for entertainment. We have not seen any improvement in the Opposition.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): We get the entertainment here.

Mr. Spence: You must have been afraid of the humane society or you would not have done it.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Once given you cannot take it away.

Mr. Spence: That is right. We do appreciate this, Mr. Chairman, it is a great improvement.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Makes working a pleasure.

Mr. Spence: That is right. I do not know that I have too much to say. I have a few questions as the estimates go along. I know my colleagues have questions to ask, so with these few remarks I will conclude.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am going to startle the Minister by saying that I will match and outdo his brevity. I think there are a few things that should be said more personally about this hon. Minister than the department. I know of no more affable and straightforward and non-political Minister in the government—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Notwithstanding the interjection to my right I stick with what I said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I am talking about sitting down and dealing with the estimates here. What he does when he gathers the Tory clan at his barbecue and gets rid of his surplus fowl, because of the collapse in the fowl marketing procedures in The Department of Agriculture, is another matter. If you wanted proof of the fact of his earthy qualities and his realistic approach to things, I have never known a Minister who could come in here and equate the gestation period of waiting to give his own estimates, and sitting waiting for a couple of mares to foal.

There is just one item that I would like to mention. It was touched on in the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Kent East, and that is to express our appreciation for the improvement in the facilities that have been made here at Queen's Park. I think with him that they were overdue. I will not say "I told you so" in terms of longer sessions, but I think inevitably we are going to have longer sessions, and therefore I think this kind of modern facility was required.

I know something of the incredible pressures and cross-currents that the hon. Minister had to contend with—he and his staff—in trying to meet the wishes, the desires and the needs of everybody. Now, at the risk of being a bit disconcerting for some on the other side, and particularly when I can safely say this now that the hon. Provincial Secretary has gone out, I have one note of criticism.

I think one mistake has been made in this. I think the proposition of this building becoming the centre of the government was a good proposition, and I think in the process of doing it the hon. Provincial Secretary's department should have been moved out of this building altogether, and instead—and I do not say this aggressively or critically, but I rather firmly believe prophetically—in the years to come we will recognize that what we should have done is taken the north wing of this building and created offices—one office with offices for one or two members, conceivably three or four, but certainly no more—along the lines that has been done in Ottawa.

When you sit 12, 14 or 16 people in tiers of desks with telephones and secretaries to whom they are going to dictate, one of two things happens. If it is a person who has been used to normal office facilities, he is going to find it difficult to accommodate himself to that. If it is a person who has not been used to normal office facilities, he will find it an improvement over what we have had here—and, I would add, a very definite

improvement over what the government back benchers have had. As I have said before, and I repeat here, with all of the criticism that has been made, I concede it has been the government members who have had the worst facilities. They have all been crowded into a lounge. But the improved facilities are far from ideal.

I submit—I just sort of plant this little seed with the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is basically a farmer; when he is not looking after his mares who are about to foal he will watch the seed grow—that some time or another we get the kind of facilities that are worthy of a province the size of Ontario and the people who are responsible for the business of that province. The idea of an office with a couple of people, or, I repeat, perhaps three or four—that will make it handy for bridge—in one office, is what we should be; I think this is what we will be driven to.

However, I hesitated to say this. I thought it appropriately should be said maybe two or three years from now, but I was emboldened by the absence of the hon. Provincial Secretary who, I know, would blow a fuse and go into orbit if he were here. But he is not here, so I said it and he can read it in the record and blow his fuse at home.

Anything else we have to say in these estimates we will raise in the individual estimate.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply very briefly to some of the remarks that have been made. I will speak to the leader of the New Democratic Party first in saying that a decision was made about three years ago not to use the north wing for members. In fact, I think I announced it in the House possibly four years ago that we were going to use it for the members, but the decision was made not to do that. Whether it will prove wrong in the end or not those few years will have to tell.

As far as my hon. friend from Kent East is concerned, I have really seen another side of him tonight that I did not realize existed. I remember that old picture I saw about 30 years ago of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, and I could not help but make that comparison tonight. I really did not expect some of the things from him that came about. However, I do appreciate his position and his remarks.

Actually, he was complaining about the surplus which we had a year ago of \$5 million. I mentioned in my opening remarks that we actually overspent our budget last year by more than the hon. Provincial Treasurer

(Mr. Allan) appreciated, I will put it that way.

I have not had an opportunity to look up the contract arrangements for the Economics and Development building, but I do know that it is on a 10-year basis, and I know the rent is a fair one, but I will give the figures later on.

The sidewalk in front of the buildings is actually the city of Toronto's. I would say about 95 per cent of that sidewalk belongs to the city of Toronto, and their parks people are looking after it. I believe my deputy has already spoken to them about fixing that portion a bit.

We have some plans for that area that we hope to work out with the city of Toronto. They have not gone as far ahead as I would like, but I hope that we can make some changes out there to fit in with the rest of our buildings.

The hon. member also mentioned about the architects. If you meet with 50 or 100 architects, you will get 50 or 100 opinions as to how things should be done. They mention also about the decentralization of departments. I do not see the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) here tonight; he has been suggesting decentralization for years—in fact, he once invited us up to Orillia a few years ago. I think this has a lot of merit; I think we have about reached our limit as far as Queen's Park is concerned. I do not know what the architects and the experts think, but I could not agree with you more. I think we are bringing all the people we need into this particular area of the town. I have mentioned on many occasions that there are departments that could quite conceivably exist outside of the city of Toronto, and be quite an advantage not only to the department that might be chosen to go, but also to that municipality.

Those are brief remarks. I could not keep track of all the hon. member mentioned there, particularly as far as priorities are concerned. Priorities do change. I think the hon. member mentioned the Ontario provincial police. There has been quite a change in thinking on some of the OPP headquarters. I think the reason that some buildings listed as priority have since disappeared is that we have possibly leased a space for the OPP in that area.

It is easy enough to make suggestions that it could improve the blue book, but we try to give you a fair outline of the work requested. I emphasize that—it is work requested. These requests come from all

areas of the province. I often wonder where the requests come from, but it is simply a request; that is all it is. It does not necessarily say that because it is in that blue book it is going to be done this year or next, or the year after. It is simply trying to show the assembly here the type of requests and the amount of requests that are coming in for The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to plead with the hon. Minister, as some of my hon. colleagues have done in previous years, for the establishment of a crosswalk at the bottom of that sidewalk before damage is done to life and limb. With the opening of the subway, a great many more people are using that route of egress away from the buildings.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I realize this has been mentioned before, and I would not say the idea is wrong at all. But I think it is a city of Toronto responsibility. Their traffic experts would possibly object strenuously to a second stop right at that particular area, but certainly—possibly I said this last year—I will make a point of writing the city people, the authorities, and ask them to consider that.

Vote 1801 agreed to.

On vote 1802:

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this vote, understanding what the hon. Minister has already said about the sidewalk in front and informing us that this piece of property belongs to the city of Toronto. All of us who walk up and down that sidewalk notice that the government has erected a plaque telling us that this park—and I assume the one behind—where this building now stands, was originally dedicated on September 11, 1860, as Queen's Park, and it was in fact opened by the then Prince of Wales, who later became King Edward VII of England. This is a very important park, and I think that it is perhaps regrettable that that section in front of the buildings in particular has been allowed to degenerate.

I say that advisedly, and I say it because I realize it now belongs to the city of Toronto. But many of us can remember when there used to be beautiful flower beds there. At this time of year there would be tulips blooming on both sides of that sidewalk. For some reason, since the subway has been constructed, these are no longer there.

But what I would like to suggest to the

hon. Minister and ask that he take under consideration, is the possibility of the government obtaining this park in front of the buildings and making it responsible to The Department of Public Works.

Now I would just like to outline why I think that this is something that should be done. I think, as I said, that this is an important park. It was dedicated by a former King of England, it holds great associations for a lot of people here, its name is the name by which the centre of government of Ontario has come to be known.

I think that a lot could be done out there, and a couple of ideas that I would like to suggest are; first, that the statue of Sir John A. Macdonald should be moved back. It is too close to the road now. Perhaps it was well placed before the widenings and the great amount of traffic that is now around here, but now you cannot get in front of the statue without getting out onto the road. I think that it should be set back with proper approaches. I think that on the sides of the sidewalk would be a good opportunity.

There has been talk about renaming University Avenue, the "Avenue of the Provinces." It would be a good opportunity for the excellent gardeners in The Department of Public Works to lay out a sort of miniature avenue of the provinces going right up to the front door of this building, and having a formal garden for each province in which their wild flowers, or their floral symbol, would be present. In other words, we would have trilliums representing Ontario; pitcher plants for Newfoundland; mayflowers for Nova Scotia; the blue violets for New Brunswick; ladies' slippers for Prince Edward Island; Quebec's flower, the blue iris, in another garden setting; the crocus for Manitoba; the prairie lily for Saskatchewan; the wild rose for Alberta and the dogwood for British Columbia, along with a plaque for each province.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Have them blooming all year round.

Mr. Wells: Have them all blooming at their appropriate time, but with the appropriate plants, if this is possible. This could be done, along with a programme to put in that park some of the natural trees that are found in the province of Ontario, with some appropriate plaques on the trees.

We have many thousands of students who come to see these buildings every year, and I think as part of their programme they could also be given—in the good months of the year

—a tour of the grounds, including this natural science exhibit, plus an explanation of the many fine statues that are out here which I think most of the people of this province do not even know exist, and yet they are found in this park—the statue of Sir John A. Macdonald, George Brown, John Sandfield Macdonald, Sir Oliver Mowat and so forth.

I think that a lot more could be done with this piece of land. It could be a complement to the fine job that has been done on the inside of these buildings. I would like to ask the hon. Minister to take this under consideration. Perhaps he has some plan to approach the city and attempt either to get them to do something with this land, or else to let us have the land and let The Department of Public Works—who I know could do a good job—take it over.

Mr. Bukator: On vote 1802, could the hon. Minister explain why the salaries of the maintenance staff of government buildings are \$61,000 lower for 1965-66 than they were in 1964-65? Has the government found a more efficient way to maintain this building, or has it simply reduced the wages of the maintenance workers?

Hon. Mr. Connell: About the only thing I can think of is just straight efficiency, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bukator: If that is the case—and you should not slough that off so easily—may I ask about when the staff here were parading, after asking for a bit more money for the cleaning of this building, what did you do about that particular case? Were they increased in pay at all, or were they just sloughed off again, as sometimes the government does?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Actually, they have been restored to their \$2,400 original pay. I hope I am not taking any words out of the hon. Provincial Treasurer's mouth. This comes in under the civil service estimates. Taken on new, they will be working at \$1.50 an hour, which is the standard rate, and I think that works out to about \$2,145.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): \$2,145?

Mr. Bukator: Then just enlighten me a little bit further. I did not follow the newspaper accounts, or worry too much about the parade here. Apparently there was a decrease in the wages of a particular group and they made a bit of a demonstration. But it was increased back to its original amount? Is that the case?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, I think so. Actually, this comes under the civil service.

Mr. Bukator: In that case, I will wait until the civil service estimates come up.

Hon. Mr. Connell: We do not set the rates in our department—the civil service sets the rates. I am not sure of the actual history of it, but I know they have been restored—the senior ones—to their original amount.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, redistribution of the seats will evidently require facilities for another nine or 10 members after the next election, and in discussing this with some of the people around the Chamber I heard that there were further renovations planned for this Chamber. Has the hon. Minister any announcement about that at all?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have not anything too definite. We have two or three designs. We had, at one time, thought of going back to the old original idea of having this horseshoe type, but my people have come up with some plans now, so that they can work in an extra 10 feet, or whatever the amount is—

Mr. McKeough: They will all be Tory seats.

Hon. Mr. Connell: It works in quite well, and we will be continuing some changes here. I think we have to extend it a bit. I think we plan that rather than taking the visitors into this lower gallery, up these stairs here, we hope that we can work it out to bring them inside here and possibly restore the bar to the House that we had—

Mr. Nixon: Which bar is that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is not the bar that some might be referring to. They tell me there used to be a bar across where the two page boys are standing. We hope to go ahead with that work this summer, if possible.

Mr. Nixon: You have abandoned any thought that the seats might be arranged in a semi-circle—

Hon. Mr. Connell: The opinion of the experts is that this is not nearly as practical as adding to what we already have here, and having the centre all free.

Mr. Oliver: Will the hon. Minister say why we spend \$1,200,000 on communications? What does that entail?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I will admit that it went up because I let hon. members do a little more calling than they used to. But our

communications services have gone up rather drastically—I should not use the word “drastically,” I guess, but they have expanded very quickly. We have many more new buildings and hospitals in service; we are renting more direct lines which are—of course we rent them on a 24-hour basis, but I assure you that if we had not changed our service here about three or four years ago, it would have been considerably higher than this. I think we are getting an efficient telephone service, as nearly as I can make out, but it is comparable with the growth of the province that we have had to continually increase this part of our budget.

Mr. Oliver: From what my hon. friend has said, that leaves me the opportunity to say something about the telephone service, which I think should be said. I agree that what has been done by the government for a great number of the hon. members of the Legislature, is a very good and commendable thing. The unfortunate part, of course, as the hon. Minister knows, is that the extended service applies only to a portion of the membership of the House, and I believe that the hon. Minister and the government, having gone as far as they have gone in supplying what I think is a very worthwhile service, should go the whole way and in some manner, map out a programme that will bring the benefit of telephone service to the rest of the hon. members of the Legislature.

Speaking personally, and I do not want it to apply too personally because it does not matter too much to me—I am speaking for a number of our own hon. members on this side of the House and I am sure I am for a number of hon. members on my hon. friend's side of the House.

There is surely an area of discrimination that creeps into this situation when half or more of the hon. members of the Legislature can call—and not only call, but do much of the business relating to their constituencies—by telephone, free of charge, while the other portion of the membership have to pay for every call that they make. Today, for instance, I paid for three calls myself, and I am sure that other hon. members have done the same thing.

I appreciate what my hon. friend has done, but I admire his capabilities to this extent. I am sure he can work out some system that will involve benefit for not only a portion of the membership, but for the whole membership of the Legislature. I think he should go to work on it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I will enlarge on my other statement, that actually most of the departments used to look after their own telephone bills. This has been referred to our department which is looking after all long-distance calls for the various departments. That explains, in a little greater detail, why that amount has gone up in the last two or three years.

As far as hon. members' telephone service is concerned, these direct lines were set up for government use—more or less for the civil service, and these lines were protected with all the ability with which we expect our civil servants to protect them. A year or two ago, whenever I made the offer to hon. members that they could use these private lines, where they were available, it was as a help to those hon. members who could make use of them. Actually, it has been a bit embarrassing to me that these lines are practically impossible to get on now. I am not saying that hon. members are to blame, but it is a strange coincidence that most of these lines are very, very busy.

We were fogged in in Port Arthur for three days last June, and unless you called about 11 o'clock at night, it was impossible to get that line from Port Arthur to Toronto. I think there is only one line from Port Arthur, and—

An hon. member: Yes, George talks a lot.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I should not put the onus on the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) because that area serves about five or six members up there, I believe. But these direct lines were not put in there for the benefit of the private members, or the local member.

If we were to put in a direct line to look after each member, Mr. Chairman, I can assure you that this \$1,200,000 would be very much higher.

I admit my experts advised me against doing that which I did, and I have been holding my head every time we talk about telephone services since. I do not think we will be expanding this; I do not think it would be good policy. I think there were certain things done here a month ago to try to make up for these inequities, and I hope hon. members continue to use this service with moderation—at least, not with moderation themselves, but I hope they continue to use a little discretion on who has this direct line. We are making it most difficult for those people for whom these lines were originally rented from the Bell Telephone

Company. I do not think that we will be enlarging this to take in all the members.

If some hon. members are more fortunate than others that they can get on this direct line, that is just the way the cookie crumbles; the others, I think, will have to put up with what they have.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister indicated that he responds to requests from other departments. Might he take a moment or two to explain to the House the processes of consultation relative to design and structure of the buildings that are developed? Perhaps I might give a special example to which he might relate his remarks. Let us say the Ontario hospital at London, which is presently being constructed, or the Ontario hospital here in Toronto, for which plans are now on the drawing board. Which personnel are brought into the design planning; how do you arrive at a final design? How much participation is there, let us say, by the superintendent of the hospital or the hospital staff involved?

I am curious, because I am frankly perplexed as to the design of some of the buildings in the province.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I do not know whether I could go into that too deeply, but there is close co-operation between the architect and the occupying department—whether it be The Department of Health, The Department of Lands and Forests, or our own department.

I do not say this critically of other departments, but if we were given a little more of a free hand, we could get buildings built much quicker than we do when we have to get everyone's approval. Again, I am not critical. Say someone in The Department of Health decides—I have mentioned this in other years—they want to change rooms from 12 feet by 12 feet to 12 feet by 14 feet, or something like that. They think that it is only two feet difference, but this—a five-minute change in somebody's mind on the design of a room or a hall or something like that—takes a great deal of time for the architect or the engineer to get down to the detailed drawing. I assure the hon. member that we ensure that there is close co-operation in making sure that the occupying department is satisfied completely—or at least as completely as we can go with our budget.

Mr. S. Lewis: The architects are in your department, are they not?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We commission quite a few architects from outside; we commission—I have not got the figures—about 65 per cent

to 70 per cent of the work of The Department of Public Works to outside architects. We have a small staff of architects in our own branch.

Mr. S. Lewis: I see. And you commission the outside architects. Now suppose the outside architect draws up a plan in conjunction with, let us say, the London Ontario hospital—which design is an eminently pleasing one, and a utilitarian one, it is presently on the drawing boards—how do you arrive at it? Is it done in conjunction with the superintendent? Is it approved by the mental health branch of The Department of Health? Who does the architect meet with? What are the channels? I am curious to know how—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I cannot give you individuals, but certainly each department—in fact I believe The Department of Health took over one of our own men here three or four years ago, who works very closely as a Department of Health representative—works with our own architectural people, who in turn are dealing with the commission's architect. It is my understanding—I do not get into the details of this—but it is my understanding that they work very, very closely, because it takes a long while for these to get final approval on a specific design of a building.

Mr. S. Lewis: The final approval, you think, is long in forthcoming primarily because of the other departments, rather than The Department of Public Works! I do not want you to put your fellow Cabinet Ministers on the spot, but I would like to get your general feeling about it, because there has been delay in several major projects. Now is it because of this—

Hon. Mr. Connell: Now, I do not criticize these delays. I would rather have a job planned and planned well. I have stated this on many occasions. I would rather be a year late in building it, but have it planned and planned well, rather than rushing ahead just because we are pressured into it. I am all for good, second planning, and you cannot do it by rushing too hard.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, I made mention of a facelifting job of this beautiful building, the Ontario Legislature, on the 100th birthday of our country. Would the hon. Minister care to make any comments along that line?

Hon. Mr. Connell: As far as I am concerned, the old building looks pretty good the way it is. I am not too critical of the ladies for dyeing their hair and such things, but it is

nice to grow old gracefully, and that is just about my picture of this old building. I think we will let it grow old gracefully.

Mr. Spence: But you want it cleaned.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, on that very point, may I ask my hon. friend, would the exterior of this building lend itself to what we call sandblasting cleaning? Or would it tear into holes, or what would happen?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think it would stand sandblasting, but I think one of the most beautiful parts of this building is that it is completely covered with ivy. Maybe it is the farmer in me, I do not know, but I like to see the green growing over this building, and if we were to sandblast it, we would have to tear it all down and it would take many, many years for that ivy to be replaced.

Mr. Oliver: You cannot do it while the ivy is there?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No.

Vote 1802 agreed to.

Vote 1803 agreed to.

On vote 1804:

Mr. Bukator: Would the hon. Minister explain what practices are followed by the government in securing rental space for government offices, and particularly, would the hon. Minister tell us how the government came to rent facilities at 950 Yonge Street? Was the space particularly cheap? Did the hon. Minister consider the location, or was location an important factor?

The cost of renting premises is raised by \$700,000 I notice this year. Would the hon. Minister explain how much of this increase comes from government's need for additional space, and how much for increased rental space held previously?

Does the sum of \$3,200,000 include leasehold improvement expenditures? If so, how much? There are two questions there, one of the rental on Yonge Street, how the hon. Minister came by that? The second is, why the increase of \$700,000?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, 950 Yonge Street, Economics and Development are renting that for ten years. The area is 60,000 square feet and the annual rental is \$228,897. I am not sure whether I followed all your questions or not. I think you originally started out asking how we go about our renting.

Actually, we have a quite active and most dependable section of our government in the

property branch. As far as our policy of renting is concerned, they deal with many real estate people. They go out and try to get the best possible price, together with the best possible rent that they can. Then, of course, all these are approved in turn by Treasury board. Were you wanting any more information on 950 Yonge?

Mr. Bukator: That was quite good. You shop around you say, through many brokers and agents, and you find the best for the money. That is the practice, is it not? Then you take it to the Treasury for approval?

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is right.

Mr. Bukator: The second question is the increase in rentals of \$700,000.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Two or three of the departments have been granted quite a bit of additional space. I suppose this \$228,000 would be a third of this amount. I think The Department of Labour has quite a bit more space, but with an expansive government growing, we have rented a great deal of space this last year.

Mr. Bukator: The other question was, the sum of \$3,200,000. Does that include leasehold improvement expenditures? There are times when you must do improvements. Is that part of the expenditure that is borne by you, or the tenant, or does it work both ways from time to time?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It works both ways. Usually we do quite a bit of the improving ourselves, and we try to value the rents accordingly.

Mr. Bukator: You know what you want.

Mr. Oliver: I wanted to ask a general question, perhaps we have passed it. Does my hon. friend in his department, build all the buildings for all the government departments? Do any departments build buildings themselves?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think, basically, we build all the buildings. Lands and Forests do build a few in the wintertime with their day labour force, but they, in turn, bill them back to us. Basically we build all buildings, but we have had a few provincial police buildings—three or four this past year—that they have built specifically for the police, and we have leased them from whoever built them.

Mr. Oliver: The Highways buildings, the Highways garages, do you build all those?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Highways have built a few of their own, but I think basically, I would have to ask the hon. Minister of Highways that. But as far as I know, I think we build all The Department of Highways buildings.

Mr. Oliver: Well, how is it decided that in a particular instance the Highways department will build their own buildings and not The Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The only buildings that they might build would be an individual sand shed, or maybe a one- or two-bay garage. They have built the odd one in the past, but I think that is pretty well ruled out to the best of my knowledge now.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairmain, does the hon. Minister call tenders for all projects in the province, is everything tendered that is built by your Department of Public Works?

Hon. Mr. Connell: As far as we possibly can. There is the odd project that we cannot. Our north wing was one example. My people felt that they just could not possibly get the specifications written up there to call for a tender. But I would say—I will not mention percentages—but I would say at least maybe 90 per cent of our buildings are called by tender and built by contract.

Mr. Spence: Ten per cent is built by your own department?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have not got the figures, I am guessing at that, but I would say it would approach that.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the building by the department, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us is there any particular procedure used in picking architects, or does the department have its own?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We have very few architects. I mentioned this earlier for the hon. member for Scarborough West. We have architects on our staff, but we do commission about 65 per cent or 70 per cent of outside architects for our work. For 70 per cent of our work we commission outside architects.

As for the method of choosing them, we try to pick out the best architect we can for any given job. In fact, this past year or two we have combined architects on a single job—a fairly large job. We have had a couple of architects or firms together which has worked out quite well apparently in any

cases where we have done this. It is just as simple as that. I take my architect's recommendations on these things, and he knows the architects pretty well.

Vote 1804 agreed to.

On vote 1805:

Mr. Oliver: On 1805, with respect to item 2, might I ask the hon. Minister is this for a jail, or is it a grant for a number of jails, or what?

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, we have no jail in mind. I think this amount is put in there because we never know when we might get a request for this. This is a grant that is made towards jails.

Mr. Oliver: Has the hon. Minister ever had a request?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, we have. We spent \$1 million on the Don jail five or six years ago. We spent considerable on a jail at Lambton. I do not know any more. We have nothing in mind this year, but we never know when a request will come in, and this is more or less keeping that vote open.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, under item 4 I would like to ask the hon. Minister what legislation permits him to undertake the control of erosion of farm lands. It is a very worthy project but—

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, this area used to be larger as far as our department was concerned, but a few years ago most of it was switched over to The Department of Municipal Affairs—anything to do with drainage. But this has more to do with exceptional flood conditions, or something like that. I think the trouble we had with Hurricane Hazel ten years ago, was dealt with under this vote, although it was not nearly enough at that time, I suppose. But the estimate is for exceptional flood conditions, I would say. If we get requests, our people go out and examine the situation and a decision is made as to whether or not they qualify.

Mr. Nixon: It is more or less an emergency fund then?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, I think that is a good word. We never know what is coming along. This vote could deal with something that might happen tonight.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister tell us to what extent the emergency fund—it must have been provided last year—

was drawn on? Does he know of a specific project that was paid for from this vote last year?

Hon. Mr. Connell: \$103,560 for last year; so actually that budget was overexpended. In 1963 we spent only \$1,542. The year before that, \$51,000. In 1961, \$199,000, and then it dropped back to \$54, so it is a rather—

Mr. Oliver: What did the hon. Minister spend \$103,000 on last year? I do not remember any Hurricane Hazel last year.

Hon. Mr. Connell: We do not seem to have the details of that here right now. If the hon. member likes, I will get that information for him.

Mr. Oliver: And the hon. Minister is budgeting for \$50,000 this year?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Oliver: You do not expect as severe a calamity this year?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We are going back to 1963.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I am a bit curious as to item 5. Does this also provide for extraordinary expenditure, municipal drainage including grants in aid thereof, \$10,000—a small amount? This would not seem to go very far in providing any drainage as far as municipalities are concerned. What does it cover?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Apparently we spent very little last year and it is more or less one of those votes that we keep in there each year for requests that might come in.

Mr. Young: Well, what kind of requests would the municipality make to draw upon this \$10,000?

Hon. Mr. Connell: This appropriation provides for grants which may be paid by the Minister of Public Works, where the direct benefit applies jointly to private and public property, such as the drainage of a field and part of an adjacent road, or to accelerate the run-off from low lying areas. These projects may involve some part or parts of municipal or county roads and would relieve the necessity of applying the annual Department of Highways limited grants for road maintenance and improvements. I think that pretty well—

Mr. Young: This would be a 50 per cent grant toward the cost, would it?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I think northern Ontario is the area—that is the last area on which I remember any money being spent. The Kirkland Lake area. These are very small projects where there are maybe only thirty or forty acres involved—this type of thing.

Mr. Young: And would they need matching grants from the municipality or matching expenditures from the municipality, or is this a thing which might be paid fully by the province?

Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, we went into this on the accounts committee, and as I recall this was in the unorganized territory. I think there was some question that there were roads in the mining municipalities or at least mining sites, and there was just no one else to pay what would normally be paid by the local municipality. I think we were given the amount of money to administer. As the hon. Minister has said, this department used to administer all the aid to drainage. This has been pushed to Municipal Affairs and that amount of money has gone down every year. This is just the tail end of it.

Mr. Young: So there is no chance of getting the backyard drained?

Mr. McKeough: I think it is highly unlikely that any of it would end up in your county or in Kent.

Mr. Oliver: But the term would indicate that somebody else paid a portion, and I do not assume that that is so.

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is usually on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. Oliver: With whom?

Hon. Mr. Connell: If there is an organized municipality it would be on a 50-50 basis, but most of these grants—I think it must be at least—I have no record here of just how much was spent on that last year, but there are very small amounts spent on this each year. The vote is kept open here for fear there is a sizeable amount requested. Any of the larger projects are usually undertaken on that other aid to remedial works.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman. It says here, item 3, "dredging of Muskoka lakes, \$20,000." What did you dredge the Muskoka lake for?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, that vote has been in there for many, many years. I think this year in Bala Bay they propose—the water gets low, and they only do it on complaints. If

complaints come in that the boats are hitting the sand bars, we go in and dredge them out.

Mr. Bukator: Is this government-owned property that you are dredging? For what purpose? For the private individual or do you have an establishment—

Hon. Mr. Connell: No, on the Muskoka lakes, for many years we have taken care of some of the locks around Port Carling. We have been doing this dredging on request.

Mr. Bukator: That is a kind of public thoroughfare by water which is maintained then?

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is true.

Mr. Bukator: Well, then, let me ask another question. Under item 2, grants towards cost of construction of new jail accommodation has been \$25,000 a year for the past three years, but actual expenditures in 1963-64 were only \$13,000. Now, I think this is a loaded question and you can take it for what it is worth. I just happened to have had this paper handed to me, but I would like to be respectable about it; I do not want to be nasty. We have an exceptionally good Minister in that department, so if you take the wording for what I try to describe it to you—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not apologize too much.

Mr. Bukator: I do not think I have to take any direction from the hon. member of the New Democratic Party. He is not doing too well on his own, you know. Let me read this to you; did the hon. Minister of Labour have anything to say? I would rather hear him. Maybe he has the answers.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): We would like to hear you.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: I did take you off the hook once tonight, did I not? Does the hon. Minister believe that? You mentioned Mercer a little while ago, and that is why I ask the question. Does the hon. Minister believe jail accommodation is adequate in the province? Would he care to comment on the jail accommodation provided in the city of Toronto? Now, the hon. Minister is going to build some, I understand; he mentioned the Mercer. Would he like to elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. Connell: All I mentioned in my brief remarks was that we are working on the replacement for the Andrew Mercer

reformatory. Beyond that, I have no comments as Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. Minister says he has no comment to make; is that project going to take place this year since you have it in your estimates this year? That is a fair question. Is it going to happen this year, are you going to reconstruct?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It might be called by this fall, but I doubt it. The architects have been working on it for about three months, but I would doubt that the plans would be ready by this fall.

Mr. Bukator: The architects have been working on those plans for about three months?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would say three months, it is at least three months.

Mr. Bukator: That is a step in the right direction.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Under this vote I have a question I would like to ask the hon. Minister. It actually concerns The Department of Lands and Forests, too.

In committee this session a lot of the delegations were complaining about certain properties that should have been bought by the government to be able to keep some of the northern areas that could be turned into parks at a later time. The problem seemed to be that they were so slow in buying them that other individuals were buying the property up and keeping it. The deputy Minister seemed to be complaining that when The Department of Public Works got hold of it and went to buy the procedure was so slow that the land was sold to somebody else before the government bought it.

Now, is there any way of speeding up this procedure or is this actually a problem in cases where The Department of Lands and Forests asks your department to buy the land for parks and by the time you get around to doing it the land has gone?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It has happened once or twice this way. Of course, if property is up for sale and we decide tonight we are going to buy it tomorrow, someone still might have bought it tonight. You are always up against that. It takes a great deal of time. If there is a specific area that has been suggested that we go out and buy, it does take time.

We are always subject to criticism, of course, but I do not think we should be criticized too severely for the speed we make

in purchasing these properties. We have bought a great deal of property this last two or three years for the very purpose of which you are speaking, and will be continuing to buy property. If we miss out on the odd one, there are other places we can go. We do not lay awake at nights worrying about the ones we miss. We like to go out and get the property that we are asked to purchase.

Mr. Davison: Normally, after your department has been asked to purchase land, how long would it take for your department to go through the procedure of purchasing? Does it take two or three weeks or a month or how long?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is a question you cannot answer in black or white. We have had areas where maybe we have been asked to buy 10,000 acres and if there are 150 owners, it is going to take time. But if we have to go out and buy a specific 30-acre lot and there is only one owner, why, that can be accomplished in a day or so. So it is pretty hard to just give a yes or no answer to that.

Mr. Davison: It was quite interesting, Mr. Chairman, that in this committee meeting all of the blame seemed to be pretty well put on The Department of Public Works. Any time they brought up a situation where there was a property they wanted, The Department of Lands and Forests just seemed to get out from under by saying, well, they had asked Public Works to buy it, and they left the impression they were losing an awful lot of land.

Mr. MacDonald: I guess you were not there that day.

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is not an unusual situation for us to be blamed for things.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): Mr. Chairman, I believe under this vote we may discuss the provincial building at the CNE.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: It is not very often we get confused here, but it happens occasionally.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: I am more used to throwing these remarks than receiving them.

Mr. Chairman, this is about the third occasion today that I have wanted to rise and make a few remarks. I think at five after six, as we were concluding the hon. Attorney

General's estimates after two weeks, I thought it was the better part of good judgment to stay in my seat and say very little. I wanted to speak about the Toronto exhibition, and I believe this vote does involve the provincial building there. I understand it is owned by the city of Toronto and was a former gift from the province but is maintained by The Department of Public Works.

I started to work in this building in 1958 trying to instal displays. At that time it was a very difficult operation because the ceiling was about seven feet six inches high and the halls were about five feet wide, and by the time you got a display installed there was no room for anybody to stand back and look at it. Much of the work of the departments in designing their displays to provide the people of Ontario with information on the work that they had been doing throughout the past year was lost. About 1959 or 1960, a very great effort was undertaken by The Department of Public Works to redesign this building and bring the various departmental displays into a position where the public could see them and appreciate what the departments are doing.

I think it was a recognized accomplishment, a very successful move when you took out the centre aisle concept of that building and brought in a wide panoramic view of the displays. I know that the people of Ontario have appreciated this and many people have remarked to me about the new look at the Ontario government building. I, for one, having had a part to play in the installing of displays there and seeing the new surroundings, think it is a fantastic improvement. I just wanted to compliment the department and the hon. Minister on the work that has been done there and the opportunity that government departments now have to display the services they offer the people at the Canadian national exhibition. I just want to say thank you.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, just a few moments ago the hon. Minister made reference to the fact that about three months ago his architects started on some new designs for Mercer. To go back three months would take us roughly back to about February. We were wondering if there is any relation or coincidence between the starting of the drawings for a new Mercer and possibly the visit of some of the hon. members of the Opposition to that place?

An hon. member: That is a loaded question.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, my friend, the hon. leader of the New

Democratic Party, has acknowledged my presence, which I presume is pretty favourable.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, I wonder if it is possible for the government buildings to perhaps remain open on Saturdays and Sundays since I had the occasion during the past session to welcome and be a host for the Waukegan concert band of Waukegan, Illinois. During that time—

Mr. Singer: Tell us about it.

Mr. Eagleson: As a matter of fact, I think it is fair to say that out of 108 members in the House, 107 are not familiar with the Waukegan concert band. But in spite of that fact the Waukegan concert band from Waukegan, Illinois, is the most renowned concert band in the United States of America and recently had the advantage of being recognized—and I would point this out particularly to the hon. members of the Opposition—as being recognized in the Congress of the United States.

An hon. member: Where is Waukegan?

Mr. Eagleson: Waukegan is the largest city within the 12th district of Illinois.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I do not like to interrupt this very interesting speech, but actually this matter of the Parliament buildings should have been discussed under vote 1802.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eagleson: In any event, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the hon. Minister, that this should come under miscellaneous. It is certainly miscellaneous and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Eagleson: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman—

Vote 1805 agreed to.

On vote 1806:

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Vote 1806, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1806.

Mr. Eagleson: I would most vehemently protest against the ruling of the chair and suggest that this would, in fact, come under miscellaneous.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1806, through you, I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he would inform the House as to the state of progress regarding the Hamilton vocational training school?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We are going to be ready to call for tenders on that vocational and technological school in, I would say, October or November. That is what they are hoping right now. The planning is well advanced. I go back to the fact that it is so difficult to get everyone together and be completely agreed as to what they want. Education are doing a tremendous job in deciding what programmes are wanted there, but it does take time to get this back from the request of the education people to the architect and get it approved by the various levels. The latest word I had on it is that it is right on schedule, and they hope to have tenders called this fall.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I feel a bit disappointed, because, as you know, we have raised this question for three years now. I am sure that we expected it would be well on the way to construction this spring. The hon. Minister made some remarks to the hon. member for Scarborough West a few moments ago that he likes to plan well, even if it meant a delay of a year. If anything is planned well, this school is going to be, because the delay in getting started is a detriment to the needs for this type of school in the province.

I would continue with the question. Does the department also install the equipment and machinery that will be used in the training programme?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes, we purchase it.

Mr. Gisborn: How often would the hon. Minister have to change plans for equipment in regard to the need for the different classes of training?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Here again, I make no apology for the planning that has gone into the Hamilton school. It is a very large one; it is a \$12 million project, which is a large one. It took us five years to plan for our Queen's Park complex. Maybe we are slow, I don't know, but it is planned, and planned well. This is a large project and I think the hon. member for Wentworth East should be well aware of it. There are long speeches made about education and the changes we should be keeping up with. I say I make no apology about the time it has taken, but I am going to tell you that we are going to

have the best technological and vocational centre on the North American continent in our city of Hamilton.

Mr. Gisborn: I assume that the hon. Minister can lay a little blame on The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am laying no blame on anyone.

Mr. Gisborn: It indicates that some of the delay lays in the hands of The Department of Education, as the hon. Minister has indicated. You will remember that I prognosticated that we would likely open this school in 1967. I said this last year, and I still think that this is the way it is planned—to open this school in Hamilton in 1967, the election year. But nevertheless, in regard to this vote, the purchase of property and expenses in connection therewith, in the public accounts, page S-16, just for a matter of curiosity there is an item of \$1,759,947.69 for the purchase of property from the Essbro Properties Limited. Would the hon. Minister explain where that property is located, and for what it is intended?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I will have to check that out for certain. I think it is across from the main buildings here on Bay Street, but I would have to check that out to be sure. I will give the hon. member the answer on that.

Mr. Eagleson: Mr. Chairman, I have been advised that I was out of order insofar as the other buildings were concerned, and I would suggest to the hon. Minister and propose to him, through you, that the new buildings which are under vote 1806 remain open during the weekend. I would now tell you why, with the assistance of my friend from Yorkview. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I say, through you to the hon. Minister, that I feel it would be of great advantage to our government in the province that the Parliament buildings remain open on the weekend. During the past session, if I may refer to them once again, the Waukegan concert band, which is renowned as the greatest concert band in the United States of America, had the occasion to—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Eagleson: —I am referring to new buildings, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. member has made his suggestion that the buildings remain open. I think that was in order.

Mr. Eagleson: If I may say to the House why I feel so strongly that the buildings should remain open on the weekend—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Eagleson: The new building—

Mr. Chairman: When the new building is constructed, I believe that you will have the opportunity of—

Mr. Eagleson: Mr. Chairman, in any event, I strongly suggest through you, to the hon. Minister, that whether the Waukegan band be involved or not at this stage, that the new building, in any event, should remain open on the weekends, since I feel the Parliament buildings of the province of Ontario are well renowned and well appreciated by all the constituents of my riding, in particular, and all the citizens of Ontario in general, and should be open on the weekends for their purposes, because I feel, Mr. Chairman—that we, as representatives in this House, of the—

Mr. Chairman: Order. I would suggest that the hon. member is now becoming repetitious. He has repeated this suggestion several times, therefore I rule him out of order.

Mr. Eagleson: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on a point of order, I would strongly suggest—

Mr. Chairman: Please state the point of order.

Mr. Eagleson: —through you to this House, in summation, to the hon. Minister that it is in the interests of all of those within the province that the new building and the old buildings remain open on the weekends.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Eagleson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth (Mr. Ewen).

Hon. Mr. Connell: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the hon. member that any time the Waukegan band comes here, we will have the buildings open.

Mr. Eagleson: It pays to persevere.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would just like to mention for the hon. member for Wentworth East, if he does not get out of here too fast, that the property to which he refers is 881 Bay Street, the Soules Building, which will

actually almost become a part of the complex. It is the building that is in our block on the west side of Bay, but in that general complex area.

Mr. Gisborn: Could the hon. Minister tell me what size of area?

Hon. Mr. Connell: It is a building, a six- or seven-storey building. It is, I think, about 140,000 square feet.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, it would be remiss of me, with the hon. member for Wentworth East mentioning this school of technology, which happens to be in my riding, not to say that there is no member in this House more concerned than I that this building gets on with the project. I would like to say that the wonderful people of Wentworth are quite concerned that it does get on; as a matter of fact, they are looking forward, particularly in that area, to boarding the students who attend this school.

I have been kept abreast of things by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and one of the big delays has been the money. The province just has not had it. The Treasury has now released this and given us the okay. If there is anybody more concerned in this House than myself, I would like to know about it, because I intend to be there. I have got a lot of pressure on me, and I am looking forward to the sod turning, I hope, this fall. I would just like to get this on the record.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to speak to vote 1806.

The Ontario Department of Public Works has under its administration what I believe to be 14 properties in Ottawa which it rents, and some 10 properties which the government of Ontario owns. There are approximately a dozen departmental agencies of our government using office space in the Ottawa area. Some of this, Mr. Chairman, is located in very substantial and some new buildings. But others, as hon. members from the Ottawa area will know, are, in many cases, located in holes in the wall.

The facts as to rentals are that the province of Ontario pays out in the neighbourhood of \$76,000 annually in rentals in Ottawa. I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister of Public Works, that the time has come to apply in Ottawa the same policy of owned centralization of government premises which is coming into effect in the Toronto area.

I suggest, sir, that the time has come when

Ontario should erect in the heart of Ottawa a prestige-type building, an Ontario House, to accommodate as many of the activities of the Ontario government in the Ottawa Valley and in eastern Ontario as may be possible.

Mr. Chairman, there are several obvious reasons for my suggestion. First, it is good policy for the public to own its own buildings; increased efficiency and convenience can result from bringing together, under one roof, the many provincial activities that occur in my own area. I am sure this consideration applies to other parts of Ontario.

However, there are perhaps more important but less obvious, reasons why Ontario should erect a prestige building and, as it were, show the flag, in the heart of our national capital. Here are some of the reasons.

It would remind the people of Canada of the fact that Ontario is the anchor province of our nation. It would remind our own people of the province of Ontario of the vast range and scope of the services which the province of Ontario, and the government of Ontario, extends to them.

It would remind 250,000 people who live in the shadow of the Peace Tower of their provincial identity. It would be an outward and visible sign that the government of Ontario recognizes the growing importance of the city of Ottawa and the Ottawa Valley, and recognize that Ottawa is one of the fastest developing cities in the whole of Canada, is one of the greatest tourist attractions in the province of Ontario and is on the point of becoming a most important educational centre.

Ottawa is the hub of one of the most important recreational centres perhaps on the whole North American continent; at the same time, it is the gateway to perhaps the best and most promising winter sports areas on the whole continent.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, not only would one location in one building accommodate a variety of Ontario departmental activities in my area and assist departmental co-ordination, but from the point of view of service to the public I believe it would have great value. It could provide attractive space and adequate staff for a provincial information centre, where the public could ask questions and obtain immediate information on a variety of subjects, from welfare to health, scholarships, employment opportunities, tourism, fish and game regulations, and matters involving industrial plant location.

As it happens, the province of Ontario owns, at this moment, an excellent piece of

land only four short city blocks from the Dominion Parliament buildings themselves. This particular parcel will soon have as its neighbours along Elgin Street, where it is located, a whole complex of monumental Dominion of Canada government buildings. A substantial start has already been made in the redevelopment, as some of you may have seen recently, of the easterly side of Elgin Street, running from the war memorial south, and extensive work has begun on the new \$20 million performing arts centre to the north of the piece of land I am mentioning.

I mention this particular site, Mr. Chairman, as one which the hon. Minister of Public Works and the government of Ontario might consider as an ideal site for what I have described as an Ontario House, of the type I have suggested—a beautiful, useful building and one befitting the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1806?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister. The hon. member for Wentworth raised a strange question. If you remember, the vocational training school for Hamilton was decided upon before the hon. member was in the House, but is he correct in saying that he has been on top of the project for the past couple of years, and that the lack of money is the reason why you have not started before now? Is the hon. member for Wentworth correct, or is it the reasons given by the hon. Minister a few moments ago?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I was not too aware of what the hon. member for Wentworth said, but as far as the approval is concerned, I do not know for how long we have had approval. Certainly it has been basically the planning that has been holding it up.

Vote 1806 agreed to.

On vote 1807:

Mr. Bukator: On 1807. I have run across—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Another loaded one?

Mr. Bukator: I have been very good to the hon. Minister of Highways; why does he not behave himself? You know, there are a lot of departments that could have been questioned very thoroughly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: What a great group of high paid help we have around here. They giggle and laugh because they get the big wages—or is it because they have chauffeur-driven

cars? Or because you have the large expense accounts? You ought to be proud of yourselves. You are a fine group of men representing this province of six million people. I do believe, that a Minister should show a little dignity; I find it lacking in that particular department.

Mr. MacDonald: What was your question?

Mr. Bukator: I did not get to it yet, I am coming to it. I do believe that a man should get just a little bit of respect from this particular group, Mr. Chairman. I have not bothered this House too much and I think these questions are pertinent to this particular department.

The appropriation for the construction of dams—we are getting into dams again—docks and locks, \$975,000 for each of the past three years. Will the hon. Minister explain how this figure is arrived at and what the relationship bears to actual need? That \$975,000 is a figure that you have had for three consecutive years and I would like to know why it is in the estimates. What do you intend to do with that money?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We usually build about eight to ten dams each year; actually it is one of the projects that we can estimate fairly closely. I just cannot tell you why we are spending almost the same amount. It is just planned that way, that is the best answer that I can give the hon. member.

I do not know whether he is interested in the dams that we are building this year; but I think we are building the Froot Lake dam in Algoma-Manitoulin and the George Lake dam—

Mr. Bukator: While you are naming them off, would you care to give the figure of what you are spending on them? You must have that before you.

Hon. Mr. Connell: Well, I do not have the figure here—well I guess I can give it to you a little closer than that. The Froot Lake dam is \$110,000; the George Lake dam—we are not absolutely certain that that one is going but if it does it will be roughly about \$70,000; the Lake of two Rivers in Nipissing is about \$70,000; the Osler Lake dam, Parry Sound, is about \$35,000; Freeland Lake dam is \$35,000; the Tiny Marsh dam is \$30,000; the South Baymouth, dock that is, is about \$75,000. The Baptiste Lake dam is \$170,000; the Camp Lake dam, \$5,000; the Delta dam, \$30,000.

Now I do not know whether that adds up to \$975,000 or not, but it is fairly close.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask; are these dams built in areas where no conservation authorities exist, are they supplementary to conservation work or what is the purpose?

Hon. Mr. Connell: They are practically all in northern Ontario or in the Nipissing-Parry Sound area. They are built upon the request of Lands and Forests. We are guided entirely by The Department of Lands and Forests and their needs. Most of them are built in out-of-the-way places where it is hard to get contractors to go in at a decent price. We have our own groups of men who go in and build these dams. I do not know whether that answers you or not, but that is it basically.

Mr. Young: I suppose it is a matter of maintaining water levels and that sort of thing?

Hon. Mr. Connell: That is right.

Mr. Young: Who maintains them after they are built, and operates them?

Hon. Mr. Connell: The Department of Lands and Forests. We turn them over to that department and their men are in control of the water levels.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I would like to explore just for a moment the—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment on vote 1807 in connection with the construction of dams. Today we hear so much about water conservation, and yet in the north people say; "We have more water than we need, divert it to the south."

I would like to give you my experience in connection with my observation on the purpose of dams. In my area—and that is north-western Ontario—in the immediate vicinity of the Rainy River district, a number of years ago there were some seven dams built. Now these dams were built because of a need that arose at the time because most of the dams that did exist were built by logging companies which had logging operations. In time these dams deteriorated and the water during a freshet would wash them out. Therefore the levels in the watershed that it had held back would drop down, the fish life would disappear or its nature would change. Under this vote these dams were rebuilt to continue water conservation.

As far as the vote is concerned, they did not secure the member one solitary vote, be-

cause the people did not realize the importance of them until a situation arose in connection with our industry on Rainy Lake and Lake-of-the-Woods watershed. About three years ago the water levels dropped, through lack of precipitation, to a low level. It meant that the Rainy Lake watershed and the Lake-of-the-Woods watershed dropped and the pulp and paper industry would have closed down from, say, a six-day operation to a one- or two-day operation. As a result these dams were opened up allowing the water that they held back to fill up the watersheds of the Rainy Lake and Lake-of-the-Woods area and kept the industry going on a six- and seven-day basis, providing employment for all the people who were interested in the industry throughout the whole area.

This was the importance of rebuilding these logging dams. I would recommend to the hon. Minister that this programme be continued.

I have found that if I made a recommendation to reconstruct some of the remaining logging dams, certain officials were indifferent; "Well, we have enough dams." In my opinion, we have not enough dams. I think we should rebuild all the old logging dams and keep up the water levels of our area throughout northwestern and northern Ontario at a reasonable level.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of interest, I think the hon. member for Rainy River has put this thing in clear focus and given us a clear indication. As a matter of interest, I am wondering if the hon. Minister can inform us—he may not have the information—but I wonder if he can inform us as to how many of these dams are in existence in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Connell: We use the figure of 1,000.

Mr. Young: About 1,000?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Yes.

Mr. Farquhar: I would like to explore the hon. Minister's responsibility in connection with dams on a different kind of project that has been bothering our area.

I have been bouncing back and forth between myself and The Department of Lands and Forests for something like a year and a half. I am not asking or suggesting that a dam be built in this case, I am asking the hon. Minister if he would take some responsibility in connection with a dam being torn out which, of course, would involve the purchasing of existing water rights that have

been established in courts. But these particular dams are flooding very valuable farm property.

I am wondering if, first of all, as I have mentioned, I have not been getting any place with The Department of Lands and Forests and it is a very important project.

Two of them are actually in the same area. This hon. Minister I recognize is an open-handed gentleman and a practical man and what is more important, he seems to carry a few contingency funds around in his estimates which is very interesting indeed, so maybe I could have a comment in connection with this type of a project.

Hon. Mr. Connell: The hon. member says he has been in several times, I really do not know which one he is referring to.

Mr. Farquhar: No, I have not been in your office, I have been dealing with The Department of Lands and Forests. But, as I say, Lands and Forests have suggested to me that your department would be interested.

Hon. Mr. Connell: But which dam? I do not know which—

Mr. Farquhar: I could name two of them; one is called the Suddaby dam project and another was called Craigie dam; and they are both in Algoma.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I have heard a little bit about the Craigie dam, but the other one is completely foreign to me. I realize that there has been a bit of discussion there in regard to the Craigie dam, but as far as the water rights or the land is concerned this is, I think, absolutely clear as far as The Department of Lands and Forests and ourselves are concerned.

We are within our rights in building that dam there. I am sure that it has been cleared. The owner has made certain claims otherwise.

I have visited that dam myself and think that it is doing a very efficient job. This is not the one that you are talking about clearing out, is it?

Mr. Farquhar: No, Mr. Chairman. There is a problem in connection with it; it is a matter of settlement with the previous—

Hon. Mr. Connell: This has been gone into very thoroughly throughout the seven years I have been Minister. I have heard about the Craigie dam and their claims. Certainly I am no lawyer, but any legal opinions we have had on it are that my department and The Department of Lands and Forests are within

their rights and the Craigie people do not have any legitimate claims.

Mr. Farquhar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was not at the moment concerned with that particular dam at all. I realize and know something about the negotiations that have been going on and I appreciate what the hon. Minister has been doing on that particular project, but what I am trying to get to the attention of the hon. Minister is a dam in another area that was built years and years ago. It is not fulfilling any function at the moment, but water rights have been established by the owner. The dam is just there and it has resulted in the flooding of several farms and laying much land to waste, but some department or other has to proceed now to purchase those rights and to get rid of that dam; this is the only way it will be resolved.

As I have mentioned, if you feel like taking some responsibility in connection with it, or can, I will not burden this House with the project. I will be around to see you, if you would like to discuss it with me, and take it on as a project.

Hon. Mr. Connell: I would be pleased to see you in the office at any time. As far as I know, we only build on the recommendation of The Department of Lands and Forests in any particular area. If we are going to build a dam or tear it out, or purchase property, I would think that we would be checking The Department of Lands and Forests, but if you would care to drop around to the office some day and give me the details, I would be glad to look into it further.

Vote 1807 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Public Works.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I am happy to present the estimates of The Department of Civil Service again. This is an opportunity to report on behalf of the civil service commission and The Department of Civil Service in regard to the administration of personnel programmes in the civil service.

Votes 301 to 308, inclusive, request the necessary moneys to administer The Department of Civil Service in accordance with the requirements of The Public Service Act, and the regulations made under that Act. The

total budget requested is for \$1,209,000, which represents an increase of \$151,000 over the budget voted last year for this department. This represents an increase in votes 301, 302, 305, 306 and 308 while votes 303, 304 and 307 are decreased.

Last year, I described in some detail the work of the civil service commission and The Department of Civil Service. I reported new policies concerning collective negotiations, recruitment, pay research and training. This year's estimates reflect the stability which has been established in civil service administration by this government. Civil service staff, including the transfer of casuals, has increased to 41,415 in December of 1964 over 39,970 for the same period in 1963. While this represents an increase of 3.6 per cent, when the transfer of casuals or unclassified staff to civil service are included, a more accurate picture is gained when the actual percentage increase to payroll is considered. With the exclusion of the number of casuals transferred to civil service, which were, in the main, already on staff in 1963, we find the percentage increase is only .1 per cent. The number of casual employees was down from 1962 to 1963 from 14,400 to 11,700, and only increased in 1964 by 500 to 12,200. This figure would compare with 14,400 in 1962. Last year, 1,395 were transferred from unclassified staff to regular staff, 628 coming from The Department of Highways alone.

These figures demonstrate two things. One is that the government is continuing its promise to bring under the civil service most of the continuous casuals working for the departments who are eligible for such appointment; and two, through such controls as those exercised by the Treasury board, the size of the civil service has been stabilized. The intake of qualified persons is controlled by the civil service commission. Better qualified staff are able to do more effective work and consequently the civil service is able to carry on increasing responsibilities and duties without correspondingly increasing the size of the work force. This is an important accomplishment of which all hon. members, I am sure, will approve.

These days, economies are as essential to government administration as they are in business and industry. I am pleased to report such evidence of effective civil service administration by the Deputy Ministers to the hon. members of this Legislature. Payroll costs, of course, have increased because of the increases in salaries. The civil service payroll for 1964 was \$190.7 million, as compared to \$177 million for the previous year.

Again, this increased cost includes the salaries of the casual employees transferred to civil service status. In the past year, the civil service commission was involved in such matters as pay research with appropriate salary recommendations based upon the bargaining process; extensive recruitment activity; new training and development programmes; and continued maintenance of the classification plan. During the year, the administrative services branch processed an average of 2,000 employee transactions per week. That is quite a number—2,000 employee transactions per week. These involve such changes as promotions, transfers, reclassifications, merit increases and salary revisions. This gives a good indication of the high level of activity involved in the management of a civil service kept up to date and enjoying excellent working conditions and terms of employment.

Public recognition of this is indicated by over 16,000 applications for employment which were received by the recruitment branch. Over 9,000 interviews were conducted by recruitment officers and 6,000 tests were given to qualified applicants.

This is evidence of the increasing pressures on the civil service department to provide service to the public on behalf of all the departments. Last year, the department moved to new offices in the Britannica building at 151 Bloor Street West on the ninth and tenth floors. Previously the staff of the department were separated in the main Parliament building by three floor levels and located in two other buildings on Bay Street. Bringing the entire staff together has increased the efficiency of the department and improved its service to the public. The Britannica building is near the subway station at Bloor and Avenue Road. For those applicants calling at the main Parliament building, the commission has continued to operate a recruitment office on the second floor.

In reviewing the requirements for moneys to carry on the work of The Department of Civil Service, let me review each vote with you in comparison to last year.

Mr. Chairman, vote 301, which covers the requirements of main office, has been increased over last year largely because of the transfer of five positions in the former examinations branch. These positions were under vote 303 last year and add \$30,600 to the cost of the main office. The transfer establishes a new personnel research branch headed by a director of personnel research, Dr. Saleh, who is assisted by two personnel research officers. I will explain the purpose

of this branch later. Normal salary increases, travelling expenses and new equipment account for the balance of the increase.

The staff of main office has increased by two civil service commission officers—one added to the programmes and standards branch, and the other to the personnel research branch of main office. The total complement for main office is 18, an increase of two. The complement for the entire civil service department for the fiscal year 1965-1966, if these estimates are approved, will be 158. This represents an increase of eight over last year. There is no change in the number of personnel required for position administration, recruitment, or training and development branches.

Three staff will be required by the administrative services branch, which is covered by vote 305. These are a computer programmer, and two tabulating and key punch equipment operators. The programmer will be hired to prepare for integration of the data processing services in the civil service department, with the computer to be operated by the Treasury department. The use of a computer will greatly facilitate the handling of the high volume of personnel transactions and, at the same time, provide extra capacity to assist in such personnel management matters as staff selection, training and development, and classification. There will be increased capacity to carry coded information on the training and experience of each employee of the government, which will be of great benefit in personnel administration to the commission and the 20 operating departments.

The largest part of the increase requested over last year is an increase in salary requirements of \$142,500. This is caused by the general increases in salary levels and new staff. There was a salary adjustment announced in December, 1964, which affected professional and administrative classes retroactive to April 1, 1964. This, together with the increase of the complement from 150 to 158, accounts for the increase. Maintenance costs are increased by \$12,500 to a gross of \$105,000, largely as a result of three items—direct costs caused by the increase of staff—purchase of furniture and equipment, and so on, \$4,000; data processing rentals and forms, \$3,000; and increased use of paper for the printing of servicewide directives and materials, \$5,500. Regular forms and printing continue to be obtained in the usual way through the Queen's Printer. These include, for example, *Tops Magazine*, the "Employee Handbook" and "A guide to

written civil service examinations" which will be printed shortly.

The personnel research branch in the main office requires a word of explanation. Before September 1 last year, personnel research activities were associated largely with the examinations programme. General research, of course, was carried out in connection with each operating branch by the director and his staff. On September 1, 1964, the personnel research branch was established as a separate unit in main office. The main objectives are to promote the scientific approach to personnel management within the limits of human knowledge in the social sciences; in particular, to develop research activities in the areas of test validation, aptitude surveys and in the evaluation of training programmes and their results. Personnel policies must be constantly studied and revised to ensure effectiveness.

The purpose of test validation is to explore the value and the validity of tests for the selecting of employees for certain types of positions. The test is considered valid if applicants who obtain high scores on the test prove to be more successful in the specific job than those who get lower scores. If this is not true, then the test is of no value and should not, and will not, be used. Any particular weakness discovered will be corrected and an amended test substituted. At the present time, general aptitude tests, social intelligence tests and Wonderlic personnel tests are some examples. These have proven to be quite successful. They are essential to identify the best qualified among the hundreds of applicants who present themselves for certain of the positions advertised.

A pamphlet of about 20 pages entitled "A guide to written civil service examinations" was prepared and approved for publication. This has been referred to the Queen's Printer for printing, with the approval of the Treasury board. It will be sold at cost to persons interested in taking civil service tests, so that they may be familiar with the types of questions asked. This policy is also followed by other civil service agencies. This will help to reduce some of the anxiety generally produced in a testing situation which could interfere with results of some applicants.

At the request of The Department of Education, an attitude survey was conducted in which almost 50 per cent of the department's employees participated. The purpose of the survey was to obtain opinions of employees about the effectiveness of departmental operations. They were asked to

express their opinions and feelings about such factors as salary, communications, organization, supervision and training needs. The results were reported only to departmental officials directly concerned, along with recommendations for consideration which might improve some of the problems disclosed on the attitude survey. This is a healthy approach taken to improve management practices by a senior department of government. It indicates an anxiety to make the most effective use of its manpower, and the abilities of its officers in furthering the responsibilities it carries in the field of education.

A pre-retirement study was introduced in an effort to explore the view and reactions of employees towards some aspects of their retirement. A great deal of valuable information was discovered, which indicates that some of the opinions now widely held are without real foundation. For example, many employees approaching retirement age are interested in any opportunities to continue in useful and gainful employment. This is sometimes true even when they could retire on maximum pension.

In the evaluation of training programmes, the personnel research branch examines the results of such programmes as the senior officers conference, the supervisors training course, and others to see whether or not they are effective. Research will assist the training and development branch in developing new training programmes to meet needs which are discovered in the process of conducting other studies. This is indeed a dynamic field which requires constant reappraisal in order to produce maximum results.

Research will be continued into some new areas next year. One will be to evaluate the quality of employees recruited by the civil service commission in the past two years. This is over the same period in which the commission has been granted jurisdiction through the amendment of The Public Service Act. In addition, there will be a study of the public image of civil service administration to discover public attitudes towards government officials, general criticisms, and how best these can be identified and corrected. Research is much needed in the area of personnel administration in government; this is also true in other areas of employment. The natural sciences have progressed through planned research, but unfortunately in the field of human relations there has been insufficient research carried out. Such studies must be by qualified persons who are permitted and encouraged to take an objective view of such

problems. This branch will carry out research for departments on invitation and report results of such studies on a confidential basis. Results are not even disclosed to the civil service commission itself unless the Deputy Minister of the department authorizes such disclosure. One of the most important projects to be undertaken by this branch is the study on the effectiveness of recruitment practices in the service, and to analyze the present and future needs for trained manpower in the services. It is expected that many retraining needs will be identified as a result of this study.

Vote 302 requests \$216,500 to carry on the work of the position administration branch—an increase of \$12,000 over last year. The complement is not increased—it still remains at 32 officers and staff. The increase of \$12,000 is entirely in the area of salaries, caused by promotions of more experienced staff taking greater responsibility, and to meet the earlier costs of salary adjustments in the past year. In 1964 the organization changes and the new classifications which were required by the reclassification programme were consolidated and absorbed by the branch. Most of the principles, techniques and procedures recommended by the consultants now form the basis for the continuing administration of position evaluation and classification. The classification grievance procedure tests the accuracy and fairness of allocations.

It will be recalled that in implementing the reclassification study, jobs affecting some 16,000 employees were examined, and 14,000 of the civil servants concerned benefited through salary adjustments. Eight hundred civil servants were reconfirmed at their former rates of pay without adjustment, and 1,000 employees were red-circled because the maximum for the job they were in was rated lower than the salary the person concerned was receiving.

The departments deserve credit in relocating red-circled rated employees to other work wherever the opportunity presented itself. In some cases, this was corrected by reassigning or reorganizing new duties to strengthen jobs which were previously lower rated. As a result of these activities, 700 of the 1,000 employees are no longer red-circled. The fact that this personnel management problem has been largely corrected is as a result of responsible and deliberate action by Deputy Ministers and personnel officers. This is an indication of the healthy attitude taken towards staff management by officers of the department.

One of the time-consuming and difficult tasks of personnel administration is in the

preparation of new or revised classifications for positions while maintaining fair relationships with others. The reclassification programme did not cover technical, professional or administrative classes, but a study of these positions was carried out by the position administration branch jointly with the departments concerned. In fact, the departments prepared about 50 per cent of the position specifications of such classes. This programme has resulted in the restructuring of a number of class series, such as forestry technicians, conservation officers, agricultural officers and others. At the present time, a thorough study is being conducted in regard to the engineers' assistants series. This will be revised to reflect changing conditions and programmes, and to recognize new technical knowledges and skills required of such staff. More highly qualified staff doing better work deserve such recognition. In 1964, 207 classes were established, while 29 class specifications were modified. Two hundred and thirty-four classes no longer in use were deleted.

It is a tribute to the objectivity and thoroughness of the work of the staff of this branch that a number of other civil service agencies have sent representatives to study the work of Ontario in position administration. The effectiveness of the work of the classification officers is indicated by the fact that 21 hearings were held by the classification rating committee—an arbitration board—with 17 of them being that the classification was correct and four in favour of the grievor, recommending a higher or a new classification. At the present time there are 10 classification officers under the supervision of a chief classification officer. They are responsible for setting the standards and determining the classifications of the staff of 20 operating departments in over 1,200 jobs.

The report of the federal Glasco commission was taken into consideration in the matter of classification administration. This supports the intention to delegate much of the basic classification work to operating departments when the staff is available to take over this responsibility. This will require an amendment of the The Public Service Act before such delegation may take place, which will be recommended. The civil service commission is presently solely responsible for classification administration under the Act.

The fact that there were 21 formal grievances against classification does not indicate the large number of problems which are resolved at the lowest level of supervision without formal grievances. This a good indication of effective operation of personnel

management in classification and pay administration.

An increase of over \$4,000 is requested for vote 303 over the cost of the branch last year for publications and advertising. Other costs are decreased by \$20,500 in view of the transfer of five staff to vote 301, mentioned earlier.

In effect, therefore, the costs of the recruitment and the examinations branch are maintained at last year's level, except for the increase mentioned and certain increase costs in salary adjustments which will be covered by an item for salaries of \$177,000.

The new premises in the Britannica building are of great assistance to this branch, providing better accommodation for interviewing candidates and conducting examination tests. This gives a better impression to the applicant interested in a civil service career, and those taking tests have a better opportunity to do their best work in a proper setting.

In some areas there is a general shortage of well-qualified job applicants, which requires the greatly increased effort to locate qualified personnel. This is true of such continuing competitions as those conducted for typists and stenographers, and for certain professional personnel. Over 16,000 applications for employment were received in the branch, with over 9,000 interviews conducted. Partial solution to obtaining typists and stenographers has been achieved through the generous co-operation of The Department of Economics and Development through its facilities at Ontario House in London, England. A number of qualified personnel have been obtained through this source.

There was some scepticism when officers of the branch visited high schools and universities in 1963 and early 1964, but this has been replaced by a sincere welcome and assistance by placement and guidance officials in these schools and universities. The Ontario government is in an improved position because of a growing respect for civil service as a career. More students are continuing to higher academic standing and technical institutes and high schools, with many continuing on to university and taking post-graduate degrees. Government must continue to get its share of such qualified graduates. The recruitment services of the government have found growing acceptance in spite of some uninformed criticism of the value and benefits of a career in the public service.

Entry salaries are kept at a competitive level for high school and university graduates, and the province is getting its share of the best qualified persons. It is only in the areas

of scarcity which we, and other employers, find difficulty in recruiting sufficient staff that the province still cannot meet its recruitment needs. These include those fields of professional training where the output of the training institutes is not equal to the demand of the employment market, such as computer analysts and programmers, social workers, psychologists, doctors, sanitary engineers, nutritionists and a number of other professions related to health services.

The departments continue to recruit outside staff in the field, using the procedures established by The Department of Civil Service, which involve competitive selection of qualified candidates.

An increase in the number of civil servants transferring from one department to another, receiving promotional increases, is indicated by the fact that the civil service assisted in the competitive selection of 54 such civil servants last year. Many of these were senior civil servants.

The staff of the recruitment branch is made up of 16 recruitment officers, four examinations officers and eight supporting clerical staff. In 1964, the recruitment officers of the civil service commission filled 2,089 jobs by direct recruitment. The personnel research branch will continue to work with the recruitment and examinations branch to improve testing procedures.

To carry on the activities of the training and development branch, \$97,000 is requested, a net reduction of \$4,500 over last year, for vote 304. The decrease is achieved by reducing travel by \$500, maintenance by \$1,000 and the training needs study, which has been largely completed, by \$25,000, while the staff salaries, which are dealt with below, are increased by \$7,000. The administrative trainee programme will require \$15,000. The latter programme will be continued this year with three incumbents attached to The Department of Civil Service at \$5,000 each, with three other trainees for a total of six attached to departments. These administrative trainees will be chosen from top graduates in such courses as political science, economics and business administration.

After a period of training of a year they will be placed with the department chosen by the trainee in a job for which he is qualified. In this way, we expect to reinforce our supply of middle management staff.

The staff of this branch continues with eight persons, one position presently being vacant for a staff development officer. Salary

costs for more experienced training officers have increased by \$7,000, in recognition of the great strides made in conducting effective training programmes.

The officers of the branch carry on most of the training programmes, with the exception of university and senior government course leaders, who participate in the senior officers conference and senior officers seminar and certain executive training programmes. This has kept the training costs down, at the same time carrying on effective courses and conferences. A new programme for training of typists and stenographers has been commenced, with over 300 civil servants applying on a voluntary basis. This is typical of some of the special programmes which will be conducted in the future to meet new needs for more highly qualified staff.

The branch continues to co-operate closely with the universities in constituting training programmes, in particular Carleton, Toronto, York and Western. The facilities at the Ontario agricultural college have been offered again to The Department of Civil Service to conduct its senior officers training conference this year. It is presently underway. This provides an ideal setting for the officers chosen by each department, and for those sent by other jurisdictions such as the government of Canada, the provinces of Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and others in a three-week intensive course of study.

The results of this programme have been obvious, in that the course has been given strong encouragement by operating departmental officials. An extensive library of books in personnel administration and public administration is now available to those who wish to engage in self-study in these important fields.

In comparison to last year, an increase of \$48,000 requested for vote 305, administration services, is required to hire the three additional staff mentioned earlier to meet the needs of data processing, particularly in regard to programming for the use of a computer. Twenty-two thousand dollars is required to meet the needs of salary adjustments and promotions; \$4,000 increase for data processing rentals; and \$4,500 increase to meet increased printing costs. Maintenance and supplies is up another \$2,000.

The administrative services branch expects to alter some of its procedures to establish less day-to-day checking and control of operating departments, but to concentrate more on internal audit procedures in the future. Post-audit by this branch, while

giving more initial authority to the departments, should establish more efficient government administration in personnel matters. This branch is responsible for over 2,000 personnel transactions each week, to ensure the accuracy and completeness of every such transaction, and to keep up-to-date records of the total staff of the civil service. It is expected that the administrative services branch will not be further increased by staff after this fiscal year, but rather concentrate on lending its services. One of the accomplishments of the branch last year was to re-design a new position code system which gives more information on the classification of the position, its location and branch, and the classification of the incumbent in the position. In a service the size of the Ontario service, it is important that position code numbers and employee code numbers be used to establish proper information about the job and the person doing that job.

A total of \$1,255,070 was paid out in attendance credit gratuities during the calendar year 1964 to 1,355 separating employees. An average payment of \$926 was involved. Almost a quarter of the employees who separated during this period were eligible for the payment of this gratuity. This is a valuable fringe benefit for the Ontario civil servants.

Under the setting for perquisite charges, rentals were set on 15 new units of accommodation, and rentals revised on another 24 units. At the present time, a complete study is being conducted on the rental charges for housing in the Ontario provincial police. It is discovered that a number of the houses occupied by police officers may receive a greater perquisite discount under the formula earlier agreed to. This is being conducted with the knowledge and assistance of the Ontario provincial police association. The number of occupied self-contained units in the Ontario civil service now amount to 1,111. Payroll deductions for all types of perquisites for the year 1964 totalled \$1,210,760, an increase of \$81,711 over last year.

New permits through the occupancy of living accommodations were designed and issued by The Department of Civil Service. The signatories to the agreements are the Deputy Minister or his nominee in the department, and the occupant of the accommodation. The revised charges and the completion of these permits to occupy these units have produced agreements of tenancy between the department and the occupants which clearly indicate the terms and condi-

tions of the tenancies. This is of particular advantage to the occupant, who now has a clear indication of the responsibilities of himself and the department in regard to the maintenance of government property. His rights as a tenant are also protected.

The number of visits to health units by civil servants was reported by the health service of The Department of Health at 58,068 for the past year. This is an important service to continue employees on the job who would otherwise be off duty through minor illnesses or injuries. Any serious illness results in the person being referred to his family physician. I am pleased to report that, for the calendar year December 1964, the per capita absence due to illness was reduced from 8.28 days to 7.92 days over the previous fiscal year.

Vote 306, pay research, has the greatest percentage increase—\$31,500 over the total vote of \$58,500 for the past year to a total of \$90,000. The reason for this increase is to meet the growing demands for accurate pay research data, basing civil service wage rates on the salaries paid by other employers.

The pay research bureau carries the heavy responsibility of studying and reporting upon salaries paid for the 1,200 classes of civil service positions.

With the cyclical review programme, the work is spread evenly over the year, which is of great assistance to the pay research bureau and the civil service association in conducting its studies of the outside market.

Three new staff will be added to the branch at a cost of \$18,000 to meet the growing demands placed upon it through collective negotiation procedures and other studies on conditions and terms of employment. It is extremely important to keep the conditions of work in the Ontario civil service attractive and up to date; accordingly, this branch assumes a very important role.

In the fringe benefits studies reported by the fringe benefits advisory committee in September of last year, basic and important information was provided to the arbitration board which considered a reference on fringe benefits. The study committee was under the chairmanship of Mr. J. S. Forsythe, and had the very valuable assistance of Mr. I. H. Ashford and Dr. A. N. McLeod. Mr. Forsythe was formerly director of pension plans, The Department of National Revenue, now retired, while Mr. Ashford is supervisor, employee benefits, for Imperial Oil Limited. Dr. McLeod is chief economist of the Toronto-Dominion bank. Mrs. Etchen, who is the director of pay research, served as

secretary to this important committee, which inquired into the nature and costs of fringe benefits presently provided for employees in the Ontario public service and recommended a standard programme of fringe benefits comparable to those provided by responsible employers in Ontario.

The arbitration board, chaired by His Honour Judge J. C. Anderson of Belleville, with Mr. D. G. Cunningham, QC, of Kingston representing the official side, and Professor Saul Frankel of McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, representing the staff side, considered the first arbitration reference concerning a matter of fringe benefits.

On Monday, March 1, I reported to this Legislature the results of that arbitration award. I will not comment further, except to stress to the hon. members of the House that this award continues in effect until July 31, 1968. This will provide an important period of stability for the Ontario public service in the very broad matter of fringe benefits, and permit the concentration on salary matters by the pay research branch.

Vote 307 provides the necessary moneys to carry on the Ontario joint council, the civil service arbitration board and the two grievance boards. From the basis of experience we have been able to decrease the vote to \$33,500, a decrease of \$7,000 over the past year.

This will still provide all the necessary moneys to carry on the work of these important councils and boards. I have mentioned that the civil service arbitration board, chaired by Judge Anderson; it is also appropriate to pay tribute to the fine work of Professor Ralph Presgrave, chairman of the public service grievance board and Professor Jack Sargeant, chairman of the classification rating committee. Serving with them are Mr. F. E. Wood and Mrs. Elizabeth Smith on the grievance board, alternate civil service members being Mr. T. R. Hilliard, Deputy Minister of Energy and Resources Management, and Mr. D. A. Crosbie, senior solicitor, The Department of Highways. Mrs. Smith also serves on the classification rating committee, and is the only person with both appointments. Mr. J. A. Bridges, personnel director of the Toronto Hydro-electric system, has served as acting chairman in a number of classification rating committee hearings. The activities of these boards is evidence of the sincere interest of the government in establishing conditions of employment which are consistent with general practice in modern employee relations.

The employee relations branch is more

involved in grievance procedure, staffing problems, turnover problems and other matters similar to the problems considered by the industrial relations branch in industry, staff morale is an important concern to any efficiently operated enterprise, and this is primarily the concern of the operating head of each department. The employee relations branch, on invitation, will consider any of the problems referred to it, and assist the personnel director of the department concerned. The supervisor of employee relations attends at grievance hearings to cover problems of personnel administration and to recommend remedial action to the officers of The Department of Civil Service and the civil service commission. Pay negotiations and other matters are of direct concern to this branch, with the supervisor working closely with the director of staff relations on the Treasury board secretariat, who serves as an official side officer of the Ontario joint council.

The entire work of the civil service commission has proven that effective personnel management practices can maintain effective administrative services at reasonable cost to the taxpayer, keeping the number of overall staff at a reasonable level, while increasing the quality and salary recognition of such staffs serves the interests and needs of good government.

Mr. Chairman, I would commend to you the estimates for The Department of Civil Service to continue the up-to-date modern personnel administration which we think is second to none in Canada. Ontario is in the vanguard of developments in collective negotiations, permitting such matters as outside employment, political activity, granting arbitration rights in working conditions and terms of employment, as well as classification determinations.

This demonstrates that The Department of Civil Service has nothing to fear from outside arbitration of matters within its jurisdiction. This test demonstrates more effectively than anything I can say that the work of the department is carried out efficiently and well. Their estimates, therefore, commend themselves to the hon. members of this House for approval.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the debate on the final report of the select committee on The Municipal Act; then we

will proceed with estimates of The Department of Civil Service and the Treasury department.

I would add that the debate on the medicare bill will be early next week for the information of those who wish and intend to participate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 19, 1965

Establishment and operation of commuter services, bill to provide for, Mr. Robarts, first reading	3091
Extending welcome to Chief Public Health Inspector W. J. Reese, of Wales, Mr. Rowntree	3095
Resumption of the debate on the final report, select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts, Mr. Beckett	3095
Motion to discharge report, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3099
Estimates, Department of Civil Service, Mr. Allan, continued	3099
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3121

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1965

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, students from St. Patrick's separate school, Toronto; and in the east gallery, students from Coronation public school, Oshawa.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

COMMUTER SERVICES

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple piece of legislation but there lies behind it an announcement that I would like to make in which all hon. members of the House will be interested, because I think, in this area we will find that we are all as one—at least from previous public utterances of the Opposition.

You will recall that, in December, 1962, I had the pleasure to announce to this House the government decision to establish a special committee to carry out a study and to report on an overall transportation policy for Metropolitan Toronto and surrounding municipalities. For some time prior to the announcement of that decision, the government had been giving consideration to the problems of increasing transportation arising from the unprecedented post-war growth of this whole area, problems that were developing despite massive capital investment in transportation facilities throughout the entire area.

Major agencies such as The Department of Highways, the council of Metropolitan Toronto and the Toronto transit commission were engaged in long-term planning projects. The two national railways had decided to

decentralize their freight marshaling yards which were located in the downtown area of Toronto. What we wanted to determine was the effect that these various plans would have on the future transportation state of the whole region; if they would provide the best overall transportation system; whether a proper balance of different types of transportation was being considered and whether there was a less costly means of peak-hour transportation and whether available railway facilities could be used for commuter movements.

The Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study committee completed its organization in February of 1963. Its first undertaking, even before it had laid out detailed plans for carrying out the assignment, was the appointment of the firm of De Leuw Cather & Company, consulting engineers, in March of that year, to investigate the possibility of using railway lines located in the region, for commuter service.

In September, 1963, the study committee published a prospectus which contained the consolidation of existing information and concepts on transportation. That document outlined the initial objectives and the character of the study. It defined its field of study as the region lying within the boundaries of Oshawa on the east, Hamilton and Guelph on the west, and Barrie on the north, a region that takes in 3,500 square miles and involves over 70 municipalities.

In October, the consultants reported that varying degrees of capacity would be available on the rail lines to handle commuter trains. This was followed by a survey of trip movements to determine patterns of travel throughout the region, and in April of last year, the study again appointed consultants to extend their investigation into railway commuting. This involved a feasibility study to determine requirements for establishing a commuter service along the lakeshore corridor, as it is called, that lies between Hamilton and Oshawa. Their report was received in January of this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have outlined these activities of the transportation study to show that it has been quickly and exhaustively exploring this field of transportation, while

carrying out a great deal of other work on the broader aspects of the assignment.

Today I am pleased to announce that another important stage in the commuter study has been concluded, with a decision by the government to establish an experimental rail commuter operation along 52 miles of the lake front, lying between Burlington on the west and Dunbarton on the east.

I might say that this is looked upon as something of a pioneering project, because it is the first time that any government in Canada has undertaken this kind of an operation, designed to provide frequent and fast mass-transportation. Although the service is being introduced as an experimental pilot project, to assess fully its acceptance and capabilities, the government looks to it with high hope for success, so that it might be adopted more extensively in the region and possibly in other parts of the province.

It was only after the railways undertook to shift their marshalling yards to the outskirts of the metropolitan area, that the door was opened to the possibilities of adopting such services. The construction of these facilities—I am referring now to the marshalling facilities, which was marked with the formal opening of the CNR yard on Monday of this week—will result in the diversion of a considerable volume of freight traffic from a number of lines, particularly those within the metropolitan area. This will provide, for the first time, a measure of available capacity to handle the type of operation we have in mind.

In other words, when the freight trains move out of the downtown area into the marshalling yards to the north, they relieve the pressure on the tracks, giving us an opportunity to introduce the fast type of passenger operation that is envisaged in this plan. I might say that the announcement of the government's decision, coming only two days after the opening of the marshalling yard, also demonstrates the effectiveness and dispatch of the transportation study in handling this particular phase of its assignment.

Since the first of the year negotiations have been conducted with the Canadian National Railways for shared use of its lakeshore line and other facilities. Agreement has now been reached and shortly the railway will enter into a contract to operate the proposed service at cost on behalf of a government agency or department, as set out in the bill.

I would like to say that the satisfactory conclusion of our negotiations could not possibly have been brought about without the

unstinted co-operation of the railway and its representatives. These men made a significant contribution throughout the entire study of this matter and their work, in co-operation with the committee, is greatly appreciated. In the House today is Mr. Donald Gordon who is chairman and president of the Canadian National Railways Company—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and Mr. Douglas V. Gonder, who is vice-president of the Great Lakes region of the Canadian National Railways—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: —and Mr. John Spicer, who is the Toronto area manager of the Canadian National Railways. It is to these men and their staffs that we are indebted.

The province will finance the estimated capital cost requirement of \$7.5 million to provide rolling stock, right-of-way operating improvements and station facilities to handle high frequency traffic. It is estimated that the gross operating cost will be about \$3.5 million per year, and these are on the estimates because this is an experimental project; but we estimate that the revenue will be generated at something in the neighbourhood of \$1.5 million.

The inauguration of the service will depend up on delivery dates of equipment, but it is expected that it will be late in 1966, or early in 1967. The capacity being developed—the peak period capacity will be 6,000 passengers per hour, but its general design will permit a maximum capacity of 12,000 riders an hour by increasing the size of the trains—the surveys estimate that there could be 15,000 potential passengers per day during the work week, the Monday to Friday period.

Before making its decision, Mr. Speaker, the government was presented with a number of proposals of the type of service that could be implemented. These proposals offered alternatives with restricted operation and correspondingly sizable savings on capital expenditure and operating costs.

The alternatives were: 1. an operation which did not have a special off-peak service; 2. a service between Oakville and Dunbarton only; 3. a service that would operate between Oakville and Guildwood only; 4. a service between Port Credit and Dunbarton; 5. a service on the eastern sector only, between Union Station and Dunbarton; and 6. a service restricted to the western sector only, between Union Station and Oakville.

Since the rail lines, we believed, could provide a valuable addition to regional transportation, it was felt that the project deserved a bold and imaginative approach and that a trial service based on any of these alternatives would be less than adequate. We wanted it to operate under the best conditions within our power, so that it could have the fullest opportunity to prove its function and potential.

Forecasts estimate that the region's population will more than double to 6,000,000 persons within the next 35 years and the population of the lakeshore corridor that this particular line will serve, will reach 1,000,000 people by 1980. It is also estimated that this growth and the economic expansion that will, of course, accompany it, will require an expenditure of more than \$2.5 billion on transportation of one kind or another in this region during the next 20 years and more than \$4 billion by the end of this century. The continued growth of this region, and the province generally, must have adequate facilities in all acceptable forms of transportation if we are to provide freedom of movement and development.

If the choice of travel is confined to the automobile, the flexibility of movement could become increasingly restricted, even with very heavy expenditures on freeways and on general road facilities in the province. It would appear that there is considerable merit in looking to rail commuter service as an alternative mode of transportation. For example, it would require the equivalent of four freeway lanes to handle the anticipated patronage on this one railway line, if these people were driving cars during peak periods. Similarly, it would require the equivalent of ten freeway lanes to provide the maximum capacity that there will be in this one railway line.

These commuter rail services, if they are accepted by the public, could go a long way to relieve congestion. A great deal of our freeway capacity outside peak periods is surplus to normal needs, and although freeway construction cannot be eliminated, the need for expensive surplus capacity can very well be reduced. There is, of course, a very distinct possibility that the expenditure of funds in establishing these acceptable rail commuter services where they are possible, will result in considerable savings on highways and highway construction, and this in turn can bring about a more extensive use of transportation funds saved here, to be used in other parts of the province.

In any event, we are seeking answers to

these questions in undertaking this project and I am aware, as I said in my opening remarks, that all hon. members in this House are keenly interested in this important transportation development, and I am sure that we will all look forward to seeing what the final results are. Based on our studies, we are optimistic that they will be good.

If I may beg the indulgence of the House, there are other questions involved in this to which I am sure hon. members would like the answers. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) has acted as chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study. In other words, he has chaired the broad study of all these transportation needs in the area, and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if he could be permitted to give you some more detailed information that I have not covered in this statement of mine.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, may I say that in conducting its rail commuter study, the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study committee first carried out an investigation of all railway lines in the region. This covered approximately 250 miles of track on 15 lines, radiating from the Toronto area. It determined the amount of available capacity that could possibly be used for short-haul commuter traffic. As a result, it was estimated that about 45,000 persons could be carried into or out of the city daily, during peak periods.

Only about 90 miles of the total track was capable of handling more than one or two trains daily without resorting to major capital investments in additional track and other facilities. Experts found that the limited commuter services operated by the railways in the region were not able to provide sufficient information to assess fully the role that such service could play in an overall transportation system. Therefore, a feasibility study was carried out to determine the public acceptability, engineering and equipment requirements and the cost involved in establishing a pilot project so that reliable operating data could be obtained.

The transportation study's experts selected the CNR line primarily for three reasons:

1. It passed through the most populated area of the region.

2. The lakeshore corridor contained widely differing community and transportation characteristics to provide a variety of data that

could be related to other parts of the region, and the line itself offered considerable savings in capital investment because it did not require expensive changes to adapt track, signal and other facilities.

3. The corridor, as has been mentioned, has a population of 568,000 people. It is estimated from a survey carried out under the transportation study's direction last year, that approximately 90,000 of that number are daily commuters, with about three-quarters of them presently using cars. An estimated 38,000 or about 40 per cent of the commuters are employed in the commercial area of Toronto.

The survey also provided an estimate that there were approximately 15,000 potential riders a day between Monday and Friday with weekend and holiday traffic, of course, on a much smaller scale. This was considered sufficient patronage to allow an accurate assessment and warrant the government's sizable investment in the project.

Specifications are now being prepared and manufacturers will shortly be asked to submit tenders for 48 new, modern, specially designed coaches, each with a seating capacity for 125 passengers, and ten diesel locomotives. The equipment will be of the most advanced design to handle this type of service. Under present plans, the service would operate from 6.45 a.m. to midnight from Monday to Friday, with trains scheduled every 20 minutes during morning and evening peak travelling periods. In off-peak periods and throughout Saturday the service would operate on an hourly schedule and a 90-minute schedule would be in effect for Sundays and holidays.

Travel time from Burlington to Union Station, according to present estimates, would be 57 minutes. From Oakville, 40 minutes, and from Union Station to Dunbarton, also 40 minutes. These times would include stops at all stations between the two points. Although there will be a considerable reduction in the number of freight trains using the line, the remaining volume of traffic and limited facilities for passenger handling at Union Station will prevent a higher frequency and more extensive service. Indeed, an increased volume of railway traffic between Burlington and Hamilton, and Dunbarton and Oshawa, is expected as a result of the changes in the marshalling yard location. This rules out any possibility of rail commuter operations on these sections, unless more than 20 miles of new lines are built and equipped with advance signalling facilities. This would be a very expensive proposition

and one that could not be considered justified at this time.

The survey disclosed that there were very few regular train commuters expected from Hamilton and the majority of present commuters patronize long-distance express trains. These express trains will continue to be available to serve them, or, if they wish, Hamilton passengers could use the parking facilities at Burlington and board trains there. Because the survey also indicated a somewhat lower level of patronage could be expected from the Burlington and Bronte areas, service to these two stations will consist of our peak period trains daily throughout the work week. This would be the same as the present CNR commuter service which will be discontinued, but travel time would be from 10 to 20 minutes faster.

Consideration is being given to a probable need to rearrange station locations in order to cut travel time on the western sector. A number of stations are located very close to each other, within a distance of about two miles, and a rearrangement of stations without affecting service to the areas involved could speed up train times by ten minutes at least.

According to our survey, the prime consideration which potential riders desired was a fast, frequent and dependable service. For this reason, and taking into consideration the volumes of passenger potential expected from various areas, it is planned to have 14 stations in operation along the line.

Sunnyside station would be eliminated as a commuter stop because the survey indicated that patronage prospects are almost nil due to the high degree of Toronto transit commission facilities available in the area. Other stations under consideration for elimination are Dixie Road, Lakeview and Lorne Park. Passengers from the Dixie Road and Lakeview areas could take trains from nearby Long Branch station and Lorne Park passengers could use either Port Credit or Clarkson stations.

On the other hand, it will be necessary to add several stations to the eastern sector where stations do not now exist. In addition to the present stations at Danforth and Scarborough it is contemplated that new stations would be located at Eglinton, Guildwood, Port Union and Dunbarton itself. Feeder bus services will be provided in areas where stations are to be eliminated, with the exception of Sunnyside, to minimize passenger inconvenience. Buses would also operate to other stations where they are required.

In addition, all stations with the exception of Union Station would be provided with

adequate parking facilities, and special areas now popularly called "kiss and ride" areas where wives could conveniently drop off and pick up their husbands with the family car. It is intended that this service shall have every possible feature to make it attractive to commuters who are in a position to use it.

The operation of a commuter service such as I have described is an expensive proposition. Consequently, to offset the considerably higher cost of the greater convenience that will be provided, it may be necessary to make some upward adjustment in fares over rates now charged by the railway. However, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House and assure the public that the new fare structure, if implemented and as it may be implemented, will remain competitive with the cost of other modes of transportation and it will not be out of line with comparable rates of similar services in other cities on this continent. The transportation study estimates that it will require two to three years of operation in order to fully assess the service capabilities and public acceptance under various conditions. This field study will be devoted to an intensive analysis of the relationships of patronage to service characteristics, and development of operating techniques that could be applied to the regions.

Specifically, some of the matters that are to be studied include comparisons of different modes of transportation where there are the advantages of speed, a matter of choice and frequency of service, integration of rail commuter operations with other forms of transportation, means of improving patronage under different operating conditions, types of service operation required to meet differing community characteristics; and perhaps the most important of all from a public point of view, the degree to which fares and costs can be adjusted in relation to levels of patronage and system costs. These are the main conditions and some of the important considerations that had to be studied in the establishment of such a project.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, all hon. members can appreciate that there is a myriad of detail still to be worked out before operations can be undertaken. It is my intention to make the House aware of further important developments on the subject as they occur from time to time.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to tell the House that we have a visitor from Wales with us, Mr. W. J. Reese, who is the chief public health inspector for Wales. He is in Ontario visiting some friends

of mine in my own constituency and I would think the hon. members of the House would want to extend a welcome to Mr. Reese. I hope he is in the House at the moment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would tell Mr. Reese that we have Wales in mind constantly in this Legislature. Indeed we have one of our ridings named after St. David, and annually the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Price), who is not here in the House as yet and could not be here, speaks annually in honour of the Welsh people. I would think this would be another occasion when we might honour the people of Wales and tell Mr. Reese the significant part that they have played in the life and growth of this province.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a very important announcement to make regarding the great riding of Middlesex South, which I have the honour to represent. On Friday, June 4, 1965 at 3:30 p.m., the new bridge crossing the Thames River on Highway No. 2 in the village of Delaware will be named the Harry M. Allen bridge.

I am particularly proud to make this announcement to the hon. members of the Legislature because the late Harry M. Allen represented the riding of Middlesex South in this Legislature from 1945 to 1963. Many of my hon. colleagues will recall the great contribution he made to the public life of this province. The hon. Minister of Highways will officially unveil the commemoration plaque and all hon. members of this House are invited to attend.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the fourth and final report of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts.

ON THE MUNICIPAL ACT AND RELATED ACTS

(continued)

Mr. H. E. Beckett (York East): Mr. Speaker, before I speak again on this matter, I wish to advise the hon. members of the House our good friend, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney) was to speak, but unfortunately he is in the hospital, so I will attempt to speak for him. I know he is a great supporter of local government.

There has been some comment, Mr. Speaker, on the qualifications and the experience that the members of the select committee

have on The Municipal Act and related Acts. I thought for the benefit of those critics and for the benefit of the hon. members of the House, I might read the experience that the members of the committee have had.

The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) was an alderman for the city of Toronto for two years and on the board of control for one year.

The hon. member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) was a councillor for six years, reeve for five years and mayor for the town of Bradford for one year. He was a member of the public utilities commission for 14 years, warden of the county of Simcoe and on the district high school board for one year.

The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) was a member of the public school board for three years and chairman for two years; and member of the high school board for two years and chairman for one year; a councillor for five years and mayor for two years of the town of Little Current; and a member of the high school board for one year, at Blind River in the Elliot Lake district.

The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Gomme), now Minister without Portfolio, was councillor for one year, reeve for one year and mayor for three years of the town of Almonte.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) was alderman for two years and a member of the public utilities commission for four years for the city of Brantford.

The hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde) was councillor for two years, deputy reeve two years, reeve two years, for the township of Caradoc and warden of the county of Middlesex.

The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) was alderman for three years, and mayor for two years, of the town of Preston.

The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) was councillor for three years, reeve for two years, of the township of North York, and a member of the Toronto metropolitan council for two years, and during the whole of that time, was a member of the executive committee.

The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox was a councillor for two years, deputy reeve one year and reeve for six years of the township of Ameliasburgh and warden for Prince Edward county.

The hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) was a councillor for seven years and a member of the planning board for two years for North York township.

As for myself, I had the privilege of serving as councillor for one year and deputy reeve for six years, of Scarborough township council.

And, as you all know, each member who serves as a reeve or deputy reeve, also serves an equal number of years on their respective county councils. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that answers the critics and some newspaper comments that the members of the committee lack municipal experience.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk further on the fourth and final report of the committee. We feel that specific functions of municipal government have now become centred in newly created bodies and functionaries. The municipal council today has been shorn of its pristine glory and in many respects, now serves but as a collecting and distributing agency between the general body of citizens and the bodies or functionaries managing and administering various municipal enterprises and undertakings.

The result is that today we are blessed or cursed, as the point of view may be, with a great number of bodies which govern and administer our municipal affairs. In the average city today in Ontario, we will in all possibility, find a council, one or more utility commissions, a police commission, parks board, town planning board, board of health, board of education, vocational school board, library board, and perhaps other boards or commissions, the members of which are elected by the people or appointed by their elected representatives. And to this must be added, Mr. Speaker, a number of other bodies of a public or quasi-public nature, which in reality serve the municipality in their particular fields, just as the council and other bodies mentioned may do, although they are not necessarily the creatures of the general municipal statutes.

Under this category, fall such bodies as boards of trade, chambers of commerce, industrial commissions, harbour commissions, highway commissions, hospital boards and innumerable others. While in the smaller urban and rural communities the situation is not quite the same, yet even there the tendency has been towards the creation of bodies, separate from the municipal council, to look after some work or project of a special nature.

If to all these elected or appointed bodies are added the great host of public and municipal officials, who in an executive capacity, administer local affairs, it will be readily conceded that we have enough, if not a surfeit, of municipal government. We all

should at this time decide whether or not modern tendencies have not made too many inroads upon a system of municipal government, which has stood the test of time. We should consider whether or not the development by municipalities of activities which are the creatures of recent years—and have become so by necessity or desire—require to be placed under some greater measure of control, so that the financial burdens resulting therefrom may not become too onerous.

It becomes the duty of all of us to take time to take some part in the matter of the administration of municipal affairs, because the management of a municipality is most important to everybody. If hon. members were to make a survey of the changes which have been brought about in the conduct of municipal affairs and which have occasioned a very large increase in municipal expenditures, it is probable that they would say that the following five factors have played the largest part in such changes: public utilities development; educational development; highways development; social welfare development and decentralization of municipal government.

Hon. members will find that out of the innumerable items which have contributed to municipal progress and the great increase in taxation and debenture debt, it has been established that the greatest percentage of them all fall into one or other of the five foregoing categories and no substantial or satisfactory progress towards permanently determining our future system of municipal government can be made without due regard to them.

The problem of preserving local autonomy, and at the same time raising revenue locally to finance local needs, permeates the whole fabric of municipal government. We should preserve local self-government in order to protect, nurture and further develop to maturity our inherent belief in political freedom and personal liberty.

Here I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member who is now in the hospital, was a great supporter of that doctrine, local autonomy. All through our meetings, he kept saying that we must maintain our local system of government. In order to accomplish this, it is imperative that local governments have complete jurisdiction and control over matters of purely local nature, including the means of raising revenue to finance these undertakings.

Mr. Speaker, the extension of the municipal franchise to persons not rated as property owners or tenants, recognizes the

rapid increase of services furnished to people, as distinguished from services furnished to property. No local government can function without the necessary funds to carry out the legal obligations and fulfill the numerous social responsibilities, if it is to govern in the best interests of the community as a whole. The present method of municipal finance is outmoded and discriminatory. There are two distinct types of service rendered by local governments.

First, there is the servicing of real property by providing such services as water, sewers, sidewalks, roads and fire protection.

Second, there are the services provided to persons, such as education, administration of justice, parks and recreation.

Services provided to real property should be financed by the owners of property and services provided to people, should be financed by the people who reap the benefits. An effective system of local government is essential, if the need for local services to local citizens and communities is to be made efficiently and at reasonable cost and in accordance with local wishes. Many of the difficulties in carrying out such functions as slum clearance, urban renewal, town planning, pollution control and area development, arise as much from the complexities and fragmentation of local government as from any other source.

As hon. members all know, there is a great distribution of responsibilities in local government between the councils and the local boards, commissions and special-purpose bodies. There are—in addition to the non-elected boards such as planning boards, parking authorities, community centre boards—the elected school boards and public utilities commissions, and there are intermunicipal bodies such as suburban road commissions, health units, conservation authorities and homes for the aged.

When I presented the fourth and final report of the committee on March 30 last, I dealt with the matter of regional government. One of the recommendations was that the members of regional councils be elected directly by the people on the basis of wards which should be as nearly as possible, equal in population. I would like to give the House two examples to show why this policy should be adopted. The London Government Act of 1963, in England, makes provision with respect to local government and the functions of local authorities in the metropolitan area. The Act establishes new administrative areas to be known as London boroughs. There are 32 boroughs, having 98 councillors, the

number of councillors varying from two to four. As of April 1 of this year, no part of Greater London shall form part of any administrative county district or parish.

Now, Greater London has an area of 393,809 acres, or 616 square miles, with a population of nearly 8 million people, whereas Metropolitan Toronto has an area of about 240 square miles and a population of about 1,600,000.

The greatest distance in Greater London from north to south is 30 miles and the greatest distance from east to west is 36 miles. The primary unit of local government is the borough. The new boroughs to which highly important personal services had been transferred are large and have great resources, and by working with each other will be able to fulfil their responsibilities.

The populations of the London boroughs range from 146,000 to 341,000, and there are only five boroughs with populations less than 200,000.

Their ratable values range from £9,200,000 to £108 million.

There was established at the same time the London boroughs committee consisting of two representatives of each of the 32 boroughs and the city of London. The principal aim of the London boroughs committee is to protect and advance the powers, interests, rights and privileges of the constituents' councils and to intervene when those powers, interests, rights and privileges are affected by legislation or proposed legislation.

This committee has established advisory bodies of officers appointed by the associations and these bodies meet frequently to consider matters affecting them.

London's two-tier system of government expresses the Londoner's dual relationship, loyalty and allegiance to London as a whole and to a local community. But the Londoner is entitled to ask that the administration of a service shall be as near as possible to the person to whom the service is extended.

It is recommended that in principle there shall be the same system for education in the whole of Greater London and that the Greater London council shall be the educational authority for the whole area—quite different from our system—and that the Greater London council should be responsible for planning, programming and financing and that teachers should be appointed to the service of the council. On the other hand, the boroughs should be given specific responsibilities to be defined in the Act, which

may briefly be described as management and maintenance.

Broadly speaking, the borough councils are charged with responsibility for those services which bring them into close personal contact with their citizens and which involves, inevitably, large volumes of correspondence and decisions.

The Greater London council is charged with a policy of administration which looks to the needs of the wider area as a whole. The council is responsible for ambulances, fire service, sewage disposal, civil defence, and a research and information department for the collection of information relating to any matter affecting Greater London.

It is the sole traffic authority and has control of planning and metropolitan highways and the important service of housing and London Building Act.

Members of the Greater London council are elected by the people.

A further example of direct election is the government of Metropolitan Winnipeg. The Manitoba government in October, 1962, appointed a commission headed by Mr. Lorne Cumming, QC, then deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs for Ontario, and they were asked to inquire into all facts and circumstances relating to the following:

A. The finance relationships of the metropolitan corporation and the area municipalities.

B. The form and structure of the metropolitan government, with a view to the adjustment of any factors that would make for more effective relationship with the area municipalities.

C. The structure and methods of the intergovernmental relationship of metropolitan government and the area municipalities, with a view to such technical alterations as would make for more effective local government in the area.

D. The boundaries of the metropolitan corporation and all the area municipalities and their suitability in the light of the services required.

E. Generally, all matters pertinent to the metropolitan government in Greater Winnipeg, not being inconsistent with matters hereinabove mentioned, which the commission may deem appropriate and to which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may refer from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, this commission, after reviewing and considering the implications of the provisions of this portion of the Act, concluded

that they were intended to implement the following basic principles:

A. The corporation should be governed by a relatively small council directly elected by the people.

B. The fundamental principle of representation by population is to be followed in view of the taxing power of the council, notwithstanding the fact that taxes for metropolitan purposes are not levied directly but indirectly through levies upon the constituent municipalities.

C. The members of the council are not to be in any sense the appointed or instructed delegates of the local council but are to be elected by and responsible to the electors residing in a specified portion of the entire area, with regard to local boundaries established for local purposes.

D. The system is designed to prevent, so far as possible, an unequal division of political powers between the central city on one hand and the suburbs on the other and to reduce the possibility of either group being able to dominate the proceedings and control the decisions of the council.

Representatives of the area municipalities argued that the metropolitan council should include, as ex-officio members at least, the elected heads of the city and the larger suburbs. They reviewed the recommendations of the metropolitan subcommittee which were presented to the government of Manitoba some ten years previously and if it had been adopted there would have been a very large metropolitan council with some of the members having multiple votes. They also studied the recommendations of the Greater Winnipeg investigating commission which, if adopted, would have meant a metropolitan council of six members elected directly by the metropolitan district and eight ex-officio members, being the mayors or elected heads of the eight cities or municipalities which would be established by a series of territorial changes.

The commission, after lengthy and anxious consideration of all the evidence and exhibits, and in light of actual experience and having regard particularly to the encouraging progress made under the present system to date after a relatively short period, has finally come to the conclusion that the principles adopted by the government in setting up the present type of council are sound and the present organization should be continued, subject of course to such further reviews and evaluations from time to time in the manner

contemplated in the Act and as later recommended in their report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act in 1960 the government of the corporation is by a council of ten members directly elected by the people in the ten metropolitan electoral divisions—the chairman to be elected by the elected members for a four-year term.

There are 19 municipalities in Metropolitan Winnipeg and each division, as nearly as possible for election purposes, is to contain the same number of electors and to include portions of at least two area municipalities.

The divisions are so constituted that in five divisions the majority of electors are residents of Winnipeg, and in the other five divisions the majority of electors are not resident of Winnipeg. Each division contains a portion of the city together with portions of one or more of the area municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that democracy in its best form emanates from the direct election of representatives at all levels of government. I say that this method is adopted in the elections at federal, provincial and local municipal levels. And if a regional government is to adhere to this pattern, the regional councils should be elected directly by the people, as nearly as practical on the principle of representation by population. And this could be accomplished by the use of a ward system. Ward boundaries could follow as nearly as possible the boundaries of constituent municipalities, although it will sometimes be necessary to combine or divide local municipalities to achieve equality of representation.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the report be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The seventeenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE

(continued)

On vote 301:

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) addressed this House last year in dealing with the estimates of The Department of the Civil Service, he said that in Ontario over the years the basis for a fine civil service had been established. I believe it to be my

duty to say that my relations with the civil service of this province since my election to this Legislature have been excellent. I have been able to solve many problems for my constituents through the good offices of many of our fine civil servants.

I do not intend to offer any criticisms of the work done by the civil servants. I would, however, like to criticize the leadership of the government in the administration of the department.

In his opening remarks in last year's estimates debate, the hon. Provincial Treasurer talked at great length on the provision in The Public Service Act providing for a joint council for collective negotiation procedures between employee association representatives and management representatives. This debate, Mr. Chairman, took place on March 5, 1964. Six weeks later, a submission regarding employer-employee relations in the Ontario public service was presented to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) by the Civil Service Association of Ontario, Incorporated. I believe it may be found useful to inform this House of the contents of this submission. I shall read first the introduction of this brief.

The civil service association of Ontario, with regret, finds it necessary to focus attention on the unsatisfactory conditions prevailing in the relationship between the Ontario government and the association in the field of negotiations concerning employment conditions in the Ontario public service. The distress of the many members and the low salary brackets, aggravated by exceeding slowness in the adjustment of their pay rates, the universal concern of all employees with the apparent apathy of government and its agents to employee matters, and the continual retreat of official side personnel behind "sovereign rights," have all combined to force the association into a position not of its own making or liking.

Hence this submission, by order of the board of directors, to fully inform the Honourable Prime Minister of the true situation of employer-employee relations in the Ontario public service.

Mr. Chairman, I think it will be advantageous to read this submission and I shall start with the first part, entitled "History":

Until 1944, the relationship between the government of Ontario as an employer and the Civil Service Association of Ontario, Incorporated, representing the employees of government, had no formality.

As a result of strong representation at that time, the government provided for a

joint advisory council and departmental councils. The basis for these councils was the Whitley council system which had existed in England since 1919. In practice, there was little comparison between the Ontario system of councils and the British system of councils. The Ontario system had no firm negotiating procedures and no provision for final or binding decisions, the joint advisory council having only powers of recommendation.

In practice also, the association representatives found that the official representatives were reluctant even to discuss matters on the grounds that they had no right to do so unless the matters were referred to them by the government. Repeated attempts by the association to improve the procedures met with little success until 1959 when the dissatisfaction of public servants reached a point of public protests.

Following this, the government made some amendments to the regulations governing the council system along with some changes in the personnel representing the government. Again, in practice, the amendments served very little useful purpose, and the net result of the amendments was improvement in the election procedures to the departmental councils with the joint advisory council receiving no authority to negotiate or to decide matters of concern to public servants.

In 1962, again following repeated protests of public servants, the association proposed an agreement be entered into between the government and the association, to provide formal relationship between the government and the association, designed to eliminate arbitrary and unilateral decisions concerning matters of employment, while protecting sovereign rights. This proposal, along with certain proposals for a regulation which The Public Service Act of that time provided for, subsequently resulted in the amendment to The Public Service Act, to provide for effective negotiations through a joint council, which was given the power of binding decisions. The right of arbitration where agreement could not be reached was also provided.

The joint council, after some preliminary sessions, commenced its operations in August, 1963. The new negotiation and arbitration procedures were announced by the government and the association with some pride and great hopes. The interest awakened in the new legislation, extended far beyond the borders of Ontario. To the public servant generally, negotiation and arbitration meant the right to participate

in decisions concerning rates of pay and working conditions. This was done at last, that the many discrepancies, particularly in pay rates, would be corrected through orderly and timely negotiations by responsible persons, with authority to make decisions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what has been the experience?

In a nutshell, it became obvious very early, that the negotiation procedure restrictions applied only to the association and to the items presented by the association. The employer reserved unto itself, the same old rights of unilateral decision. Class specifications were revised without reference to joint council or the association. Pay rates were published without prior negotiation. Changes to working conditions were made without negotiation. Experience was contrary to expectations.

(a) Joint council: The first big disappointment to the association was the arbitrary exclusion from joint council provisions of the Ontario provincial police. While the Act provides for exclusion by regulations, the association had held the opinion that the government would not use that device to arbitrarily remove groups from the bargaining provision, particularly since any across-service item negotiated must apply to such groups. The fact remains that the association was allowed no say in the matter even though a significant number of police officers are members of the association.

In an effort to clarify the extent of negotiation and establish the rights of the association as a full partner in the negotiating body, the association submitted as an item of joint council agenda the following:

"Ontario regulations and amendments thereto under The Public Service Act:

"The association submits that bargaining in good faith requires the parties to bargaining to refrain from any unilateral act which would tend to bind the employees of the bargaining unit and which would prejudice negotiations. The issuance of regulations or amendments to regulations covering the employment conditions in the Ontario public service, without reference to the Ontario joint council, can seriously embarrass the members of council and adversely affect the public image of the Ontario joint council.

"The association submits that, in establishing the Ontario joint council with authority to make decisions concerning matters related to the employment con-

ditions of public servants, the Ontario government delegated its powers of decision in personnel matters to the Ontario joint council, subject only to the authority of the Legislature.

"W. J. Foster, representing the members of the civil service association of Ontario, now moves that henceforth no regulations or amendments to regulations governing the general employment conditions of Ontario public servants shall be issued without prior negotiation in the Ontario joint council."

Official side of council refused to accept them on the grounds that "we cannot tell the government what to do or what not to do." Such an attitude completely negates the principles of negotiation and arouses suspicion against the employer.

Negotiation of all items placed on the agenda was not of the type expected and the approach of official side members did little to inspire confidence in the joint council as a negotiating body.

Example: Hospital-medical-surgical insurance. In preparation for negotiations, the association representatives were armed with a mass of facts and figures and offered to table same as a basis for negotiation. The item was presented in August, 1963, and received preliminary discussion in September. In October, it was agreed to meet informally "to clear the way for the official side to prepare a counter proposal"—Minutes of October 7, 1963.

In November, official side stated that the government would arrange without delay a study of fringe benefits. Staff side offered to negotiate on 70 per cent. Official side was not prepared to agree or offer counter-proposals. Staff side asked for arbitration. Two weeks later, official side offered an expedited review "so that council may place its decision in respect of the said matter before the government prior to the first day of April, 1964."—Minute of November 19, 1963.

At the meeting of April 13, official side were blandly stating that they would have no report until May. Staff side declared this unacceptable and again declared for arbitration, subject to confirmation by the board of directors meeting of April 17. A further meeting of council on April 20, indicated quite clearly that the original agreement on the April 1 date had been merely a device, a date for report in June was now being offered. Obviously the matter should have gone to arbitration in November, saving a delay of five months

and obviating questions as to staff side credulity and official side sincerity.

Staff side negotiators have valiantly attempted to bring some realism to negotiation and have stated emphatically that the official side are not acting as negotiators. The Hon. James N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) was made aware of this and arranged a meeting attended by representatives of both sides, the chairman of the civil service commission and a labour lawyer, retained by the government. Apart from assurances that better negotiating procedures would be devised, nothing has transpired.

(b) General: There have been occasions when the association was generally aware that changes in working conditions were being considered and became officially aware that changes had been made when the *Ontario Gazette* was received through the mail.

Example: New regulation prohibiting second or subsequent leave of absence for maternity. The original procedures for leave of absence were adequate and apparently acceptable to all until an employee filed a grievance when denied a second maternity leave. The grievance board found in favour of the employee. The details are available in the grievance file. It is sufficient to say here that losing a grievance in any other jurisdiction would not give management the right to change the rules of the game unless and until the change had been bargained for.

Example: The decision to have two or more standards for teachers in The Department of Education. No negotiation was offered. No consultation was offered. The association read about it in the daily newspapers.

The examples quoted are just that. They are cited as examples of bad faith or official disregard of all the time and effort spent in devising a form of negotiation which was to be a shining guide for all other public service jurisdictions. The changes in working conditions may be desirable and completely justified—if so, then the official side has missed a glorious opportunity to improve communications and enlist the support of the association—if not, then the official side has misused its big stick of statutory authority to defeat the means by which employees may have some measure of representation and protection.

(c) Salaries. There has been no negotiation on salaries. On occasion we have been

invited to discuss salaries for certain classifications, but only in one instance did our protests against rates to be recommended by the commission, result in any improvement to the rates. In other instances the rates disputed were subsequently announced without negotiation and in defiance of our protests.

In 1961, a well publicized job evaluation programme was commenced with high level assurance that Phase 1 would be completed in one year. It is a matter of record that Phase 1 is still not completed. The long delays, the lack of reasonable explanation for the delays and the confusion in the processing of the findings have resulted in frustration and bitterness at all levels of the service. Rates revised with the effective date of September 1, 1962, are now overdue for further revision, while other rates have remained static since October 1, 1959. Trades classes were revised July 1, 1960 and should have been again revised not later than July 1, 1962. Still other classes have had more than one revision in the last two years. In-service differentials are chaotic and relationships distorted. In some cases employees recently promoted are now receiving less pay than they would receive had they not been promoted. The planned, orderly two-year programme which was publicized far and wide has become a disorderly jumble with no apparent end.

Mr. Chairman, there was a further letter dated February 18, 1965, and this shows a continuation of the conditions that I have mentioned in the first letter.

The hon. Minister, I am sure, may have some comments to make in this matter. He might tell us that these difficulties have all been ironed out. I am sure, however, that there are still many grievances in the civil service of this province. It is to be hoped the joint council will, in the future, assume the role for which it was formed, and that the association will be recognized as a full partner in the negotiating body.

In advertising for staff, the commission always uses the motto: Ontario, Land of Opportunity. I would like to quote an editorial published in the *Globe and Mail*, dated April 8, 1965, and I quote:

Under the heading, "Ontario, Province of Opportunity," the following advertisement announcing challenging new positions for research officers in The Department of Education has appeared in the *Globe and Mail*:

"Research positions are available in the

recently formed youth branch of The Department of Education. The branch will study such topics as the effects of automation, the changing nature of job situations, the problems of youth who find it difficult to accept current social standards with reference to educational, cultural, recreational and employment opportunities.

"The individual research officer will represent one of the following disciplines: Economics, sociology, education or psychology. The total effort will be directed, in co-operation with youth agencies, toward the development of practical programmes and policies to help young people meet the challenges and opportunities of contemporary society."

So far, so good. The department is to be congratulated again for its imaginative approach to solving the problems of the youth of the "province of opportunity."

But read on:

"Openings are for graduates at the Ph.D. Master's degree and honour degree level in one of the above-mentioned disciplines. Starting salaries will be commensurate with the level of the degree; that is \$5,250, \$6,300, \$7,200. Additional requirements include acceptable experience in the applied fields of education, economics or social work; a strong measure of self-direction; the ability to communicate effectively in writing and speech."

Now, after a slight pause for century identification, a reader might ask how The Department of Education could possibly expect in these times to hire personnel with such high qualifications at such low salaries—and particularly from a field where there is already a great shortage of trained people. The answer, of course, is that the jobs will be filled by people who are not quite competent, or who are so dedicated to research that salary is unimportant. In either case, the work or the worker suffers. Neither answer should be satisfactory to the "province of opportunity."

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that many other examples have been quoted in this House by other speakers in the study of estimates of many departments. Some of the problems in The Department of Health, The Department of Public Welfare and many others would not exist if the salary scale had been set to conform with salaries for identical positions in private business or the federal government.

The hon. Minister mentioned that the increase of the staff of the civil service was

from 39,970 to 41,415 in the past year. This represents a percentage increase of 3.6 per cent, when the transfer of casuals or unclassified staff are included. If these are removed, the percentage increase is .1 per cent. Does this mean that the civil service had been overstaffed before?

The hon. Minister has also advised the House that the government is continuing its promise to bring under civil service administration most of the continuing casuals working for the government and that, through such controls as those exercised by the Treasury board, the number of civil servants has been stabilized.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the wish of most hon. members, particularly in the Opposition, that with as little delay as possible all positions be brought under the jurisdiction of the civil service commission.

In his remarks last night, the hon. Minister said that it is essential in government administration, as in business and industry, that economies be performed. I think we all agree with that statement, but not at the cost of inefficient administration.

I would like at this time to make a few comments on the figures mentioned in the estimates for 1965-66. I notice an increase of \$151,000 to a total of \$1,209,000 for this fiscal year. It is hard to explain this amount without visible signs of increased efficiency.

The greatest increase in cost relates to work to keep employees happy: Pay research salaries, an increase of \$90,000; employee relations, an increase of \$67,500; joint council, an increase of \$33,500. That is a total of \$191,000.

I think it would be useful for the hon. Minister to explain the apparently unwarranted increase in purely administrative costs. The main office costs have been increased from \$155,000 and recruiting to \$224,500.

The training budget is totally inadequate, having been reduced by \$4,500. The government says industry must take notice of the need for up-grading in the face of developing management science. Why should it not be done by government itself?

Canadian National Telecommunications estimates that it spends \$650,000 a year to train 6,000 employees. Professional organizations estimate that they must spend from five per cent to 10 per cent of their gross revenue on training or they will fall behind. This is done by chartered accounting firms and many others. With approximately 50,000 employees, how can the government get away with spending the sum of \$97,000?

In the question of salaries, rough estimates show an average of \$4,500. This figure is probably too high. Does this suit the wealthiest province with the most challenging problems in Canada?

I would now like to make a few general remarks on the estimates.

First, it is evident that the morale of the civil service is very low. The letters from the civil service association of Ontario only confirm an impression that is easily gained around the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I have just been given two letters from the civil service association, which I will not read, but they still have the same grievances. These two letters are dated May 5 and May 18, 1965. Here are some of the reasons for the situation of low morale in the civil service: (a) Lack of bargaining in good faith; (b) lack of challenge to individuals; (c) lack of training opportunities; (d) lack of motivation; (e) lack of pay standards; (f) lack of recruiting standards; (g) patronage and paternalism in non-civil service agencies; (h) lack of modern methods in clerical and administrative routines—only \$570,000 for the data processing branch; any large company spends five times that amount; (i) knowledge that there is an inordinate amount of administrative fat—a programme that largely should be capable of administration by one-half the staff with careful training; (j) paternalism in benefits and retention policies; and (k) lack of feeling of worth to the work.

Now, the second item is a most obvious lack of guidance from the Cabinet. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has enough to do to look after financial policy. He should not also have to administer the personnel functions. The result of doing this is a bureaucratic autonomy in the department which feels it can go its own way without having to account for a detailed scrutiny of its actions.

My third point is that the government is not meeting the so-called challenge of automation. It obviously is afraid to streamline; afraid to meet the problem of employee dislocation and training. So much for its pious teaching to others!

I would like to make a few suggestions in order to correct the present situation:

1. I would transfer the responsibility for the civil service to the hon. Prime Minister himself.

2. There should be an integration of agencies and departments in order to reduce redundancy in departmental functions.

3. Investigation of the feasibility of greater use of mechanical means to improve efficiency

of administration. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, for instance, about the operation of elevators in the new building. Would they be run by people or by computers?

4. The training philosophy should be modernized: (a) Senior officials should be moved around, as suggested by the Glassco commission; (b) an integrated development programme for promising career employees should be developed; and (c) challenge and competitiveness in the service should be publicized.

5. Standards for admission and promotion should be improved. It is not enough to boast that two-thirds of employees taken in in the three summer months in Toronto had Grade 12 or better. How can the government obtain the respect of the community and lend an example to students when its standards are so much lower than is normal in business?

6. Good faith and proper bargaining methods should be developed.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that considerable research and study has gone into the preparation and study of this debate on the estimates of this department. I know that the hon. members of my party are anxious to make the civil service of this province the best in this country. We should study the Glassco commission report, which is now being implemented by the government of Canada; and I notice with pleasure that the hon. Provincial Treasurer intends to use that report of classification administration.

Many of the recommendations of that report may be easily used in improving the administration of the civil service of this province.

The retraining of many of our civil servants would greatly increase the efficiency of several departments. It would also improve the morale of many civil servants who would feel that they are now doing a job instead of staying around with not too much to do. They would also feel a lot happier if, because of their retraining, they have a chance of increasing their income.

If the hon. Provincial Treasurer, or his successor as the Minister responsible for The Department of Civil Service, sees to the implementation of these proposed reforms, I am sure we will have in a few years a much more competent and happier civil service.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, after listening to the hon. Minister last night, I was almost convinced that the civil servants

of Ontario were the happiest group of people we could find any place around the whole wide world, and that they were the best treated people anywhere, at least on this continent if not elsewhere.

I do agree with the hon. Provincial Treasurer that much progress has been made over the last few years, a progress in such things as the treatment of casuals and overtime arrangements, in classification, in other fields. However, when I look at the situation and as I look over my files, I am not quite convinced that things are quite as rosy as he painted them to us and to this House last night.

I would also say to my hon. friend who has just completed his speech that he should—I think he said a great deal of research had gone into this and certainly a great deal of work had gone into his speech—but I think he should fire his researcher because the document he read into the record is a document which I almost threw into the wastepaper basket last night. I think it was one that he mentioned to me and did not tell me what it was and said that he was having it looked over; I did not realize at that time what the document was. But it is a document which is dated April 23, 1964, and it was the basis of my Budget speech last year so I am fairly familiar with it. I read large sections of it into the record at that time, so that I would say to him, he had better talk to his research people and tell them to get his documents up to date in this respect. But I suppose that may be par for the course, I do not know.

An hon. member: I think it is pretty well up to date.

Mr. Young: Well, the reason I did not throw it into the wastepaper basket, I will say to my hon. friend, is that I decided I had better keep it because there is a lot of it which is pretty pertinent today. I thought for background purposes it might be a valuable bit of information. I just say that so the hon. Provincial Treasurer will not have to tell you later on, because I saw him writing furiously when you started to read this and I presume he was perfectly aware of this, as he must have been.

I do want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that in speaking of the civil service this afternoon, I think we should establish the fact first of all that Ontario, I think by and large, has a pretty dedicated group of civil servants. Otherwise they would not be working for such pay as they are working. They are, by and large, good people and in many cases I think the quality could be improved if we had

better salaries and better conditions. But I think, too, that we should establish this fact, that civil servants are just as important to any civilization as the employees of private corporations or individuals.

Now, we have been inclined over the years to think of civil servants as "those bureaucrats," and say, "Oh, well, if they are civil servants they don't work as hard as people in private industry, and they don't produce as much" but my experience with civil service in the municipal field and the province, for quite a number of years now, is that the people who work in the public service are as efficient as, if not more efficient than, the people who work in the private sector of the economy. And I want to register that today because I will have some criticism here. I want it thoroughly understood, that as far as I am concerned, this is an essential part of our civilization and these people deserve better, both in public attitude and in public remuneration, than they are now getting.

It is not long—just a week or two ago—since a group of men appeared in front of the Parliament buildings. I got from them a leaflet which I have here and which I am not going to read into the record in total. They were men from Oak Ridge hospital at Penetanguishene. These men had come to protest their salary situation in the institution there. They point this out in their leaflet that "At Oak Ridge at the present time the patients are made up mainly of capital cases from the courts, penitentiaries, reformatories and county jails and of other unmanageable patients from other Ontario hospitals. We also care for federal prisoners waiting to be deported."

Now, these men have not only the job of guarding these almost incorrigible patients sent to them from other institutions—because they are incorrigible—but they also are expected as far as possible to do a therapeutic job wherever there is a chance of redemption, to work with these people and restore them if it is humanly possible, in co-operation with the specialists there, to their place in society.

And yet these men have a starting salary of, I think it is, \$3,020 per year. That is a great deal lower than the starting salary even in the institutions over which the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman)—who has just come in—has supervision. In comparison to the salaries which are paid there, these salaries are bad, even though the other salaries are very, very inadequate.

I bring this to the attention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer because there is no

question that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction there, dissatisfaction to the extent that these men saw fit to come from Penetanguishene to march and to protest to the government about their situation.

It is not long since I had the privilege of visiting a group of people in the Whitby hospital. There are attendants there who have a very serious grievance and I heard via the *Hamilton Spectator* today that these people and others are also contemplating action as taken by the Penetang people recently. In the Whitby hospital the minimum salary there is \$3,000 for attendants. Some domestic staff start at \$2,600. Out of the \$3,000 an employee must pay six per cent to his pension plan. There are some changes now being made in the total fringe benefits and I am not going to elaborate on this. But there is a maximum of \$3,900 after seven years service and I understand that the complete maximum in that institution is \$4,400, about \$85 a week.

I met people there with 25 and 30 years service who are now in the supervisory capacity, who are helping to supervise five, six, seven, eight people, at the same time looking after their quota of patients which may run up to 70 or more. And these people are on an \$85 maximum. These people have certain qualifications that have to be met. They take a two-year instruction course, that is, an in-service instruction course which includes psychiatry, psychology, bedside nursing, anatomy, first aid and a further examination after five years of service.

There is no risk pay whatsoever, no shift differential, no remuneration for working weekends, and they say that they practise psychology and psychiatry at the moment they go on duty until their tour of duty is finished for the day. I presume it is a limited type of psychology and psychiatry, but it is the treatment which patients receive at the hands of the attendants whom they see hour after hour and day after day. The doctors depend upon these people for observations, regarding the type of treatment and medication for the patients allotted to their care. They are responsible for the administration of medication to the patients, Mr. Chairman.

A daily report of the progress of the patient has to be made, his actions and his reactions, so they must know something of what they are doing. A full bi-monthly report on the patients, their responses, habits, activities, reactions, eating habits and sleeping habits. The doctor really depends on their observations and notes as to whether a patient is

ready to be discharged, probated or boarded out. And so the story goes.

In industry, a man with training for a job as foreman or the responsibilities that the supervisors have here would certainly get a good salary. But here again you have a salary which is \$4,400 per year, less than \$85 per week. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a disgraceful situation in an institution such as Whitby. I have other communications from other institutions of this kind in other parts of the province where the similar salary scales are now being paid. The day is here when something must be done about this situation.

I have some pay slips here, a pay slip for a man who has been eight years in the government service in Whitby. He is paid every two weeks and he gets take-home pay, after his deductions, of \$108.95. One hundred and nine dollars for two weeks, upon which he is expected to raise his family. Now this is a disgraceful situation, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, and one which should not be tolerated.

I have also a copy of the letter which has been sent to the hon. Minister of Health, a letter from an immigrant. He thanks Dr. Dymond for the job he got in the Ontario hospital in Whitby some time ago and he felt grateful for that, but:

I beg of you not to feel that I am any the less grateful for my work, my job, because of what I feel I must say. It is simply this. As a frugal, hardworking new Canadian—my wife and I immigrated to Canada from Holland five years ago—I find to my horror that I am unable to live on my salary without undergoing the humility of asking my church for financial help. In fact, I have found it urgently necessary three times this winter alone to seek out my pastor and beg him to come to my rescue. Each time, thank heaven, he has given the aid.

The point is this, sir, after starting at a salary of \$2,760 yearly four years ago, I have worked hard to gain increases in pay. Three and a half years ago, September 1961, I obtained my diploma for Grade two attendant. My gross salary is now approximately \$3,200 a year. I have four children, age 13, ten, eight and two.

In September 1963, I bought my own home after a succession of moves, because landlords objected to the children. Today the payments on my home are approximately equal to my former rent.

The salary of \$3,200 per annum sounds quite generous for my work, but in reality

I assure you it is not. Although my wife and I budget our funds to a fraction of a cent, and deny ourselves and our children even a vestige of the smallest of luxuries, we simply cannot get by. In the last three years there has not been one single article of new clothing in our home. All of our garments are purchased in second-hand stores.

I know, sir, that this sounds just like another hard luck story, but it is more than that. I know I speak not only for myself. There are others like me, in similar circumstances, with exactly the same problem, and the problem is this. Surely it could be expected that an employer would pay his workers enough to live on, and I would think this truism should surely apply when the employer happens to be the government itself.

Finally, what I have to say, sir, is something I hesitate to write. I am afraid it may look strange, exaggerated on paper. Nevertheless, I will put it down, because it is honest and true. One of my fondest wishes is that I shall soon become a Canadian citizen. I tell you truthfully, however, when I say that even though the expense for my citizenship is very minute, I simply, even though I work for the province of Ontario, cannot afford it. Wishing to have a vote, but cannot afford it, faithfully.

This is a letter which is typical of some of the situations in which many of our people find themselves, and having talked to this person and others, I realize that this is not an exaggeration. They are having a tough time. You might say they should budget a little more carefully and closely, but I ask the hon. Minister how many of us could possibly get along with that kind of a family, on that kind of money.

I noticed that the hon. Minister of Health was quoted in the local paper, the Oshawa paper, as saying that, "many hospital employees might well find difficulty in competing in the general labour market, although they are well fitted to do the work they presently do. It is interesting to note that rarely do we have many vacancies on the staff."

This may be true. I do not know what qualifications there are for those people who are now applying, but certainly the good doctor should realize that the quality of people demanded in these kind of institutions should be equal, at least, to the quality of men we demand running our machines in our factories.

The men in General Motors who run a punch press, or do any of those intricate bits of push-button operations, these men demand certain skills. But the men who have to deal with human beings, who are in day-to-day contact with patients who are mentally ill, these people it seems to me demand greater skills than the industrial worker, because they are dealing with much more intricate machinery. And their job, in co-operation with the specialist, is to restore to sanity and to health the people who are committed to their care. I think it ill-behooves an hon. Minister of the Crown to downgrade these people by saying that they would have a tough time to find employment in industry. If so, then the quality of the employees of which the hon. Minister speaks must indeed be lower than it ought to be in this province.

This morning's newspaper brought us another illustration of the same kind of thing. When Dr. Shulman, that thorn in the flesh of certain of the establishment, was conducting an inquest into the death of a mental patient at 999 Queen Street West, he found the hospital attendants painted a confused picture of how information on a patient was passed from one shift to another. "This lack of communication"—and I am reading now from the *Toronto Telegram* of May 19:

This lack of communication was blamed partially on what Metro chief coroner Dr. Morton Shulman called the ridiculous salaries paid to attendants. He said an official of the Ontario civil service commission might be called when the inquest reconvened on May 25 to explain the salaries.

James Armstrong, assistant chief male attendant, said part of the poor communications was due to lack of staff. The staff we get won't stay because of the poor money, he said.

Commented Dr. Shulman: "I'm not surprised you don't get many people looking for work there when the starting salary is \$57 a week."

And added to this is the *Toronto Star's* story this morning which says:

James Armstrong, assistant chief male attendant, said the hospital had been understaffed for months because they just do not pay enough to attract anyone. Attendants start at \$3,000 a year and work up to \$3,900.

Why, that is only \$57 a week to start, said Dr. Shulman, I am surprised you can get anyone to work for that.

Chief male attendant John Boyd said the civil service association had tried to get the civil service commission to raise the wages, but they would not do it.

I would like to have someone here who can speak for the commission and explain just why these salaries are so low, Dr. Shulman said.

Evidently, according to the other paper, he may call one of the members to make that explanation.

Now all this, Mr. Chairman, is simply an outgrowth of the government's refusal to face up to the fact of twentieth-century employer-employee relations. The hon. member for Ottawa East this afternoon gave something of the background of negotiations, and the appointment of the joint council—the negotiations that took place over a year ago in this field. Since that time, there has been a struggle between the government and the civil service to get action on achieving their first contract, a contract which dates back to 1962.

During this period of struggle, the government time after time has acted in bad faith by taking action unilaterally. Something was under discussion, various matters were under negotiation at the joint council level, at committee levels, and yet the government would issue directives and send out its pronouncements in various regards.

The *Toronto Star*, January 9, 1965, said this:

The last chapter in the association's eight-year fight for a welfare package for the government's 40,000 association employees resulted in a charge that the government wrote a letter undercutting the association. The government's letter, put in the employees' pay envelopes, contained omissions, distortions, inaccuracies, the association says.

This is one part of the editorial. It goes on to talk about this, and I have several instances here of that kind of thing going on.

I think all of us have been acquainted with the situation of the cleaning women in this building, and I am not going to go into that in detail here. I talked some time ago of the transfer tax auditors and their problem, and about the cleaning women and these other people. During negotiations the government arbitrarily makes decisions, sets salaries, revises salaries again, and sets them again, without finalization of negotiations with the civil service association.

On February 18, 1965, the civil service association of Ontario again protested to the

hon. Prime Minister about the arbitrary and unilateral actions of government on rates of pay and working conditions of public servants. Following strong protests arising from an emergency meeting of the association, held in Toronto in May 1964, the government appointed a chief negotiator and so on. In spite of this the Ontario government continues to negate the principles of negotiation by refusing to negotiate on any changes they wish to make, while requiring the association to follow all the procedures for any changes the association thinks desirable.

A letter to the hon. Prime Minister, a copy of which I have here, reads:

Unfortunately, the official side of joint council is not used by government or the appointees of government and we are still faced with the fact that changes and working conditions affecting public servants are made arbitrarily and without attempt at negotiation.

The position at the moment is that the association is forced to negotiate through joint council in the first instance through the appropriate authorities, while the management levels of government and government itself are able to completely disregard the joint council and implement changes in working conditions, remuneration, leaves and hours of work without any regard for negotiations.

We believe [they say] that the present Act can be sufficient if there is a clear understanding that the Crown considers itself bound, if not legally at least morally, to negotiate any change in rates of pay and general working conditions.

Accordingly we request a statement from you—

this is to the hon. Prime Minister:

—to the effect that government and its appointed officers will not arbitrarily change rates of pay or working conditions, but that where the government or its appointed officers consider the changes may be desirable a proper submission will be made to the association for negotiation and, if necessary, for arbitration.

And we have this report No. 106 from the association:

At the regular meeting of the Ontario joint council on March 18, 1965, the association representatives advised council that there were a number of salary matters to be negotiated and it was agreed that a steering committee should be held to deal with these matters. The steering committee

met and considered the matters and subsequently a special meeting of the Ontario joint council was called on March 26, 1965, with teachers' salaries as the first item on the agenda.

The Department of Civil Service had offered a one-step increase to teachers, and so on.

The association's position was that a two-step increment should be implemented for teachers. The official side stated that they were not in a position to argue factually for or against these recommendations due to a lack of prior investigation. It was requested by the official side that briefs be prepared on this matter by both sides and placed before the next meeting of the Ontario joint council, and subsequently a tabling motion with respect to teachers' salaries was made.

And then, a memorandum was issued to all Deputy Ministers; amendments to classifications and salary schedules not negotiated to agreement and a new salary scale is included and sent out before these negotiations were completed.

It does say that salary adjustments for teachers were under negotiation for some time with the civil service association, but no agreement was reached.

And because the government did not get exactly what it wanted, it took unilateral action, issued this directive and sent it out. I presume that those negotiations will now go on until some satisfactory conclusion is reached, even though the government has taken the action. This is not bargaining in good faith, this is anything but that.

Then report No. 59: The hon. Minister mentions certain things that had been achieved and I said that I gave him credit for these achievements—overtime, standby time, equal treatment for casuals. Agreement was reached in March, 1964. But those agreements, I understand, are not yet in effect in Lands and Forests and some other departments of government even though Highways and some others have brought them into effect. So there has been a year's delay in putting these agreements into effect.

During these negotiations—and certainly I would be the last one to say that two parties to negotiations should not be as tough as they feel they ought to be, but when you get a contract which dates back to 1962, and we are now in 1965, this becomes just a bit ludicrous. But a contract has been hammered out in the meantime since the document which the hon. member for Ottawa East read. A contract was hammered out with certain

things which could not be agreed upon. Those matters which were not yet agreed upon were referred to an arbitration board. And there was tough negotiation prior to that. The arbitration board met, conducted its hearings and then brought in its report.

One of the matters with which the two sides dealt and agreed upon was a life insurance package. This was agreed upon and this was not referred to the arbitration board, but when the arbitration award comes in, strangely enough, the very first thing that is mentioned in the arbitration award, and forming part and parcel of a package—\$1.60 per employee per month or \$19.20 per year—is a group life insurance plan. How that ever could get into this is a question we still do not know. Whether this insurance-minded government had so negotiated and so presented its case, and so insisted that this kind of thing should appear, I do not know. But the arbitration board, which did not even have this under its terms of reference, brought in a recommendation regarding group life insurance.

Then the second matter was the matter of medical-surgical coverage, and in this again the insurance bent is very pronounced. The award: 75 per cent of the cost of a medical insurance plan to the employees, paid by the government; 25 per cent then would come from the employees. But they base their award on the federal government plan which is a co-insurance feature, something like \$50 deductible per family and 20 per cent of all medical bills after that paid by the insured person. Now, these were the terms of the award, it is tied right in with the federal plan. It is designed to show the employee that if he accepts this, then \$61.45 of the plan will be paid by the provincial government.

Then it says this:

Any change in premiums made necessary by increased or decreased costs, resulting from experience, shall accrue to the government and employees in the proportion of 75 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

And, of course, it also says that:

—the staff and official side of the joint council will determine the type of insured plan which will be most satisfactory to the employee within the cost framework as set out above, without delay.

But the strange thing with this tremendous stress upon the insurance, the co-insurance, the life insurance, is that it was eight days—this was tabled in the House on March 1—eight days before this that a syndicate of life insurance companies, headed by London Life,

invited representatives of government and the association down to London to hear a proposal. The proposal that they made at that time was that they could provide a plan like the federal plan, which is outlined in this arbitration award for X number of dollars.

They urged upon them that this plan could be accepted. This was six days before the arbitration award was signed and eight days before it was tabled in this House. Now, ordinarily an arbitration award is a private document until it becomes the property of the people concerned, and I presume this was and I am making no charges here. I presume that the London Life and the insurance syndicate, knowing what happened were just good business people and so they were being fore-handed and were offering this package to the civil servants and to the government prior to the tabling of this report. But the question that is bound to emerge in our mind is how it was, that eight days before this was tabled, that kind of offer was made to the civil servants of this province.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): You fellows think everybody is crooked except yourselves.

Mr. Young: I asked how it could happen, that is all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: I am bringing the facts before the hon. Minister; you can have your say later on.

Since that time there has been a desperate struggle between the association and the government representatives in respect to this medical-surgical plan. The government, insisting on its side, that this kind of a plan run by the private insurance companies should go out to tender, and should be the plan that is carried and, on the other hand, the association has had PSI for a great many years. As a matter of fact, I understand that the employees of this government—or of this province—many years ago were pioneers in this field. I think it was the associated medical service that grew out of the action of what is now the civil service association of this province, so they have had a long history in that kind of cost insurance.

They had a contract with PSI, a contract which has been worked out over the years and which has worked very successfully; it pays up to the standard payment of PSI. The employees have been paying for it, having it deducted from their pay. It was then forwarded to PSI.

The staff wanted to keep that plan; they were satisfied with it and they wanted these costs which were awarded here to be prorated against a PSI plan, or at least they wanted a plan that covered them as well as PSI covered them, to go out to tender and let all bid.

After almost three months, and after a great deal of scrapping and a heart-rending struggle, that has been finally agreed to and the matter has gone out to tender, but with a combined life insurance and medical-surgical tender. What will come out of that? We do not yet know, but that is the situation at the present time, and these are the negotiations, I understand, unless the hon. Minister has something more recent than I am aware of.

But more than that. While these negotiations are going on, we find something else. After the hon. Minister had made his statement to the House, his statement went out to all the civil servants in the association. That statement was a reasonable and rational one—the statement he made here—but it would seem that when the civil servant read it, he thought this was the decision. I almost understood from the hon. Minister last night that these decisions were pretty well final for a long time to come, but there are others yet to be made. But because this was sent out, there was a great deal of consternation in the association. The civil servants asked if this meant that their PSI ends; did it mean that the things being asked for in their negotiations they were not going to get? And so the associations sent out, to counteract the action of government, their activity report No. 104, in which they said this:

A number of circular releases have been made by the civil service commission or departments of government. In addition, there have been references to the award in the press. Unfortunately, these releases, because they are not fully authentic, have caused considerable confusion among our members. At the time of release of this activity report, there had been no agreement on a medical-surgical plan, and any release from any source, indicating what type of plan will be instituted, is absolutely unreliable.

The association policy is, and always has been, that any such medical-surgical plan must be a PSI blue plan or a plan having the same general benefits. The association has again informed government representatives of this policy and are still awaiting their reply.

The initial plan proposed by government has been rejected by the association. When

a plan has been agreed upon, the association will issue its own reliable release. Until then, members are asked to govern themselves accordingly in their assessment of releases from other sources.

The attitude of the association is a very simple one. If information had been sent out to their membership, it should have been a joint release, since there was a joint council dealing with this matter. A unilateral release of this kind, which only confused the membership, should not have been sent out.

The hon. Minister has his own point of view on this, but I present this as what I consider to be a logical one.

Now there is one further matter which is before the hon. Minister; that is the matter of negotiations of institutional service groups. I have already mentioned these, and in dealing with institutional service groups, the association brought to the hon. Minister certain facts. This group is now due for renegotiation of salaries—April 1, 1965, I understand. This is reading from the civil service activity report, No. 107:

Although the cycle review dates were established after much consideration to obviate the necessity of retroactive adjustments, April 1, 1965, arrived without any submissions from the commission on the institutional classes. The association accordingly presented its salary demands. After some delay, we received a letter stating in part:

"I am unable to negotiate on your submission which, in the opinion of the commission, does not comply with the basic policy agreed upon for research, whereby comparisons are made between jobs with light duties and responsibilities."

The association goes ahead to do a very significant thing. In the arbitration award the government had quoted certain companies—30, I think it was, when it appeared—in regard to fringe benefits. Quoting those companies, it showed that, basing its case upon those companies, certain fringe benefits should accrue, and only those fringe benefits should accrue to the employees in the civil service. The association took those 30 companies, and, dealing with the rates of pay, again quoting:

For institutional classes our approach is very simple and very reasonable. The proposed rates are based upon the clear reasoning that you cannot logically pay an employee concerned with the care and rehabilitation of the unfortunates admitted to institutions a rate of pay less than is

paid to labourers. To establish the average rate of pay for labourers, we used the list of firms chosen by government in their research on fringe benefits and which formed a basis of the government presentation to the arbitration board. We could have chosen a different area of research and arrived at a higher average rate for labourers. Our present demands are very reasonable and do not go as far as they should, perhaps. We can understand that the commission would be somewhat shocked on receiving our salary demands, because by and large it is asking for a \$1,000 increase across the board. It is quite obvious that the commission is still engaged with the old theory of one or two set increases. Since the commission refuses to negotiate demands, it will now be placed before the Ontario joint council.

And so they work out their case based on the government's own submission before the arbitration board and they point out that they are asking for average labourer rates in these companies which were quoted by the government. They ask that these rates be paid to the employees in the institutions.

At least this would seem to be a reasonable demand, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, and if this government is going to stop there and base its rates of pay for people who are dealing with the sick and the mentally ill, upon labour rates which are prevailing in private corporations, then I think they are stopping far short of what the need is; far short of the need which could be clearly established, to first of all get, and then to hold, the calibre of people that are needed in these institutions.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer made a great deal last night of morale in the institution. I quote to him again from the *Civil Service*, the last edition which I mentioned in the House some time ago; they point out:

The record will show that a considerable number of gratifying increases have been given to a large number of employees. The record will show that gains have been made in such areas as overtime pay, layoff and recall procedures—

I mentioned that, and also mentioned some of the delay of putting these into effect:

—and other working conditions of importance to all employees. On record it will be expected that the employees of the Ontario government would feel rather good, and be inclined to give credit to the association for its many successes. Unfortunately, any good feeling which is

initiated by any improvement in rates of pay or working conditions, is soon destroyed by the many long unexplained and, therefore, unjustified delays in implementing the things achieved.

In place of a good feeling, there is frustration; in place of gratitude there is bitterness. It is a fact that many increases announced months ago—some effective as far back as September 1, 1962—have not yet appeared on the employee's pay cheque.

I understand many of those have appeared since this was written, but there is still delay in getting many of these matters settled and cleared away.

So we ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer to give very serious consideration to a speed-up in the procedures. I also call to his attention the fact which I mentioned in another connection some time ago, that the *Civil Service* report states that in 1963, 3,325 people resigned from the service. Better pay in other jobs headed the reason for the resignations. But the most disturbing feature in all this is that the age group from 21 to 31 years accounted for 27.7 per cent of all separations.

This would seem to indicate that too many young people are not satisfied with the opportunities in the service, and are leaving for better paying jobs. The government cannot afford to bring young people into the civil service, young people who come with some sense of idealism. Many people come feeling that they can do a real job for the public, through the civil service, and yet find themselves frustrated by lack of adequate pay. They see ahead of them a future which is not as rosy as they had thought, and gradually begin to look for other jobs.

I know that turnover is normal in any industry, or in any civil service, but the figures we have brought this afternoon, the information that I have laid before the hon. Provincial Treasurer, must cause him concern, and perhaps has caused him concern in the past.

Let that concern be translated into action, so that this province is not in the position of being a pinch-penny employer; so that it pays its people adequate salaries and adequate wages; so this province can hold up its head among other employers and can say, "Not only do we pay the kind of wage scale and the kind of salary scale we ought to be paying, but our negotiations are in good faith."

Three years, almost four, is too long for a contract to be hammered out. Stop taking unilateral action right along the line.

I know this government established its symbol some years ago when they put up the billboard of the hippopotamus, and perhaps that symbol is still pertinent when it comes to this matter of negotiation and treatment of the civil servants, it is a slow, lumbering animal. We hope that it is not going to stay. We hope that this series of negotiations is now close to an end, that is the 1962 series. We hope that this new series dealing with the institutions can be quickly disposed of, and we hope that in the future this province will emerge as an employer which deals fairly, and quickly, with its civil service.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. member a question before proceeding to answer some of the statements that have been made.

I was disturbed by the impression that the hon. member seemed to desire to indicate that Judge Anderson and his board of arbitration were influenced by the government in the decision that they were going to give. Was that your contention?

Mr. Young: That is not what I said. I asked you a question.

Hon. Mr. Allan: But you indicated that, did you not?

Mr. Young: I asked you the question.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, no, you did not ask me.

Mr. Young: I pointed out the sequence of facts; that eight days prior to your tabling of this, invitations were issued to a meeting in London; that figures were given on a contract similar to the one which is mentioned in the arbitration award; and I asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer how this could be.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can very well answer that. I know nothing about any meeting in London. I knew nothing about the offer that was made by the insurance companies, if such was made. If it was, it was made on a basis of speculation by the companies—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Were there not two Treasury officials of the government who went down?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know whether there was or not. Certainly there was nothing official. There were no arrangements with any insurance companies. How could you make arrangements with insurance companies when you did not know what the award was?

Mr. MacDonald: That is what we are asking.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There was no arrangement. I say that, and I expect it to be believed.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, two officials of your department invited the civil service association to go along with them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know whether anyone went down or not. I have nothing to do with what certain insurance companies may try to sell. But I have something to do with the buying, and I know perfectly well that there was no arrangement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, about the other thing, just as a basis of understanding. Can anyone say that the award of an arbitration board is a unilateral decision? Can I ask you that question?

Mr. Young: You are supposed to be answering.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No! I want to get a basis of understanding before I begin to answer them, and I understood the hon. member for Yorkview to say that the award was a unilateral decision.

Mr. Young: The award?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Of the arbitration board, referring to—

Mr. Young: No, I was not speaking of the arbitration award. I said that you had, time after time, made unilateral decisions. You sent out the memorandum regarding the teachers.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, you referred to them together.

Mr. Young: No, I did not say the arbitration award. The arbitration award was an award of the arbitration board.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, what is an arbitration award? Is that not an award? Is that not an answer to the negotiations?

Mr. Young: The arbitration award is the award of a board—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Can you not see that—

Mr. Young: The arbitration award is the award of a board set up to do that job, and then after that, the two sides decide what they are going to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: And both sides are expected to accept the award, and live up to it.

Mr. Young: They did not decide to—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, but is not that a reasonable statement?

Mr. Young: Both sides?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Young: Have to accept it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Certainly!

Mr. Young: Oh, no. No arbitration award like this is ever fully accepted. It does not have to be.

Hon. Mr. Allan: What? An arbitration award that accepted this is the basis of our negotiations.

Mr. Young: But in this case the arbitration board did not lay down the kind of plan; they said the two had to get together to work it out. It left an open end there.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You are trying to wiggle out.

Mr. Young: An open end whereby the insurance companies were able to pressure—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the award was based on an amount of money.

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Mr. Young: That is right. Mr. Chairman, could I say this to the hon. Minister? The arbitration award first of all dealt with a matter—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, anyone.

Mr. MacDonald: How can it be binding when it only indicated an amount which could be spent—in varying ways which would have to be negotiated?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, it is not in a package! It is in a package, but they can get that—

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I simply point out that the arbitration award could not be binding, because it first of all referred to a matter already settled, the life insurance business—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will refer to that.

Mr. Young: —was knocked out and they awarded \$19 and some odd cents—20 cents in that case—so that was out, it was wrong. The second was tied into a federal plan and they said that the two had to get together. This could not be binding.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It certainly was binding. The basis of our whole association proceedings is that if agreement is not reached you go to the board of arbitration and the award of the board of arbitration is binding.

Mr. Young: Well, they better deal with the matters that are referred to them then.

Mr. MacDonald: They dealt with life insurance that was not referred to them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Why did the representative of the staff sign the award?

Mr. MacDonald: They certainly are not happy with it at the present time.

Mr. Young: Could I ask the hon. Minister if it is not true that the reference to life insurance was knocked out afterwards, because they said—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Go to arbitration, then you better accept the award, had we not?

Mr. MacDonald: What about the question the hon. member for Yorkview asks you now?

Hon. Mr. Allan: What was that?

Mr. Young: The question was: Is it not true that the reference to life insurance was knocked out of the award afterwards because this was not referred to the board?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No. The board of arbitration said they presented their side of the case. The board of arbitration endeavoured to develop a package that would receive the unanimous support of all the members of the board.

Mr. Young: But the life insurance in fact had already been settled.

Hon. Mr. Allan: But they agreed to the package and certainly you cannot say that the government had anything to do with the award. The judge and his two members of the board, the representative of the government and the representative of the civil service association, agreed they would change that life insurance. They did and they brought in an award and the award determined a certain amount of money, five dollars—

Mr. Young: It was \$19.20 a year, life insurance.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have not the figures, but they agreed.

Then it came to a question of deciding what sort of medical insurance they should have. It was the opinion of the government representative that the award was not high enough to provide the coverage that the civil servants had had before. They said, we will call for alternate plans. If you can get a contract that will supply the same service as you had before; fine, that suits us, we will be entirely in agreement. But we ask for alternate things: One for the whole package; one for the proposal that had been developed, with supplementary coverage which would have given the civil servants the same coverage that most of them had before.

The representatives of the association would not accept that. Now we are so stubborn, as you indicate, we sat with them first of all in the discussions. They walked out of the joint council and there were no joint council meetings. You are saying that we have delayed this thing. They walked out of the joint council and there were no joint council meetings for three or four weeks.

Finally, in an endeavour to try—and let me say at the very beginning that we do not want to fight with civil servants or the civil service association.

Mr. Bryden: You could fool most people on that.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I tell you that, and I say so sincerely. I will tell you that I have the greatest respect for the civil servants that serve this government; and they are not, as a group, as dissatisfied as you indicate. Any frustration that I have seen has been at the level of the persons who prepared the material that you two hon. members have been reading this afternoon.

Mr. Bryden: Do you have respect for their association?

Mr. MacDonald: These are the people who have been elected by the association.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have the greatest respect for their association and I am particularly anxious to see the association successful in what they are trying to undertake.

Mr. Bryden: Well, why do you keep running behind their backs?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not running behind their backs.

Mr. Bryden: Well, your representatives are. It is right here in this circular signed by Mr. McNab.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do no such thing. You make allegations that are incorrect. Why do you not make sure that the things you say are correct?

Mr. Bryden: Well, this is correct. Are you accusing me of lying?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I can stand here—

Mr. Bryden: Here is the evidence of it right here.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not care what evidence you have.

Mr. Bryden: You mean you do not care about that.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I stand here today and I say that we, and I speak of the government, are doing everything possible to try to make this thing work.

Mr. Bryden: It is running behind the back of the association.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are not running behind the back—

Mr. Bryden: Well, here is the evidence, right here.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not care what you have.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What do you want us to do?

Mr. Bryden: Are you doing your red herring job again?

Hon. Mr. Allan: To get back to the matter of negotiations and this insurance plan. I think that someone was inexperienced, and perhaps if they had been more experienced they would have realized that negotiations have to be done at the negotiation level.

Now, it is all very easy to say let us let the thing go to arbitration, but mind you, you cannot negotiate at arbitration. I have no doubt that in all probability a health plan could have been worked out that would have suited everyone if there had been an effort to develop it at the negotiation level; but no, we say we go to arbitration. Well, then, when you go to arbitration you accept the award of the arbitration board.

But I am particularly concerned because I realize that the civil service association have been losing some members, and I am sorry

about this. I want to see the civil service association accepted. I want to see them serve their people. We want to sit down and negotiate with them in good faith.

We go into negotiations the other day on these institutional branches. They were as far apart as the poles. What happens? We go to arbitration.

You mentioned the teachers. You see, it is so easy to be misinformed. The teachers have gone to arbitration and without prejudice, to try to keep the teachers a little bit happy—because this going to arbitration delays everything—without prejudice, we gave them a one-step increase.

Now, is that unilateral bureaucracy? Is that an indication that we do not want to try to get along and work with the civil service? We do. We want the civil service association to be successful in what they are undertaking now and we are just sorry that some of the advice they have been getting, and I say this without any disrespect to the hon. members, but I am not happy to see matters that are being discussed and negotiated at the management and staff level become a political football of any party.

Mr. Bryden: The reason they do is because you people are not doing your jobs, that is why.

Mr. MacDonald: Any employer who takes three years to negotiate a contract—

Hon. Mr. Allan: How can anyone say, Mr. Chairman, that it takes three years? Negotiations did not begin until a year ago. In fact, I am not sure that they have begun.

How can you say that it takes three years? You get half-truths. The matter of the clerk was mentioned here today and it was time for the cyclical review at this time. The cyclical review—two years from the time of the last one—will be next January.

At the time of the last one pay increases were paid retroactively that amounted to \$600 to some of those people. The date of the decision was a year ago last December, and two years from that time will be next December.

How can you say that is three years? I would not be so certain that I am correct in this if it was not that I had a great ambition that this plan was going to be a wonderful thing for the civil servants. You speak about a unilateral decision—

Mr. MacDonald: That is what they say.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I know they do say that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, do not blame us.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not blaming you and I do not think you would believe it if you understood. Here is the position as it exists today. They do not have to accept the salary that we propose. How many governments in this country have placed themselves in a position where they will accept an award of an arbitration board covering salaries? Will the federal government do that? Name me another government in Canada that put itself in that position. We want to be fair—

Mr. MacDonald: Some of them are miles ahead of you.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They are not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will tell you this to show you that I am very fond of some of the people in Saskatchewan. We have some excellent persons on our staff who came from Saskatchewan and they are happy with us.

Mr. MacDonald: They could not live with the Liberals there.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We have quite a number who have come from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bryden: We will admit that you are easier to get along with than the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Practically every one that we have had has been an excellent person.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I might deal with some of the statements that were made, but I did want to establish the fact that we as a government are doing our utmost to make this plan work.

Mr. MacDonald: You will have to convince the civil servants. We are not the people to convince.

Hon. Mr. Allan: As a matter of fact, we do not have much trouble convincing the civil servants, but we do have a little trouble convincing some of the officers of the civil service association—

Mr. MacDonald: That is an old tactic—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I would be very happy to have you know everything we are doing and I know perfectly well that the hon. member for York South would say that we are doing a good job and it is because we are trying to do a good job.

The hon. member for Yorkview mentioned the letter that we sent out. Now one of the

things to which I would certainly object and not support, is anything that would stir up enmity in the minds of those people we are going to deal with.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it did.

Mr. Bryden: You have done it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It did because the civil service association took exception to it. The people who got the letters were not concerned.

Mr. Bryden: You try to drive a wedge between the people and their representatives; this is the oldest employer's manoeuvre.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Let me say this; what would you think about it if we had sent out the type of circulars that have been read in the House this afternoon? If we, as a government, sent out things that were as irresponsible as those?

Mr. Bryden: You should be responsible in regard to the association and not go behind their backs.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Ottawa East must be a friend of civil servants. The very fact that he is here indicates that he is, and I may say that I do not differ with him in that respect at all. I try to be a friend of the civil service just as you are.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Tory he beat was not a friend of the civil service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know whether he was or not.

Mr. Sopha: It follows, from your argument—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I agree with the hon. member when he says that negotiation should be carried out in good faith and it pains me and I feel very badly that we are settling practically nothing at the negotiation level. To me that is very unhealthy—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): There is only one reason; there is not enough money there.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, that is not so. We should have settled this fringe benefits affair and everyone would have been just as well off if we had negotiated the thing and come up with a package that the civil servants would have liked; we could have done that at the negotiating level; it would have been no—

Mr. Bryden: You mean if they just take what you want, everything will be fine—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No; that is an unreasonable statement.

Mr. Bryden: It is not an unreasonable statement.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do they not accept your statement then?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Because they would not negotiate; we could not move. Before the award we could have negotiated, but how could we negotiate it after the award had been made?

I think I should say this: that mention was made of some delays as soon as this practice was brought into effect, and I would be quite frank to say that there was inexperience on both sides and we were not getting along as well as we should have been getting along. As you know, we were endeavouring to develop this plan on the Whitley system, which has worked so well in Britain; so we went to Britain and we spent three days with the British people there. The one thing we learned and the message we brought back—and I conveyed this message to the head of the civil service association—was that there was absolute confidence and good faith between management and staff—

Mr. Young: Did the head of the civil service association go with you to examine this plan in Britain—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, he did not go, but we would have been very glad to take him. We went to work with him, not against him. We went over and we came back and we tried to convey what we had learned to them, and I thought we had. We obtained staff that were experienced in this area and we began. Unfortunately, I do not think that we could be pleased with the experience of the negotiations, due to the fact that we did not settle anything at the negotiation stage, and I think this is a sad state of affairs, and I have spoken with—

Mr. MacDonald: Whose fault is it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not going to say; I am not going to stand up here today and say anything that will make the members of the civil service association or the officers any less friendly with me than they are now, because we have always had the friendliest possible relations.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, everybody is a friend of yours, but—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not going to get up and say "This is your fault." That is not the way things are settled. I want to get this thing settled so that it works; that is my ambition.

Mr. Young: How can it work if you are paying \$1,000 less than a labourer earns?

Hon. Mr. Allan: You have your opinion; unfortunately, neither you nor I will determine what these institutional classes get, and I think when we say, "You have the opportunity of going to a board of arbitration, you present your case, we present ours, an award is made, that is it," now, what is unilateral about that?

Mr. Young: In that case an award will hold.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, we will certainly accept—

Mr. Young: Why could you not negotiate?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are doing exactly what we agreed to do, what the association wanted us to do. But I do not like this way of doing it. With respect to salaries—our salaries cannot be far out of line. Mind you, we have an excellent civil service, the quality of the civil service is continually improving. There is no evidence that I see in any areas where I am, where there is discontent—

Mr. Young: What about Doctor Shulman's statements?

Mr. White: Oh, let the hon. Minister answer the question.

Mr. MacDonald: You do not like Shulman over there?

Hon. Mr. Allan: So, I cannot feel that we are tremendously out of line, and we do not want to be. Mind you, we realize that if we are going to have a good civil service, we are going to have to be competitive in our payment of salaries and we are willing to be competitive in our payment of salaries.

Mr. MacDonald: Competitive! When custodial staff are \$1,000 below labour rates!

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do have the responsibility of providing good administration in this government, and that is exactly what we are endeavouring to provide. The mention was made by the hon. member of the provincial police—the civil service association was not permitted to bargain for them. This would have been a great mistake to have

attempted it. The provincial police did not want to have anything to do with the civil service association; they wanted to have their own negotiating committee and that is what has happened.

This is another evidence of distorted understanding, perhaps. Mention was made of the editorial that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* and the terrible salaries that were being offered for certain types of persons who were required in education. The ad was in, the applications had been received. We have had as many applications as one would expect. It has been successful; we have good applications. What is the answer to these questions? Is it someone's opinion, or is it the results that are obtained? It seems to me that it is the results.

I agree with the hon. member when he says that senior officials should be moved around. They are being moved around. If you have any doubts, ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) how many we have brought down to Treasury from Highways. During the past year we have had 50 competitions for senior staff in the departments to give qualified people throughout the whole of the civil service an opportunity to obtain these better positions—an opportunity to improve their place in the service.

Mention is made of senior officers courses. There is a senior officers course underway at Guelph at the present time. We have a great number of training courses. We have had sales tax staff taking courses at the university and in very large numbers. It would be in the hundreds in the last two years, those endeavouring to improve themselves so that they can earn better salaries.

I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Yorkview in that, and I have said that we have a dedicated civil service; I agree that they perform good service. I had the opportunity of meeting three of the men who came from the Oak Ridge group. I found them to be very reasonable people. One had the name of Cameron, and I knew right away that you could expect some sense from a man who—

Mr. MacDonald: If he was reasonable and you are reasonable, why cannot you make an agreement?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Did he get what he wanted?

Mr. Bryden: They still get the same lousy treatment as they had before—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I can only tell you the complaint that they brought to me.

Mr. MacDonald: What was that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The complaint was that they were wrongly classified.

Mr. Bryden: Basically, they were not getting enough money.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not so unrealistic as to state that if they got the classification they felt they were entitled to, they would get more money. There is nothing wrong with them feeling that way about it.

Mr. Young: But they were refused money.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This was their complaint—that they were doing the work that was comparable to the guards in the reform institutions. They came and spent a half-hour with me; they were very fine fellows. I thought how sound and reasonable they were, because there were a couple of press boys who had waited to get their story on the way out—

An hon. member: They will come to it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I happened to overhear as they walked out. The boy said: "What have you to say?" He said: "You ask the boss in there."

Mr. MacDonald: Do they think you are reasonable now?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes. They must have thought so or they would not have appeared satisfied with my promise. I promised that we would review their classification, and we will.

Mr. Gisborn: Will you change the money alongside the classification?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Let us be a little sensible. I think you want to discuss them on a reasonable and sensible level. They went away, and it was a nice experience for me. Mention was made of the man at Whitby, who had been there five years and was getting \$3,240 a year. Of course, I do not know. You see, there is something wrong somewhere.

Mr. Gisborn: I'll say there is.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Anyone who has been in that job and has given satisfactory service is getting more than \$3,240 a year after he has been there for five years.

Mr. MacDonald: Wrong classification again.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, he is not in the wrong classification, but his yearly increment would

have brought him up pretty nearly to the \$3,900 which is the top of the class in five years in that classification.

I might say to the hon. member, and I do this in a very—

Mr. MacDonald: Kindly way.

Hon. Mr. Allan: —in an effort to be helpful to him—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Be very careful, now.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I had a letter from someone the other day who was in this position complaining about the amount of their take-home pay. So I looked it up and I found out that before the take-home pay was a very substantial payment to the credit union.

Mr. Bryden: So what?

Hon. Mr. Allan: So what? Is that take-home pay?

Mr. Bryden: What has that to do with what we are talking about?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Just this. You cannot believe everything that people tell you when they talk about take-home pay after they have deducted their savings.

Mr. MacDonald: We have come to that conclusion, after listening to this government, that we cannot believe everything we are told.

Mr. Young: I might say that the take-home pay I quoted—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Now the other. There is something somewhere that neither of us know, because after five years—

Mr. Young: This is after eight years—\$108.95 take-home pay every two weeks.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would be very glad to get the history of the case. I would like to know, because I want to help you.

Now, the cleaning women. I do not know if you saw the smiles on the cleaning women's faces yesterday or not. I do not think the hon. member for Yorkview will say that this was prearranged, as he said the insurance was prearranged. But every cleaning woman was very happy yesterday—they had a cheque for \$250.31 back pay. They are entirely satisfied with the arrangement as it is now.

Mr. Young: No raise.

Mr. Bryden: You mean—

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are looking into the possibility of increasing the hours shortly to give them a greater amount of take-home pay.

Mr. Bryden: Well, is that not nice of you, after you cut them 25 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member is trying to get me to say the civil service association brought this on these people. But I am not going to say it, because I want to stay friends with them.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, who is the hon. Minister referring to? Is it me, saying that I am trying to make him say something? I am suggesting that he withdraw that remark. He has no basis for the imputations of motives he has been engaged in all through his speech.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will tell you. I do not like to discuss in this House salary negotiations between members of the civil service association and ourselves, but this was all discussed. We begged them not to do what they did, but they were determined to do it, with the result as you found it.

Mr. MacDonald: Management always thinks that of their employees.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairmain, I do not know if the two minutes continue past six o'clock, but there certainly is a lot more to be said with regard to some of the matters that have been raised by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I wish to co-operate in dealing with these matters in an orderly form, and if there is a different vote other than 301 under which some of these matters, such as negotiations of the employer and employees could be raised, I am prepared to deal with them there.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think that would be best.

Mr. Bryden: Okay. Then there is also the question of the people who are not treated as civil servants or covered by The Civil Service Act. Now, what vote would that come under?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I really do not know what you mean.

Mr. Bryden: Well, your Civil Service Act only applies to some of the people employed by the government—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, are you trying—are you talking about casuals, or what?

Mr. Bryden: No, I am talking about employees of such agencies as the water resources commission, the hospital services commission and other Crown agencies—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Crown agencies?

Mr. Bryden: Well, Crown agencies are not all in the same category, but the first vote is the place to deal with this matter because it is bound to have an effect on overall employment conditions in the service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know what you intend to speak about; the civil service commission does not have any control over the—

Mr. Bryden: I know, and that is what I want to speak about—the fact that they have not, when they should have.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would expect the proper place to deal with that would have been in the estimates of these various agencies when they were before the House.

Mr. Bryden: We could take them one at a time, but surely it is a matter of total personnel policy—and you can look at it from either point of view. Obviously the people who are covered by The Civil Service Act are affected by the fact that certain other people are not, and the people who are in these agencies are also affected by the fact that they are not covered. Now it seems to me that it is better to deal with all of them in one place rather than take them up as each case comes along.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not trying to sidestep anything, Mr. Chairman, but how can I answer for what is being done in the water resources commission?

Mr. Bryden: I do not wish to deal with detailed matters in any of these agencies; I want to deal with the overall matter of policy of the government of having certain people excluded from its general personnel policies. Now it seems to me that, you being the Minister who reports with regard to personnel policies generally, you are the Minister who can answer this.

The fact that the water resources commission or the hospital services commission or any other commission is excluded from the coverage of The Civil Service Act, is a matter of overall government policy. It is not a matter affecting any specific agency.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I find it is difficult for me to answer as to whether this should be done or whether it should not be done. I am the Minister that reports for the civil service.

Mr. Bryden: I am going to suggest to you that the jurisdiction of your civil service commission should be extended.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, surely if you are going to deal with a question of overall government policy—if we are going to deal with these matters in an orderly fashion—such has its place in the general debates. Here we are dealing with the specific estimates of this department, and that is all we are dealing with. We cannot bring up a question of general policy of the government here if it extends upon the amount of money being asked to be voted—certainly the latitude that is permitted in dealing with estimates is extending—and I might say it is a matter of some concern because it is getting broader with every set of estimates that comes before the House.

I think we are going to have to look at the procedures. There are places in the procedures of the House to put forward any of these ideas, but they cannot be put forward just wherever it suits. There are certain debates called with regularity in this House, which provide for such matters as general government policy with which the Opposition may disagree, and that is where those comments should be made. But they should not be made in the estimates, when the purpose of the estimates, really, is to vote specific sums of money for the administration of the department under review, and the discussions should be limited to where those amounts of money are being spent.

I think my interpretation of the rules of the House is correct. We have allowed latitude here recently that has gone far from the point at issue—we have heard great dissertations upon legal theory that have no more to do with the estimates—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh now, Mr. Chairman!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We have, and we might just as well bring this matter up right now—

Mr. Singer: The hon. Prime Minister's statement is just not correct. There was not anything that we put before the House that did not relate directly to the votes of The Department of the Attorney General. There is no point in making foolish statements in your own bailiwick about these matters. We

intend to continue to examine the estimates exhaustively.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member is very sensitive.

Mr. Singer: You are the one who is bringing it up—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The point I am making is that in conducting the business of the House, we must pay attention to what we are doing in the various items of business before the House. I point out to hon. members that there is, within the accepted procedures of the House, a place for any debate you wish, but it has to be kept, and I think we are going to have to follow the rules a little more closely.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no doubt this will be discussed again before we are finished with this session of the Legislature of Ontario, but in the meantime, I move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with second readings. There are some on the order paper that will not be called. I am referring particularly to the medical services insurance Act, which will be called, as I see it now, on Tuesday of next week. Also there are those introduced by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) that are not intended to be called—having to do with the first report of the law reform commission—and there are some others there that have not been on the order paper long enough—for instance, the amendments to The Municipal Act—that will not be called. But the others that have been there for some days will be called; and we will then proceed with the estimates of this department and of Treasury and, following that, The Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 20, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 20, 1965

University of Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	3125
York University Act, 1965, bill intituled, Mr. Davis, first reading	3125
Lakehead University, bill respecting, Mr. Davis, first reading	3125
Introducing Hon. Charles Whitney, Minister of Health for Manitoba, and Dr. A. R. Tanner, Deputy Minister of Health for Manitoba, Mr. Dymond	3126
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	3126
Establishment of regional detention centres, bill to provide for, Mr. Grossman, second reading	3126
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965, bill intituled, Mr. Allan, second reading	3126
Tax on the consumers of tobacco, bill to impose, Mr. Allan, second reading	3127
Estimates, Department of Civil Service, Mr. Allan, concluded	3127
Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan	3151
Recess, 6 o'clock	3154

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1965

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Queen Elizabeth collegiate and vocational institute, Kingston, Burnhamthorpe public school, Cooksville, St. Clement's girls school, Toronto; and in the east gallery, West Wawanosh public school, Wingham, and St. Bernard's separate school, Windsor.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1947

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The University of Toronto Act, 1947.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of University Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this Act provides for the repeal of the sections that we discussed in an historical way during the debates on the estimates of The Department of University Affairs. These are the statutory grants going to the University of Toronto and since the university's grants are now considered in total, within the general situation, these two sections are being repealed.

THE YORK UNIVERSITY ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, The York University Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members of the House will recall, in 1959

this Legislature passed an Act establishing York University; the institution has operated on the basis of this Act since that time.

The university has grown and developed very substantially, and the need has become evident for some amendments to the Act to take into account the changing circumstances. The bill which is presented here incorporates the changes which the officials of that university feel are required. At the request of the university, this bill is being presented to the Legislature.

LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Lakehead University.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, perhaps this bill deserves a slightly longer explanation.

It was in June of 1946 that an order-in-council was passed establishing a provincial technical institute at the Lakehead. The institution was opened in January of 1948, with a programme that was limited to a two-year course in mining technology. Shortly afterwards, further technological courses were added and first-year courses in university programmes were also offered. As the institution grew and developed, it began to take on a new status and in 1956, in recognition of this fact, the Legislature passed an Act changing the name to the Lakehead college of arts, science and technology. Six years later, in 1962, when it became apparent that the college was in a position to offer university programmes through to graduation, an amendment to that Act was passed giving it full degree-granting powers. This year, very recently in fact, the institution graduated its first university class.

It seems clear that if in its size, its programme and its degree-granting powers this institution of higher learning, located in the northwest of this province, is to function as a university, it should have the name, organization and all the rights and privileges

that are both consistent with such responsibilities and in keeping with the powers designated to other universities of this province.

The changes have been incorporated, and set out in this Act, and I am happy to present it to the Legislature at this time. This, in essence, puts the Lakehead college on the same footing as the other universities and it will be known in the future as Lakehead University.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), of which I have already given notice.

The question is as follows: In view of the great interest in southwestern Ontario, would the hon. Minister advise if the police college at Aylmer shown in the work book of The Department of Public Works in 1964-65, and again in 1965-66, will be under construction this year?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): The answer is no.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), notice of which I gave him yesterday.

Is it the intention of the hon. Attorney General to bring in amendments to The Collection Agencies Act during this session which will bring house agencies under the provisions of the Act?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the matter of house agencies acting as collection agencies is under review by my department at this time, as I think I indicated recently in our discussion of the estimates of my department.

I am not in a position to state at this time that I shall definitely be presenting an amendment to the Act in this session.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I was cut off. I have a supplementary question in regard to my question. Would the hon. Minister be prepared to answer a supplementary question?

When will the college be completed or built?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Is this in the way of a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

I am not sure, due to some of the complexities of getting approval and priority for this building. Actually, there has been a great deal of money spent on the police

college as it is presently set up. We have absolutely no plans at this time. It has not been approved by the Treasury board. We have not heard that they are in any dire need of a new set-up. In fact, I think it is working very well. This is a continuation of a request for a building that has been in there for not only the past two years, but for the past five or six. I think it was generally accepted that when we remodelled the set of buildings that are there now, they would last for a number of years. Eventually, there might be a new building there.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), as we have a distinguished visitor from Manitoba here today, if he would be so kind as to introduce him.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the indulgence of the House in getting out of turn on this.

I am pleased to present to you, sir, and through you to the hon. members of this House, the Hon. Charles Whitney, Minister of Health for the province of Manitoba, and his Deputy, Dr. Tanner, who are visiting us here today. I hope they see how a well-run province operates.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

REGIONAL DETENTION CENTRES

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves second reading of Bill No. 142, An Act to provide for the establishment of regional detention centres.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX ACT, 1965

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 143, The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TAX ON THE CONSUMERS OF TOBACCO

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on the consumers of tobacco.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, a word or two about the principle of this bill. Although it has never been stated by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, or by any other hon. member of the government, it appears to me that the principle of this change in the tax position is so that the government would be free to elevate the taxation on tobacco in the years that lie ahead.

If this is the principle of the bill, I wonder if the hon. Minister might comment a little more specifically as to what he would consider the future of this particular tax on tobacco to be? Is he going to use it for revenue, other than that which would have been raised if the tobacco had been subject to the normal sales tax? Is he going to use it as a means whereby the consumption of tobacco would be controlled? How does he view this change in the situation?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I may say in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Brant that the reason for the change is purely an administrative one. It has two advantages that greatly appeal to us. I think I mentioned these before. One is that it relieves a great many small businesses from requiring a sales tax licence and reporting each month. Lunch counters and similar small operations have found that the only item necessary for them to report was the item of tobacco. This was one of the reasons for the change. The other reason was that the plan that is being devised is efficient and, in a sense, follows the principle of the collection of gasoline tax; it assures us that we get all the tax and with the least possible inconvenience to those who are concerned. Those are the reasons for the change.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer how this new approach will affect the wholesalers of tobacco products from the point of view of tying up their cash and of their principal, where they are servicing small businesses?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, this matter will be given the most careful consideration when the regulations are being prepared, and, likewise, the effect it will have on wholesalers and manufacturers. Opportunity will be given them to present their views as to

how it should be done. Certainly every consideration will be given to that part of the industry.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The seventeenth order. House in committee of supply; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE (continued)

On vote 301:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, yesterday, at adjournment time, there had been a little discussion as to the scope of this vote. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) put forth what appeared to me to be the quite remarkable proposition that when the vote of an agency is before the House it is not in order to discuss the agency in terms of broadening its functions beyond what they are now. It is my view—and this is the point of view I wanted to express—that the civil service commission, being the central personnel agency of the government, ought to have jurisdiction over a larger number of public servants than it now has. The hon. Prime Minister proposed that it was out of order to discuss that matter at that time. I consider that a rather remarkable position; however, I do not intend to pursue the matter here.

The other way of doing it is to deal with each of the Crown agencies whose employees are not now under the civil service commission as they come along, which means that the matter will be raised six or eight times rather than just once. I thought it would be better to raise it once, but if that is the way the hon. Prime Minister wants it, that is fine with me. I shall have something to say about this on other occasions.

Vote 301 agreed to.

On vote 302:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am not absolutely certain as to what is involved in the term "position administration," but if I understand it aright, I believe that this would be the appropriate place to discuss the experiences of the female cleaning staff over the past few months. I think it was mainly in relation to position administration that they found themselves in rather an unfortunate position.

I ask that at the moment because if this is the wrong place, I have no doubt that the

hon. Provincial Treasurer will advise me, and I will wait until the right spot.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): That is all right.

Mr. Bryden: This is as good a place as any, I take it.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer advised us yesterday that the faces of the cleaning women who work in this building and, I believe, elsewhere in the government, were wreathed in smiles. I am happy to know that; if it is true, it is the first time in some months that it has been so. I think it rather regrettable that in order to make people feel happy the government had to cut their pay and then restore it to where it was. This is the sort of procedure that one would expect from a sweatshop employer of the 19th century. One would not have thought it possible from a government in this age of supposed enlightenment. What actually happened was that the civil service association took up a grievance on behalf of the cleaning women on the grounds that they were wrongly classified.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer suggested yesterday that I was trying to provoke him into saying that the civil service association brought this disability on these people. I can assure him that that was the last thing I was trying to provoke him into saying. I was rather interested, however, that such an idea apparently was in his mind. He expressed considerable concern yesterday that relations between the government and the association do not appear to be of the best at the moment. I would suggest to him that an experience such as that relating to the cleaning women is one of many reasons why that is so.

In my estimation, the civil service association fell into a trap; I do not think there is any doubt about that. In the best of good faith, they were trying to get the wages of the cleaning women raised. Heaven knows, they could stand being raised. Technically, it won its point, but then it found itself in a trap because the government had another technicality up its sleeve, which meant that far from the wages being raised, they were, in fact, decreased.

The civil service association, let us face it, was out-manoeuvred; there is no doubt about it at all. I am going to suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he will never establish a solid foundation of responsible staff relations if one party finds it is out-manoeuvred by what comes very close to trickery. From here on he can expect that they will be on their guard. They are going

to watch for tricks in the future. The way this decision was communicated to the cleaning women was, Mr. Chairman, difficult to believe. I have a copy here of the letter that was sent to them, advising them of their great good fortune. It was sent to them on November 26, 1964. It was a memorandum which, I believe, was sent individually to each member of the caretaking services division—at any rate, to each of the women employees in the caretaking services division. It was signed by Mr. Mitchell, the personnel director of The Department of Public Works who, of course, in this capacity, was acting as an agent for the government. Mr. Mitchell's memo starts as follows;

Please be advised your salary has been increased from \$2,400 per annum to \$2,640 per annum.

A month before Christmas, this would no doubt be good news to all the ladies concerned. But after they got through all the fold de rol in the rest of the letter, they found that their increase from \$2,400 to \$2,640 actually meant a decrease to \$1,815—a decrease of roughly 25 per cent, I believe. That is the sort of an increase that very few of us can afford.

In particular, I would suggest that these cleaning women are most unable to afford it. For most of them, this is not a part-time job for pin money. A great many—indeed, I believe the majority of these women—are perhaps in their 50s, with families to support, and are the sole breadwinners in their families. They are fortunate in that they can get this sort of employment which occupies them in the evening so that they are at home in the daytime to look after their families. But they are dependent upon this employment—they and their families are dependent upon it—for their livelihood, and I would say that \$2,400 is a very small amount of money to pay to them. However, they are not in a very strong bargaining position in the labour market generally. As I say, many of them are in their 40s and 50s, and we all know that there is widespread discrimination in employment against people who have committed the crime of passing the age of 40, as most of us in this House have done.

It is particularly difficult for women who, for most of their lives, have been at home bringing up small children, to get employment. So this type of employment, which is necessary to the government and to the public, is also very useful to them. But I think the government should be thinking in terms of paying these women a living wage; I submit that \$2,400 is not a living wage, especially if

one has one, two or three dependants, as many of them have. That, I think, is what probably motivated the civil service association when it tried to get a modest increase, but it succeeded only technically in getting the increase. The whole thing blew up in its face and these poor women were cut to a maximum of \$1,815. The range actually went from \$1,567.50 to \$1,815. This, just before Christmas, was their Christmas present—an increase that cut their wages 25 per cent.

What kind of personnel relations are involved there? There has been a long struggle since this heartless action of the government. I had a few things to say about it, some of which were reported in the press; they were not very complimentary to the government. The cleaning women themselves took their courage in their hands and demonstrated in front of these buildings. When I say they took their courage in their hands I do not mean that they had any reason to fear any discrimination; I do not think they did. I certainly hope they did not have any reason to fear that. But to such ladies, it is quite a thing to march up and down in front of the Parliament buildings with a placard in their hands. That is the sort of thing they are not accustomed to doing. Some of them looked quite embarrassed while doing it. But after all, this was their livelihood; that, and that of their children, had been seriously threatened, so they took whatever steps they could.

Finally, we are now told in May, nearly five months after the original communication from Mr. Mitchell, that the government has decided to take a more generous attitude to them. I am not quite sure whether it is doing any more than just restoring them to the \$2,400 level where they previously had been. I gather from what the hon. Provincial Treasurer said that that is all that has been done. The ladies have been returned to the \$2,400 level where they had been all along, and the difference for the intervening period has been paid.

I hoped that the hon. Provincial Treasurer had done a little better than that, but if that is all he has done, I do not care whether the faces of the ladies were wreathed in smiles or not. I think it is abominable treatment to subject them to mental stress, uncertainty and actual privation for a period of five months, and then do no more than bring them back to where they were.

I would say that the government should now, at least, have the good grace to pay them at the rate of \$2,160 to \$2,640 that they thought they were going to get. They thought they were going to get that, until they were halfway through Mr. Mitchell's memo; then

they found that it was going to be \$1,567 to \$1,815.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am appealing to the hon. Provincial Treasurer to forget that pettifogging regulation in which he and his representatives apparently got themselves entangled, and just declare that he is going to pay them at least according to that scale. That seems to me to be a disgracefully low wage for the government to be paying, even at that. But at least it is a little better than they were getting. I am going to suggest to him further that he not only accept that wage scale, as payable to all of them, regardless of the petty little regulations, but that he make it retroactive to the date of the award by the grievance board, whenever that award was made. That seems to me to be only fair and decent treatment. It would not only wreath the faces of these ladies in smiles, but it would give them a genuine basis for feeling happy and satisfied. I think that after all the government has put them through, it ought to do a little bit to make them feel satisfied and happy.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, commenting upon the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine, I would like to say that I think I have as much interest in the welfare of the ladies he refers to as he or anyone else in this Legislature. No one is, or has been, more sympathetic to them than I. I would inform the hon. members that there was no trap, and I will make a full statement as to what occurred. I am sure the hon. members can come to their own conclusion and if the hon. member for Woodbine is as fair as he says he is, I think he will be willing to retract some of the things he has said about the Provincial Treasurer and this government.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know on what basis—

Hon. Mr. Allan: But you have not heard it yet. Mr. Chairman, I gave this hon. member a perfect hearing. I did not interrupt him, and I do not propose to be interrupted myself at this time.

I would mention that the personnel of the civil service commission are too skilled to endeavour to manoeuvre anyone out of anything. That is not our practice it is not our way of dealing with the civil servants, and I certainly object to a statement that we set a trap, or that we manoeuvred anyone out of anything. It was our hope from the very beginning that we would negotiate the situation which arose as a result of the grievance, one by the cleaning staff based on a technicality; we wanted to come back and negotiate, as you will find when I make a

statement covering the whole matter. If this had been done, if the civil service association had been willing to negotiate, these cleaners would never have had a salary of \$1,815 a year. We did not want them to have that salary.

Mr. Bryden: But you gave it to them.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We had to give it to them.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald: Why?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will tell you.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let us have the explanation.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You will get the statement.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We certainly did not want to do it. As for the insinuation that they were not happy, I will tell you that when I met one of them last night and I said: "Did you get your cheque?" "No," she said, "but I will get mine tomorrow." I said: "What are you going to do with it?" Being a very fine Scottish woman, she said: "I'm going back to Scotland, and have a trip." She was not unhappy.

Now I will give you the history of the whole situation. The history of this province clearly demonstrates that the association's failure to use negotiation procedures was entirely responsible for the unrest. To understand the problem which arose, it is necessary to describe the following sequence of events. The reclassification programme focused attention on the fact that women cleaners in The Department of Public Works, working in the evenings for a total of 25 hours a week, were paid the same salary as employees working a full week of 40 hours. In effect, their salary was \$1.85 per hour. This \$1.85 was the salary that was provided by the annual salary of \$2,400.

Effective September 1, 1962, a revised rate was issued of \$2,640, calculated on a 40-hour week. It was proposed to safeguard the interests of the employees hired prior to the programme's findings by a fine red-circle procedure. This has been done with many other classes of employees. It was proposed that the women cleaners, working only 25 hours weekly, should be red-circled at \$2,400 per annum. The red-circle protection was not accepted, and these employees grieved that their rate should be the same as the cleaners working 40 hours weekly.

On the technicality that the classification of buildings cleaners had not been included

in the schedule under the regulations prescribing hours of work, the employees won their grievance; they received back pay to September 1, 1962. This was at the end of 1964, and about \$500 per employee was paid in back pay to those who had been on the payroll since September, 1962. Such a situation—and this is where we found ourselves, and was the reason that the situation had to be cleaned up—obviously unfair to the 40-hour a week employees could not be allowed to continue. The 25-hour a week employees were now receiving \$2.03 per hour, against \$1.27 for 40-hour employees. While endeavouring to obtain the concurrence of the civil service association to the establishing of a separate classification covering cleaners who work less than 40 hours a week, with a salary more closely related to the former one of \$2,400, an interim step was taken to designate these jobs under Regulation 10 of The Public Service Act by which a prorated salary could be applied.

As from November 16, 1964, therefore, the prorated annual salary was \$1,815. The civil service association would not negotiate, but preferred the grievance procedure as a means of settlement. This time the grievance was against the decision to make this designation under Regulation 10-A. This grievance was lost by the grievors.

We had begged the association not to pursue this course. I am sure all hon. members of this House must realize that it was not a happy situation for any of us who had anything to do with personnel administration of the government. We did not want to put that salary back to \$1,815.

The association still would not negotiate, and the civil service commission was obliged to exercise its statutory responsibility to create a new class of cleaner, office buildings, Toronto, which will pay employees hired since November 1, 1964 at the hourly rate of \$1.50, but which will safeguard those employed prior to this date by allowing the annual rate of \$2,400 to be paid. This was done without prejudice to any further negotiation.

I do not think you could complain that we did this in any unilateral way; we did it without prejudice and there still can be negotiations. Our information is that the employees concerned are satisfied—several of them have told me that they are—with the establishment of the commission's original position in regard to a maximum of \$2,400 for those previously on staff.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned yesterday—

evidently the hon. member for Woodbine did not hear me—that it was our hope that arrangements will be made to extend the hours of work for these women so that they will have a greater amount of take-home pay. I might have added that the maximum rate for cleaners in the city of Toronto is from \$1.30 to \$1.50 per hour, so we are not paying wages less than the market rate. I am sure that with this explanation no one can feel that we were willingly unkind to the cleaning women.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, having heard the hon. Provincial Treasurer's explanation, and I was fairly familiar with the facts in any case as he gave them, I would say that the conduct of the government was vindictive in the extreme, at the expense of a group of people whose income is very low. You see, the hon. Provincial Treasurer keeps saying that he would like to have good relations with the association. He has even told them that the basis of sound staff relations is confidence on both sides, but the association is always wrong, according to his thinking, it can never be right. He accused me yesterday of trying to provoke him into saying that the association brought this on these people. As I told him a few minutes ago, such an idea has never entered my head, but he said it without being provoked. He said in his statement now that it was the association's fault—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I gave you the facts.

Mr. Bryden: —that these people's wages were cut 25 per cent. I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he could have done at the beginning what he did after a long protest—he could have kept them at least at \$2,400. He did not have to cut them to \$1,815, but he was going to teach the association a lesson; unfortunately, his method of doing so was to punish these women—and punish them most cruelly. That is a drastic reduction in pay for anyone to have to suffer. But for one whose wages are already at the line, I think it is inhuman. There was absolutely no need to make these women the victims of his exasperation with the association. Whether or not the exasperation was justified is not a point I am interested in going into; I do not care about that. These women had always been getting \$2,400 a year on a 25-hour week. The rate for that classification was raised to \$2,640, and it was only after the association established, through the grievance procedure, the point that they were now entitled to the \$2,640—a miserable \$240 a year more—that the govern-

ment decided that it had to prorate them. It had not prorated them for 10, these many years, but now it had to prorate them and thereby pull their salaries away down.

The explanation that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has given simply confirms what I have already said, Mr. Chairman. There is, however, one further matter I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer about. I understand that these women are now at \$2,400 and, as he said, the government is looking around for ways and means of increasing their hours. I do not know what that will amount to, and there is no use asking the hon. Provincial Treasurer now, because nothing has been settled.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member knows that the civil service commission has no way of increasing the hours; this is done by the department. You would understand that any change of hours would be arranged by the department; we can use our influence, but we cannot—

Mr. Bryden: That may be, but I would suggest that they be paid the \$2,640 rate and forget about the hours. They are a special group of employees; there is a very small number of them, and I do not see any reason why you have to be so hidebound by regulations, especially since you were not in the past. When they were getting \$2,400 you did not prorate them.

However, what I want to know is this. I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer said the salary they now get is back to the \$2,400 they had been getting all along. Is that retroactive to the period when they were cut down to \$1,815 or is that lost permanently?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The cheque for \$250.31 that they received yesterday was the difference for that period when they were receiving \$1,815, so that they in reality have never received that. The pay is retroactive so that they have not suffered in the overall picture.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad to know that, but I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that is what he should have done in the first place. He should have kept them at the \$2,400 and saved them all the mental stress and worry and concern about how they were going to support their families through that substantial period when they were cut down to the \$1,815. The mere fact that he has now departed from his original decision—or whoever made the decision, but as he is the representative of the government I will put it in terms of him—and has now wiped out

that thorough injustice, I think, establishes beyond all possible dispute that there was no need to have committed it in the first place. It was simply a matter of punishing these women in order to teach the association a lesson, and I am suggesting to him that he will never build sound staff relations on that basis.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, following up what the hon. Minister said, that he would not willingly be unkind—and I think that fundamentally he is a kindly gentleman—I questioned yesterday and I question today his understanding of the kind of processes that are involved in this collective bargaining which is going forward. But there is another case I would like to bring before him in this respect, of what I consider to be an injustice, which I hope that he will see fit to correct, within the civil service.

I have a letter which I would like to send to the hon. Minister, and I will do that so that he will have a copy of it. It concerns a man who was mentioned in this House the other day by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman); his name is Mr. McQuillan. Mr. McQuillan was evidently involved in the Cross case in Guelph, and I am not going to discuss at this point the merits or demerits of that case, because it had a pretty thorough airing in this House, but I was rather startled when the hon. Minister mentioned the other night that Mr. McQuillan harboured an ex-convict for two days, pumping him for damaging information, even though he, the convict, told him he was sought by the RCMP. This kind of statement against Mr. McQuillan, who, I think, is an honest man, is rather damaging, particularly when the hon. Minister sat in my own office with this man several days later. My question is, if he knew that this was the case, then why did he not at that point turn him over to the RCMP?

The other thing is that I sent this man to the parole office and to the parole officers here in the city and they looked after him, for how long I do not know. But they did not turn him over to the RCMP. Then, again, Mr. McQuillan was charged with complicity in tearing pages out of a record book. Again, both of these men so charged have denied this. And this, perhaps, is part and parcel of the kind of statement we have been getting in the House from the Minister when a department is allowed to investigate itself and come up with answers of its own problems and against charges that were made.

However, Mr. McQuillan, being involved in this together with Mr. Lindsay, has been

fired. Other people who were also involved with these two men in trying to bring about certain reforms within the institution have left, and in disgust and despair they tell me. These two men have now been fired.

Mr. McQuillan wrote me in this respect after he had been fired. He says that he was with the department for five years and during that time he had built up 70 days of sick leave, which to him is worth around \$400 in cash that he would collect at the termination of his period. He gives the dates, and as I said, I will send a copy of this letter to the hon. Minister.

He was suspended on March 25, 1965. A hearing was held with the department on March 29—four days later—and immediately after the hearing he overheard Mr. Harloff ask Mr. Lambie if he was still under suspension, and Mr. Lambie turned to him and said, "You are still under suspension, but will be officially notified of the outcome by letter." In Mr. McQuillan's own words:

On the evening of April 7, Mr. McQuaig and Mr. Welland delivered notification of my dismissal to me at my home. This letter was dated April 6, 1965, and it stated that I was dismissed on the date of my suspension, March 25, 1965. This means I was dismissed before I had a hearing with the department, if this carries through.

At the time of the hearing with the department I had 14 days holiday, four special and two days overtime coming to me. These two days I had been called in on days off for investigation—

Naturally, this would count for him. But the question here is that the department is maintaining that he is two days short of the five years in order to collect his \$400 and he claims that he is at least one day over the time.

In any case, it is in that area, and so the case has been sent to arbitration, evidently.

It just seems to me that here is another case where the hon. Minister, with his regard for the civil service, could very well see to it that justice is done. As I say, I am not discussing the merits of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions and his department feeling that this man should be discharged; that is their business and I am not here to argue that he should not be. He may have done certain things that they disagreed with, but we can have our differences on that, and this is not the case at issue. The case at issue is whether or not it is just to say to a man after five years service, "You are two days short of getting your time for the \$400 sick

leave pay and therefore you are not going to get it."

I put this before the hon. Minister because he said that he would not willingly be unkind and it seems to me in this case, there is unkindness and injustice being done.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, can we not have some answers to our questions?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Certainly, we can. Mr. Chairman, first of all, as you might suspect, I know nothing about this case. The personnel management is the responsibility of departments, but let me say, and point out to the hon. member for Yorkview that within the last few years we have established an independent grievance board that is entirely independent of the government for the very reason that he suggests, namely, that everyone will have justice. The chairman of that board is Professor Ralph Presgrave, who is, I think, one of the most highly regarded personnel men in the whole of this province, a man who does justice, but a man who is sympathetic always to the person who may be down. This man has grieved and I do not think we should discuss any details in connection with the case. I would not want to prejudice, in any way, his possibility of fair treatment. He can grieve, and I can assure you that from that grievance board—certainly based on my experience and having read every award they have ever made—he will receive justice.

Mr. Young: But surely, Mr. Minister, my point is that this kind of case should never have to go through the grievance procedure; it is so close to the borderline that justice here would demand that that one day be given.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to pursue the point that my hon. friend has been dealing with, but I think the government is obviously a little cheap in forcing the man to go to a grievance board to get what he is entitled to.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not sure that is what he is grieving for.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, that is what he is grieving for.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is grieving over dismissal.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me come back to the other point. Apart from what I think is rather a cheap attitude, let us come back to the point

that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions introduced in the House the other day. He made what I think is a positively malicious charge. He stated that this man was harbouring a man who had been let out of the institution in Guelph and the RCMP were looking for him.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I did not say that, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect.

Mr. MacDonald: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said that this man was harbouring a releasee from the institution, who, in his own words, was wanted by the RCMP. I did not say he was wanted. I further added that at the time I made the statement in the House the other night, the RCMP was, in fact, looking for that man. I said that they were under the impression that the RCMP was looking for him. I want you to get the facts clear.

An hon. member: That is not the impression—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Never mind the impression; that is exactly what I said, and this is established by the evidence the man himself gave.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this is a very nice switching of words, because the fact is that after the man harboured somebody whom presumably the RCMP was looking for, the hon. Minister sat in the hon. member for Yorkview's office and talked to the man. The man went down and was in the hands of, and was being attended to by, the rehab. people in the hon. Minister's own department. So to get up and to leave the suggestion that he was being—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Am I concerned through these estimates with something that happens in a department that we have nothing to do with?

Mr. MacDonald: No, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, I agree; you should not be concerned. But we have got to be concerned in the Opposition at this kind of attitude and treatment of civil servants. We are faced with the difficulty, periodically, of dealing with one department and finding the issue is over in another department; we are chasing it back and forward. We got into this difficulty the other day. When this issue was originally raised in The Department of Reform Institutions, the hon. Minister, in effect, washed his hands of it and put it to the hon. Attorney

General (Mr. Wishart), so we raised it with the hon. Attorney General. The hon. Minister brings it back into his own department and causes all the confusion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are confusing it deliberately.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not confusing it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was not quite that simple at all.

Mr. MacDonald: The civil servants certainly need somebody to fight for them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has an organization to speak for him and I am sure it will.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I have a problem in the Ontario hospital at Hamilton I would like to bring to the hon. Minister's attention, concerning the classification of building cleaners and helpers; I would presume it is group one. They have a wage scale of \$3,240 a year. I have a pay check here for a man that has worked there for six years—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Would you mind? I did not hear.

Mr. Davison: I have a pay cheque here for a man who has worked there for six years. For two weeks his pay cheque is \$115. I would like to point out to the hon. Minister that in the city of Hamilton, if you are cleaning the floor in the public washrooms you get \$70 a week, as compared to \$57 at the Ontario hospital.

What I would like to find out is this. There are four groups here, running, I suppose from group one to group four. Is there a possibility when a man is at the top of group one of moving into group two or group three, or would his occupation have to be changed? It seems that pretty nearly everybody in the Ontario hospital at Hamilton is in group one. Have you got the percentages there of how many are in the different groups?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Hamilton East, I may say that the salary mentioned of \$3,000 a year is paid only during the training period. If the person is performing satisfactory service, the longest that it should take to get to \$3,900 per year is six years. It does not take most the six years to get to the \$3,900, which is presently the top of the class. These particular classes are being negotiated at the present time. Negotiations fell down, so the matter has gone to arbitration. The percentage of the employees in the institutional classes—in class

one—is very small. I do not know if it would be ten per cent or not; I could get that figure and give it to you sometime, but I would think it would be ten per cent or less. It is only there during the training period, and if the person is performing reasonably satisfactory service, with the annual increments he would be at \$3,900 at the end of six years.

I cannot explain the cheque. If you would like to—

Mr. Davison: That is fine. I just want to explain that this man has worked there six years. According to the people in Hamilton, his work is very satisfactory.

But what I am interested in is going down to class four, which would be a top of \$4,800. Would there be anybody in an institution that would be getting this type? Who would he be?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, yes. He would be the supervisor.

Mr. Davison: Just the supervisor?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The supervisor. They are chosen, of course, from the—

Mr. Davison: The ordinary worker would not have an opportunity of—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The ordinary worker could become a supervisor in two years; he does not have to work for the six years in order to become a supervisor. I think that class begins at \$4,000. I have said to you that these rates should be under negotiation at the present time.

Mr. Davison: If I send this gentleman's name over to the hon. Minister, would he look into it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will look into it and give you the particulars.

Vote 302 agreed to.

On vote 303:

An hon. member: We have not passed 302 yet.

Another hon. member: It is hard to know what vote some of these things come under.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a few questions. I do not want to be repetitive in what has been said in the general comment about the civil service association and the commission, but I feel I must rise on behalf of many of the employees of the institution in Hamilton

—not just in the Ontario hospital, but in The Department of Health and The Department of Highways. The reason I was not here at the opening of the session today at 3 o'clock is because I have been on the telephone, listening to appeals for some action by employees in the Hamilton district. Of course, they are pretty well excited about their problems of trying to live with the kind of money they are receiving as employees of the government of Ontario. Some of the questions that were raised with me this morning were that they were working at the lowest rates—\$3,200 a year. The wife had a job. The employee was appealing for some way that he could moonlight and find an extra job to help supplement his income. I told him that I was well aware of this situation; that I had had four or five calls previous to his, and that this is the going trend in many areas. People that are working for this kind of a salary work on other jobs on their days off, and on their off shift. And, of course, their wives are out trying to supplement the income also. Some would say: "This is all right. Maybe between the three jobs they can make \$4,500 or \$5,000 to keep their families the way they should be kept." This is not always the case. A few who have health and want to go out and do a moonlighting job do it to supplement it. With those who have no children or are perhaps fortunate enough to have in-laws to look after the children, the wife can go out and supplement the income. But in any case, when they do I do not think I have to tell the hon. Provincial Treasurer that this is not conducive to family life, or to the health of a person in this society if you have to work seven days a week or have to work 16 hours a day to supplement your income.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer is aware—it was raised in this House yesterday—of the proposed march on Queen's Park next Thursday by the rank and file of the civil service association members. This is what has caused some of the concern with many of their members. The Hamilton paper today, the *Labour Beat*, has a write-up taken from a meeting held by the so-called rebel group on Tuesday night of the employees, and an interview by the *Labour Beat* reporter, Bas Korsanti, with the director of the Hamilton branch. This says that the civil service association is warning them—the so-called rebel group—not to disrupt negotiations by a march on Queen's Park. At this point, I have to say that I think they should come down and make their protest if it is in two ways against their own directors or the civil service association, or rather whether

or not it is against the laxity and the slowness of negotiations.

In collective bargaining in the trade union movement, of course, the rank and file gets exercised about delay in negotiations and the time comes when they have to show a little bit of militancy to spur things up and get things going. But I have often thought, Mr. Chairman, that when someone makes comments in this House about the great Canadian way of life and the great pride we have in this province, all hon. members are ready to thump their desks with pride, but if anyone needs to have some shame for the province of Ontario they can find it in the wages we pay to some of our civil servants. Certainly there has to be a real look taken at this bottom wage. I think the request of the association for a base rate of something in the neighbourhood of \$4,300 to start is realistic, and so is maintaining this approach of moving up. This \$2,800 is just ridiculous in this day and age.

I know that there are many problems in trying to deal with such a large group—400,000 employees—but nevertheless there may be some way that a new approach can be taken. I looked through the last issue of the *Trillium*, the civil service association of Ontario's official organ, and I saw the classification and salary schedule and it goes on for page after page. You wonder just how any kind of sensible approach to the problem can be finally resolved to please everyone.

I would ask the question, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer could answer it later on, could he tell me how many different rates of pay there are in the civil service groups of Ontario? I would think there would be thousands.

Hon. Mr. Allan: About 50 rates.

Mr. Gisborn: About 50 rates, 50 different rates? There are only 50 different rates in the whole—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am told that there are sub-groups within some of those sections but that there are 50 main classifications. That is, you will find—if you study these—that certain professional people are classed together as far as salaries are concerned, although the work they are doing may have no relation whatever.

Mr. Gisborn: I would think if this is the case it should be reduced drastically. The steel industry had a real problem in this area for many years and it is now ten years past since it took a real look at this idea of classification. In the Steel Company of

Canada, the Stelco plant, prior to 1954 there were 219 different rates. In certain occupations there might have been seven different rates in the labour class and this did nothing but cause a lot of favouritism, a sort of phony, false incentive, and a lot of these things that get the employees mixed up and dissatisfied with their positions. The union and the company went into what was called the co-operative wage study and they boiled that down to 27 rates in that plant. Those 27 rates now prevail. Now there is some reasoning and some cohesion to what a man might be entitled to—27 different classifications and, of course, the groups in those rates.

I think this is something that should be looked at in the civil service. Take, for instance, in the schedule on page 11 we find under "cook": Cook 1, cook 2, cook 3, cook 4, cook 5, and cook 6.

Mr. Bryden: None of them gets paid anything worth mentioning.

Mr. Gisborn: I understand that once they become cook 3 they are in the supervisory capacity. How anyone can put any sensible application to that sort of thing I do not know. It starts, of course, with cook 1 at \$2,880 and when you get to cook 6 you get from \$4,600 up to \$5,500.

But then if we go on to page 14 we find in the laundries, we have laundry worker 1, laundry worker 2, laundry worker 3, laundry worker 4, laundry worker 5, laundry worker 6, laundry worker 7, laundry worker 8. What in the world would be the difference? If you could not come up with an occupational differential where you could have maybe three rates to cover your laundry workers, certainly you could have starter, intermediate and standard rates in the laundry shop and then have a foreman who is paid as a foreman. This silliness of eight different classifications makes one wonder, just what they are trying to do. Certainly this would help to complicate things.

But in the main, it is hard to understand why we are sticking to such low wages; why do we not establish a base that is reasonable? Does the hon. Minister or anybody in the department feel that anything below \$3,000 is a reasonable starting rate? Do you not think in this day and age that a base rate should be something in the neighbourhood of \$4,000 or \$4,200, and then go on up from there? This is the big problem.

Another question I would raise is about the procedure of arriving at a settlement in negotiations. I am not too familiar with it

and I will stand corrected by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but if I may ask a question for clarification, I understand the procedure is that they do bargain, they have now collective bargaining, and if they fail to arrive at an agreement in the bargaining stage or negotiation stage, it is then referred to the joint council, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The bargaining is at the level of the joint council.

Mr. Gisborn: There is no bargaining before they go to the joint council?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I am wrong; there is discussion at the civil service level with the association.

Mr. Gisborn: This has something to do with causing confusion, in the sense they get together with the directors and the commission and they try to settle it. If there is no settlement, they go to the joint council, but then I understand the chairman of the civil service commission also sits on the joint council.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He acts as chairman; he has no vote, no say.

Mr. Gisborn: He acts as chairman, but has no vote—

Mr. Bryden: He is in a neutral position in one spot and in a partisan position in the other.

Mr. Gisborn: I would advise the hon. Minister that this is one of the bones of contention and I can see where it could be a bone of contention. This joint council could take the place of a conciliation stage, but it will not be a conciliation stage in any sense if you have equal numbers on each side and then you have the chairman of the civil service commission—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The chairman is a neutral chairman.

Mr. Bryden: But he is not neutral in his previous state; he is a representative of the government in his previous state—well, he is under the Act. We will deal with this later.

Mr. Gisborn: Whatever happens, this is what I understand happens. In any case, if he is there, whether you call him a neutral chairman or whether we say that he would have some influence, is a little bit beside the point; his presence there does not tend to be conducive to reasonable negotiations. I would suggest you have the joint council and if you have a conciliator—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could give the hon. member a little information that might straighten him out. I may have misled you when I said that the civil service chairman does not negotiate at all; it is the officers of the civil service commission, and not any members of the civil service commission who have any discussion with the salaries in the beginning.

Mr. Bryden: That is no explanation—

Mr. Gisborn: This is an area of confusion as far as the associations are concerned and I have never talked to anybody from the executive of the Ontario civil service association; I have talked to some of the rank and file and to one or two directors, and the impression I get, with some experience, is that they have been confused right through the whole business as to knowing where they really get into the meat of having somebody deal with them on a basis that negotiations really mean something.

If it is a fact that the chairman of the civil service commission sits in on the joint council, I think that this should be changed. If this is where you get to the point where you start to talk cold turkey and do some real negotiating, then you should have someone in there in the capacity of a conciliator, one who is really impartial and tries to resolve the questions as they arise.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister, before the afternoon is out, would give us some idea as to whether the present set of negotiations is proceeding in an orderly fashion and if there is some likelihood that there will be a conclusion in the near future, so that we are not faced with protest marches to Queen's Park to protest the delay and the actions of the civil service association in conjunction with the commission. I do not think that it is conducive to the welfare of the government of Ontario to have employees making protest marches in regard to the amount of money they receive for their labours.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the hon. members for Hamilton East and Wentworth East. I appreciate some of the suggestions that the latter has made and I certainly shall give them some consideration.

I would point out to him, and he will understand this because he is an experienced labour man, that we had hoped when these negotiations began—and they do include the institution classes, which are one of the largest classes in the civil service—that we could get down to some negotiations. Unfortunately,

the two sides, as I said yesterday, were as far apart as the poles. No negotiations took place; very quickly the staff decided they would take it to arbitration and it is in arbitration.

I think in fairness to the government, that anyone must give the government credit for the fact that the determination of these salaries finally is going to be determined by an independent body, namely, the arbitration board. Any feeling that the government wishes to be unfair with the civil servants is a long way from the facts. We want to be reasonable. There is a great difference of opinion as to what salaries should be for certain positions.

I can tell hon. members that there are three institutions in this area and there are only 13 vacancies in all three of those institutions; we have lists of persons waiting to obtain positions at the mental institutions throughout the province—almost every institution, with one or two exceptions.

We want to be good employers, and we have said from the beginning that we want to be good employers and that we are willing to be. Certainly there can be a great difference of opinion as to the salaries that should be paid, but when I tell you that during what would amount to the last three years—that is from 1962—our salaries increased from \$144 million to \$155 million in 1962, the following year from \$155 million to \$177 million, and last year from \$177 million, with no increase in staff, or only .1 per cent—

Mr. Bryden: You said, “no increase in staff”; I do not know whether that applies to last year or the entire period you were talking about.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, that is the total—.1 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Point one per cent, and the salary payment increased from \$177 million to \$190.7 million. I think that this is an indication that we want to be fair with the civil servants. We want a good staff and we realize that to have a good staff we have to be good employers.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think the government is doing a pretty good job in increasing the wages in some of the higher wage ranges and in some of the competitive places where it found that it could not get people, but in some of these lower scales, I would suggest that its attitude is not a very realistic one, if I may use that term. Maybe

it can get people—I do not know—but I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that perhaps as many as one quarter of the people on the payroll of the government of Ontario will qualify for subsidization of hospital insurance premiums if and when the bill that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has before the House goes through.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Perhaps we could have a bet on it.

Mr. Bryden: What percentage of your employees in the civil service—we will not bother with the others and you probably have not got the information—gets paid less than \$3,000 a year and what percentage gets less than \$3,600 a year? It is in these ranges that people are going to qualify for subsidization under the hon. Minister's bill if it should go through.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I have already said that I am quite sure that it is less than 10 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: Getting less than \$3,600 a year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Getting less than \$3,000 a year.

Mr. Bryden: All right. It seems that the deputy is looking up the information, so perhaps you could give it to us.

Hon. Mr. Allan: These figures would indicate that there might be 17 per cent under the \$3,000 mark.

Mr. Bryden: And how many under \$3,600, or whatever figure you have that is close to that?

Hon. Mr. Allan: There would be about 35 per cent under \$3,600.

Mr. Bryden: That would include the 17 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: It looks as though I have understated the case, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You lost your bet.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I have not.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad I did not take it. I was sure I would have been betting on a sure thing anyway, and I do not believe in doing that. This 17 per cent means that almost a fifth of the civil service of this province are making less than \$3,000 per year. Almost anybody in that group will

qualify for subsidy under the bill that the hon. Minister of Health has before us, because most of them will have some dependants and that will get them into a taxable income of less than \$1,000 a year. I said 20 to 25 per cent. I just have to take that group, and I have about got it. Then there is another 18 per cent that are between \$3,000 and \$3,600.

I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that on the basis of the studies of almost any experts, those people are below poverty levels. These people are living in poverty, getting wages like that, if they have anybody to support. A single person probably could get by. He would not get very fat, but he could get by on those wages. But for people with dependants that is poverty. We are always talking about the war on poverty; it is getting to be the favourite slogan of politicians. Let us start it right here. Let us eliminate poverty in the civil service of Ontario. I would say that we should not contemplate anything less than \$3,600 a year—in fact, I suggest we might be better thinking in terms of a basic minimum of \$4,000 a year. I am not suggesting we do that tomorrow, but that should be our objective over a reasonably short period of time.

The institutional services group's salary schedules are now up for review, as I understand; I think they are going to arbitration. I have no doubt that there has been a great deal of study gone into their wage rates by the pay research branch of the department. I have no doubt that the pay research branch is quite competent and has provided the government with information as to rates for people in comparable employment elsewhere. I do not wish to question any information it may have provided the government, but I think we should bear in mind that the pay research branch has the sole function of providing information. It is up to the government to make a policy determination after the pay research branch has provided the information.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he should consider the information he no doubt has from the pay research branch in this light; the people in this institutional services group are notoriously underpaid all through the community. They provide a major vital service to the community, but they are, without question, the worst-paid group in the community. Therefore, he should not be too much impressed by comparisons with similar groups employed by other employers. I am sure that the people in his institutions are as well paid

as the people in the Toronto general hospital; the people in the Toronto general hospital are grossly underpaid. In view of the growing importance that service is assuming in the modern world, somebody has to make a start in getting the wages of these people up, and I say the government should make the start. You see, negotiations broke down before they started because the civil service association was asking that the people who provide services to sick people should be paid as much as common labourers in industry. The government is not prepared to accept that proposition; it wants to compare them with grossly exploited people in other institutions; not government institutions. I am sure the two parties will never get together.

I would not be too happy about the outcome of the arbitration. I hope it will go well for the association, but my own experience in past years with boards of this kind is that they go on the basis of comparison; they never consider the question of basic equity. If everybody in this type of work is being underpaid, how are we ever going to get the wages up? I say that the government ought to take a bold step forward. It should not force this arbitration; it should come forth with a realistic proposal that would make a significant increase in the pay of these people.

We had a group of men from Oak Ridge at Penetang in front of the buildings, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer took them over to the Treasury building and jollied them up in his own inimitable way. He tells us that they went home happy.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I did not jolly them up.

Mr. Bryden: They went home happy, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member is disappointed if anyone is happy, is he not?

Mr. Bryden: I am disappointed if anyone is deluded into being happy on the basis of exploitation. These men, with families no doubt, are getting \$3,400 to \$4,200 a year. I would certainly be ashamed of myself if I tried to persuade those people that they had any basis for being happy. I think you should make them happy on a real basis by getting some more money for them—a living wage. You are paying starvation wages to a substantial part of your public employees, and I think it is time you changed your attitude. There are men sitting on these benches who work in plants where people who sweep the floors are paid \$2.30 an hour. My colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton

East, says probably more than about half of your total civil service. And yet you are trying to tell us that you are interested in doing a job on wages. I am personally concerned about this institutional services group, in terms not only of the public service itself, but of that type of employee in the community at large. I think it is time the government set a pattern for the community in trying to get these people up to at least the point of a living wage. The overwhelming majority of them now, both in the government service and elsewhere in the community, are getting less than a living wage.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a word to say on The Department of Civil Service.

Mr. Chairman: What item?

Mr. S. Lewis: Vote 303, on recruitment. Are we not on recruitment?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 303, right!

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a small point I would like to raise; I am perplexed about it. In the memorandum to all employees dated March 17, 1965, Mr. Collins indicated the award that had been arrived at. Point No. 1 of that award said that a new schedule for the accrual of annual vacation leave has been awarded. Under this clause, new employees having up to three years of service will have vacation leave of two weeks per year, and employees having three years of service or more will have vacation leave of three weeks per year up to 20 years of service.

Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I am frankly not familiar with this. Is it a cut-back from three to two weeks as part of the negotiated agreement?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Perhaps I could explain it to the hon. member. There will be no cut-back for anyone. I am not trying to speak in a double-talk fashion; for the new people who come in, this will apply once the award has come into effect. This was negotiated and agreed upon by the civil service association. This was not considered by the board of arbitration, and it does not affect any of those who were here before.

Mr. S. Lewis: But it will be limited to two weeks for all those who are new employees?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Provincial Treasurer, what I wanted to raise in this House, and what perplexes me about it, is the lack of

contact and consultation which this reflects. I stand to be corrected—and the hon. Minister of Health may subsequently do so—but as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, this has seriously and adversely affected prospects of hiring at all Ontario hospitals in the province—indeed, if I understand it correctly, the mental health branch of The Department of Health is presently in the process of making some submissions for encouraging that this be otherwise altered. For nurses, social workers, psychologists and medical psychiatrists, the prospects of two weeks leave at a lower salary for the first three years obviously is not sufficient enticement—certainly not to compete with general hospitals in the community. What I am curious about is that this could have happened without some kind of consultation with branches in the department which this legislation or these rules affect.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I should think that the civil service association, having representatives from all these staffs, must have discussed it with their people; there must have been an understanding.

Mr. S. Lewis: I see. Please understand me, Mr. Treasurer, I am not in fact laying blame; I am trying to understand. Here are OHs in enough staff difficulty as it is, yet another serious obstacle has been put in their path. It will take some time to overcome the impression that has been created, even if it is reversed.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This was really an adjustment of holidays. As you know, there were advantages as well.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate that there were advantages on the other side. All right, I shall let it lie there until the health estimates.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, one year ago I made the suggestion to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he post vacancies in Dominion public buildings, in post offices throughout the province. Has that suggestion been accepted at all?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that we are not even permitted to do it.

Mr. Newman: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: We are not permitted.

Mr. Newman: You are not permitted at all? May I suggest then, possibly you should take some other public building in the community, maybe one of your own offices in a central

location, and post vacancies in that office, so that residents from all parts of Ontario have the same opportunity for applying for positions with the civil service? Will you follow a suggestion like that, Mr. Minister—post vacancies in some other central location in each community, so that other centres have the same opportunity for employment with the civil service?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will see.

Mr. Newman: You are doing that now?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, we are not.

Mr. Newman: Will you consider that, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister a question? As he knows, the head office of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is situated in my riding and many of his employees live there. The hon. Minister mentioned, I think last evening, about the engineers' assistants and some problems being ironed out here. One of the problems conveyed to me was that on the road they work a 40-hour week. When they come in, the work week is shorter. There was some question about pay. Has that been ironed out so that they know exactly where they are in that situation?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I might inform the hon. member that some adjustments have been made. The matter is still under consideration and the final determination has not yet been made. We are working on some change in the classification.

Mr. Young: And they will go on an hourly pay!

Vote 303 agreed to.

Vote 304 agreed to.

Vote 305 agreed to.

On vote 306:

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister with regard to 306, about the directives that come from the office? I have seen some of them. I asked the hon. Minister for copies of them, but I understand it is a little difficult to get them all, because there are so many of them. Are those directives based on legislation and regulations, or do they sometimes go out without any basis in regulations?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I may inform the hon. member that there are a great many of these. The manner which is followed in this man-

agement of personnel is to develop classifications. Once the salaries have been agreed upon, those classifications are brought to the Treasury board and usually approved. Then an order-in-council confirms the arrangement and that is the basis of the directive that goes out.

Mr. Young: Then, the directives go out that are based on an order-in-council.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Vote 306 agreed to.

On vote 307:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of matters I would like to raise here.

First, this may be an appropriate time to come back briefly to a point raised by my hon. friend from Wentworth East a few minutes ago, with regard to the position of the chairman of the civil service commission as chairman of the Ontario joint council. The Public Service Act is quite specific in providing that the civil service commission is a department and is responsible to the Minister for the administration of the Act. The Minister in this case happens to be the hon. Provincial Treasurer, although it could be any Minister designated by the Cabinet.

There are some jurisdictions where the civil service commission, or a comparable body, is in a sense an independent body. For example, in the government of Canada, it is accountable directly to Parliament. I am not saying that is of vital significance, but there is no question here but that the civil service commission is a department and an agency of the government, directly accountable to the government, through the Minister designated as the person responsible for the administration of the Act. Therefore, I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer—and I am not going on the basis of any complaints I have received, because I have received none—that it is not a good practice to have an agent of the government, sitting, shall we say, as the impartial chairman of the joint council.

The joint council, of course, is not a council in the normal sense. It is a bipartite body. There are four representatives from each side, but they act as a unit, and this is as it should be. Then there has to be a chairman who is not associated with either of them. Now, that cannot be as long as the civil service commission is in the position it is in; it cannot be regarded as an impartial body in these matters and its chairman cannot be regarded as an impartial person.

Therefore, the government should seek somebody entirely removed from the government service, in my opinion. This is certainly not intended as any reflection on the present chairman of the civil service commission. I would think that if anyone can act in this dual capacity and carry it off, he is very likely to be the one who could do it, but basically—

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Well, why bring it up then?

Mr. Bryden: Of course, matters of principle are completely beyond your comprehension. I suggest you just go back to sleep.

Mr. Edwards: You are yakking all the time.

Mr. Bryden: A person with one head cannot successfully wear two hats, and that is what the hon. Minister is suggesting the chairman of the civil service commission should do in this situation. In fact, the comments he made a few minutes ago lead me to believe he even may be wanting him to wear three hats. At any rate, it is quite clear from the Act itself, that he is asking him to wear two hats. I do not know whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer wishes to make any comments on that point.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the hon. member for Woodbine that if I thought that I could make him happy, I might decide to recommend that the chairman be changed. But I am not a bit sure that if I did even then he would be happy.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder you have difficult employee relations.

Mr. Gisborn: We want you to make some people happy who are looking for more money. You never make me dis-happy.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Let me say this, and I say this seriously, I would be the first to admit that when we arranged to negotiate salaries those who were going to undertake that task had not had even as much experience then as they have had now, and they were not what you could say tremendously experienced. It was thought that the chairman of the commission could be helpful in arranging to get these two groups together.

Our representatives on the joint council are all good men—Mr. McNab, the chairman, the Deputy Minister of Highways; Mr. Elborn, the Deputy Minister of Education; Mr. Metzler, the Deputy Minister of Labour,

and Mr. Walker, the associate Deputy Minister of Treasury. We did our best to pick good representatives from the management side, and I think this has been helpful. But I do not seem to be able to impress my hon. friends with the fact that the motive and ambition that we had was to make this work. We did what we thought was wise in that connection.

We may not always have this chairman of the civil service commission. If it would work better with some other chairman, certainly we will arrange to get some other chairman.

As I said last night, and I say again now, we are disappointed that we are not in negotiation, and that everything is being referred to a board of arbitration. This is of great concern to me, and I do not know what we will do, but we will do everything we can to change this situation. I hope that if you have any influence in areas that could bring this about, you will use it to do that.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to use my good influence—or whatever it may be—in the area where I think it is most urgent that it be exercised. The hon. Provincial Treasurer, I think, quite genuinely, wants to see the negotiation work; he wants to see a sound basis of understanding in mutual goodwill and confidence. But that does not come about through exhortation, Mr. Chairman. I say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer—and I am not trying to be critical at all—that on the basis of what he was saying yesterday, and on the basis of what he is saying today, the difficulty is that he—and I take it since he is speaking for the government—does not even understand what negotiations consist of. This is where the trouble arises. You see, there is a long history that unfortunately you have to live down if you are going to establish a sound, secure basis of staff relationship. For years, the government of this province flatly refused to consider even the proposition of negotiation. We had many battles in this House in past years on this matter. They just would not consider it; they wanted to maintain a paternalistic relationship where the civil servants and their representatives were nice little boys who could be patted on the head from time to time, and the government would make decisions when the chips were down.

As a matter of fact, this Public Service Act is shot through with that paternalistic attitude. All sorts of matters that should be settled by negotiation are actually, under the Act, determined arbitrarily by the government. Almost everything. I am not saying that continues to be the practice in all fields, but that

is still the philosophy in the Act. A paternalistic philosophy is written through this Act.

This was the attitude of the government until very recently, when it said it was prepared to negotiate—to use the joint council actually as an instrument of negotiation. That is a new type of departure that may take some doing to make it work. But, at any rate, the government wants to negotiate, but it is not going to be able to negotiate on a basis of mutual confidence and trust if it continues to hold on to the old paternalistic attitude that it had before, and take the position that every time something is not settled, it is because the other fellows are so unreasonable, and will not do it their way: “Let us be reasonable, fellows. Just accept what we say, and everything will be fine.”

Hon. Mr. Allan: Is the rank and file unhappy or is it just the leaders who are unhappy—

Mr. Bryden: Oh, yes, it is just the leaders who are unhappy, or it is just I who am unhappy. I do not give a hoot whether the hon. Provincial Treasurer makes me happy or not, but I would like to see him make some of these other people happy.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would just love to see you happy.

Mr. Bryden: The only trouble is that there are a lot of unhappy people with whom you are dealing and you are not making them happy; that is a little more to the point. You see, this sort of frivolous dismissal of a serious problem is not really a very good answer. The hon. Minister said that he spent three days in London, England, last year, talking to people connected with the British civil service. He found that their relationship is well-founded in mutual trust and goodwill. Well, I think that perhaps he might have found a few other things. He could have looked—

Hon. Mr. Allan: He looked around and saw both sides—

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but just a second. If he had looked a little further he would have found that that mutual confidence and goodwill is based on 40 years of solid negotiation, or what we in this country call collective bargaining—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is right. I realize that—

Mr. Bryden: Forty years of it. The British Treasury enters into signed, written agree-

ments with the recognized staff associations and they have been doing it for years. As a matter of fact, the Whitley councils—what we call the joint councils—are not the agency of collective bargaining. There is genuine collective bargaining, such as in industry, with signed agreements between the Treasury, which acts for the government and designated associations. The civil service over there, of course, is a much bigger and more complicated organization than we have here. They have several associations which make their job more complicated.

They have a solid base of negotiation and the Whitley council, or joint council, is just a further level of consultation erected on top of the fundamental basis of what we would call collective bargaining.

We do not have any of that sort of background at all, and we do not have any of the spirit that is implicit in it. I may say, incidentally, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer did not have to take a trip to London at the taxpayers' expense to discover what I have just been saying; it is all set forth with great clarity in a command paper issued by the British Treasury in 1955, which is on file right in the legislative library here, and set forth in somewhat less detail in Professor Frankel's book on "Staff relations in the civil service." You just cannot come back to the boys here and say: "Look, fellows, over in Britain they have mutual confidence and good faith and it is well established," and so on.

You are not going to get that spirit by exhortation. You have to get it by evidence of good faith on your side. That is the only way you can do it. You can exhort them until the cows come home; unless they can see it in what is happening, there is not going to be any real basis of good faith. My observation, and I have had substantial experience in the field of labour relations, is that where an employer genuinely does negotiate and takes the representatives of his employees into his confidence and treats them as adult human beings, he finds that he develops a sound basis of mutual confidence. But as long as he fails to do that he can exhort them all he likes; but all he will get will be more and more ill will, and more and more dissatisfaction, which seems to be the current condition in Ontario.

I would judge, from what the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said himself, that he hardly even gets started in negotiations. There is not even enough basis to get together and sit down and make a first step; it just goes bang!—off to arbitration. There is certainly no negotiating relationship there.

No doubt this is, in part, the fault of the civil service association. As the hon. Provincial Treasurer said, when the parties sat down in this joint council for the purposes of negotiation, they were both very inexperienced. That is probably true, and it will take a while to work out procedures that are satisfactory. But you still have got to treat the properly designated representatives of the employees with respect.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We do.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I raised a matter yesterday and the hon. Provincial Treasurer denied it. But I am going to raise it again today, because I cannot understand the basis for his denial. I raised the matter with him that in an important negotiation, in one of the most vital ones he has had to date, he went behind the backs of the association representatives, directly to the employees. I am telling him that as long as he does that he will never build up any mutual confidence and goodwill.

I refer to the first case that ever went to arbitration, relating to fringe benefits. This was, without going into all the details, and trying to summarize them as quickly as possible, under discussion for a substantial time and it appears that a deadlock had been reached. The question was referred to arbitration pursuant to The Public Service Act. Then the government stated that it had some sort of a committee investigating the matter, and it was thought that the arbitration procedures might well be left in abeyance until that committee reported that its recommendations might be a basis for further negotiation. So the arbitration proceedings were suspended. Then the report of the committee became available and Mr. Collins, as the chairman of the joint council, attempted in September to get the question back to the joint council; he advised the chairman of the arbitration board by letter of September 21, 1964, that he was doing that.

So there was an attempt, and I think a sensible attempt, to try to reopen negotiations on the basis of further information that the government had. I think the chairman of the joint council is to be commended for making that attempt.

There were, apparently, some discussions. Apparently some difficulties were encountered. The employee representatives were not willing to take what the government handed out in its infinite goodness and mercy, and take it as something they should be overjoyed about. They wanted to negotiate; they wanted to discuss the matter. This

immediately got the government's wind up. These fellows actually wanted to talk about it; they were not willing to take the government's proposition exactly as it was, so that seemed to indicate that we were going to be in trouble and there was going to be a breakdown. At any rate, the parties presumably were still supposed to be discussing it, because according to the arbitration award, under date of December 8, 1964, Mr. Collins, the chairman of the joint council, again wrote to the chairman of the arbitration board saying that the matter was once again officially on the agenda of the joint council for Monday, December 14. So the matter was on the agenda of the joint council for December 14 for negotiation. Mr. Collins also stated in his letter, according to the report I have here, that it looked as if there might be a breakdown in negotiations and the matter might have to go to arbitration, but as of that date negotiations had not broken down. According to this document, the matter was still to go before the joint council on Monday, December 14, for a last try at an understanding.

On December 7, that is one week before the date it was to go back to the joint council, Mr. A. T. C. McNab, the chairman of the official side, that is the government side of the Ontario joint council, undertook to circularize all the employees of the government. If the hon. Provincial Treasurer wants to know where I got that information, I got it from one of the bulletin boards here; it was posted all over the place. It was also sent, I believe, to the employees individually although I am not certain of that.

While negotiations were still in progress the government went behind the civil service association—the civil service association represented on the joint council—directly to the employees. How do you expect you are going to get a mature relationship on that basis? Mr. McNab's letter to the employees was headed "Government offer concerning employees' fringe benefits." It read as follows:

On November 13, 1964, the chief negotiators for the civil service association and the government agreed to recommend to their respective principals a basis for settlement of current negotiations concerning fringe benefits.

The civil service association, incidentally, denies that the negotiators had agreed to any such thing. However, that is not the point I am getting at. Quoting further from Mr. McNab's letter:

This settlement would have given civil

servants presently employed the following improved benefits—

then there is a list of alleged improved benefits which I will not read out unless the hon. Provincial Treasurer wants me to.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): They are not allegations, they are facts.

Mr. Bryden: Then, continuing from Mr. McNab's letter:

It is estimated that the above proposal would represent an estimated average annual saving of over \$140 in premiums to employees who currently have life insurance and comparable medical-surgical coverage for himself and his family. Unfortunately, the association board of directors did not ratify the recommendation of the chief negotiators, although the official side of the joint council and the government accepted it as the basis for settlement and the matter remains unresolved.

In other words, these terrible fellows over in the civil service association have stopped you good people from getting improved benefits. Continuing with Mr. McNab's letter:

Either party may again refer the issue to the Ontario joint council, and if no majority decision is possible the civil service arbitration board would reconvene to decide the matter on its merits.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, this letter was sent out while the matter was still officially under negotiation. It would have been bad enough if it had been sent out after negotiations had broken down—that, in my opinion, would be most reprehensible—but when it was sent out when there was even a glimmer of a chance that negotiations might be resumed, it was totally irresponsible.

It is not really of concern if what Mr. McNab said is right or not; it is the whole procedure that is involved. I do not know how one gets this across to the government because it seems to have no comprehension of what is involved in collective bargaining.

Let us put it this way: On the Treasury benches there are a number of lawyers—perhaps a third to a half of them are lawyers. I imagine that all of them, though probably not engaged in private practice now, have been so engaged in the past. Let them think of their position as a solicitor in this context.

Let us say they had a client who was engaged in certain negotiations with another person represented by another lawyer, and

let us say that the two parties were having some difficulties or that the two lawyers who were acting on instructions from their clients were having some difficulty in getting together. Then let us say that the lawyer for the other side went behind the back of the lawyer on this side, the Cabinet Minister who was in that capacity, went directly to his client and told him, "If that lawyer of yours was not such a hard guy to get along with we could get down to business and get an agreement that would be quite beneficial to you. You would get many of these benefits, but this lawyer of yours is standing in the way."

I do not know what any of these hon. gentlemen would do if they found themselves in that sort of situation, but I expect they would report the other lawyer to the law society. But this is what the government does with the civil service association. It runs into difficulty, so it has the chairman of its side on the joint council communicate directly with the employees, saying to them, "If it were not for that association that is supposed to be representing you, you could have all sorts of benefits. We could have a nice agreement that would benefit you all."

Yet in the face of that, the hon. Provincial Treasurer tries to tell us that he is really concerned about establishing a good relationship. It would seem to me that it should come home to him that he will never establish a good relationship that way. The civil service association is the representative of the civil servants. The government, if it wants to have a good relationship, will deal with their representative and with no one else. It will not try to go behind their backs. It will not try to undermine the confidence of the employees in their own association; yet that is essentially what this letter tries to do. It says, in effect, "We had a good settlement that would be good for you but your association turned it upside down."

Mr. MacDonald: Let us not blame Mr. McNab.

Mr. Bryden: No, I am not blaming Mr. McNab. I am quite certain that in a matter of this magnitude Mr. McNab would not act on his own initiative; I am sure he was acting exclusively—

Hon. Mr. Allan: He certainly did.

Mr. Bryden: The government has to take responsibility. I do not think we have to get into the ins and outs of his relationship with the government in this matter, but as

far as I am concerned the government has to take responsibility for what he does. He is the government's representative in these negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is the representative, and he is entirely free.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Allan: He is free. We are not looking over his shoulder all the time.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Provincial Treasurer mean to say then that his official side does not represent the government?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, I said they did.

Mr. Bryden: All right, if they represent the government then they are acting for the government and the government has to take responsibility for what they do. It may be impossible to persuade the hon. Provincial Treasurer even of that, I do not know. No wonder he is having trouble with negotiations if he is repudiating his own official representative, if that is what he has in mind.

As a matter of fact, when I saw this and saw what terrible people these civil service association people were, I phoned them up and asked them if they would let me have their side of this story. It would appear to me that they gave considerable thought to the question of whether or not they would send me anything but they did decide to send me a printed document. I suppose it would be a public document in any case, but I just want it understood they did not come to me—I went to them. They were not even sure that they would give it to me at first but they did give me this so that I would have both sides of the story. I think since I have read part of Mr. McNab's memo into the record, just to keep the picture honest, I should read at least part of their memo into the record.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No more than you do.

Mr. Bryden: This is from the civil service association, signed by W. J. Foster, president, and Harold Bowen, executive secretary. It is addressed: "To all Ontario public servants re the welfare package." It begins:

Do not be misled.

This shows a sound basis of understanding.

A. T. C. McNab, representing the official side of the Ontario joint council, has distributed a letter which by its omissions, distortions and inaccuracies is obviously aimed at undercutting the association.

I will not comment on their allegations of omissions, distortions and inaccuracies, but the charge that he is obviously aiming at undercutting the association is unquestionably true. What other purpose could it have? Quoting further:

These are the facts:

1. The government has never contributed one cent toward a welfare package.

2. The association first requested in 1956 government participation in Blue Cross and PSI Blue plan or equivalent plans.

This is a matter that obviously has been hanging fire for a long time.

3. A formal submission was placed before the new Ontario joint council in August 1963 for participation in OHSC replacing Blue Cross and PSI Blue plan or equivalent.

4. After repeated attempts to negotiate without success the association requested arbitration.

5. The Ontario joint council promised a decision by April 1, 1964, and the association withdrew from arbitration.

6. The promise was broken and the arbitration board sat on July 8, 1964. The arbitration board referred the matter back for negotiation on the government promise, again, that the government study would shortly be completed and a valuable package would be offered to all employees.

7. The report finally appeared in October 1964 and, in general, expressed the opinions of the committee rather than facts of research.

In other words it was just a propaganda document from the government.

8. They refuse to commit themselves on an effective date and will not talk about retroactivity.

Even after all this stalling they would not talk about retroactivity. These are the people who want to negotiate, according to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

9. They refuse to discuss participation in OHSC based upon a committee theory that OHSC premiums are taxes.

This is negotiating? In other words, you set all your terms and then say, "Well, fellows do it that way and then we will have a settlement."

10. They now offer 60 per cent for a medical-surgical plan and refuse to increase participation in this area to offset lack of participation in OHSC.

11. They propose an insured medical-surgical plan which would not be equivalent

to PSI and would remove benefits which the employees have paid out of their own pockets for years.

12. There was no agreement between the chief negotiators. The association negotiator remained available to seek agreement.

Now these are flatly contradictory statements. I do not think it is necessary here to try to determine who is right and who is wrong but it certainly shows the bad state, I would suggest, of feeling between the two parties.

13. The association counsel invited government counsel to continue negotiations on the areas of dispute.

14. Mr. McNab's letter was issued while the association was awaiting the reply from government counsel.

Now what kind of negotiating is this? The association invited government counsel to continue negotiations on the areas of dispute, and while the association was awaiting an answer on that, the government's representative sent a letter to the employees to try to destroy their confidence in their own association, to undermine their confidence in their representative. The hon. Prime Minister thinks that is a big joke. I would suggest—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I do not think it is a joke, I think you are a joke.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon? Well, I am going on the basis—

Mr. MacDonald: You are heading for an awful lot of trouble.

Mr. Bryden: They have already got it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: At any rate, the memo then contains a table which I will not read, comparing what the association was asking for and what the government was offering, and there is certainly a wide difference between the two and then it says:

Our demands are modest and represent far less than you would have received for many years past if you had been working for a good employer.

As I have already said, Mr. Chairman, I am not really inclined to ferret out the precise truth as between the various conflicting statements in these two documents. I do not think there is much point in trying to do that now, but I would like to impress upon the House and upon the hon. Provincial Treasurer the enormity of trying to go behind the backs of the official representatives as was clearly done in this case.

As a sort of a first test of negotiating procedures, the government did not really negotiate at all. It found that the association was making what it considered no doubt quite definite, and even perhaps unreasonable demands; and when it was found that they were continuing to do that, its answer was to do the thing that more than anything else was calculated to destroy confidence and respect.

Now I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he can make all the trips to London, England, that he wants, he can make all the exhortations that he wishes to the association, but as long as the government carries on in this way there will be no good faith. When I see some of the statements that the association is now issuing, I would say that staff relations in this government at this moment are in a terrible state.

I have known the officers of the association, I have known of their work for a good many years, and I would say that they are extremely cautious men who are very careful not to make extreme statements. Yet they seem to be being provoked more and more into what appear to me to be pretty extreme statements. I think the government, instead of taking the position that the hon. Provincial Treasurer takes—if only these fellows would be reasonable everything would be fine—instead of that, I suggest the government should look at its own record and see if there are not ways in which it could be reasonable; because, after all, the way two parties get together is by both seriously trying to be reasonable.

Some hon. members: Carried!

Mr. Bryden: Of course, these gentlemen over here could not care less about how anybody is treated, but this is probably one of the most important matters before the House, Mr. Chairman.

I would certainly like to have from the hon. Provincial Treasurer an explanation of that letter sent out by Mr. McNab. I would like to have an assurance from him that such a thing will never happen again, if he sees fit to give it.

I would like to have something more than just bland statements to indicate that in future there is going to be a genuine effort on the part of the government to produce good relations; not to blame everything on the other fellow, not to exhort them, but to just look at its own records and do everything possible to establish a genuine negotiating relationship. We certainly have not got that yet. We may have a statutory basis for it,

but we have not got the true spirit of negotiation yet.

Vote 307 agreed to.

On vote 308:

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, just a minute.

During the presentation of these estimates, I have resented the statement that we went behind persons backs, that we set traps and that we manoeuvred. I say that that is entirely incorrect. I cannot appreciate the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine when he would stand up and say in this House that we have done nothing by way of fringe benefits for our civil service.

Mr. Bryden: No, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, you—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, I said—

Mr. Chairman: The statement is out of order.

Mr. Bryden: I am sure I am entitled to correct a mistake.

I said no such thing. It is unfortunate that the hon. Provincial Treasurer apparently cannot understand what is being said. My remarks were directed entirely to your method of dealing with these people, not to the merits of fringe benefits at all.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, they were not.

Mr. Bryden: Well, does the hon. Provincial Treasurer have to accept my statement or not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I am tired of him refusing to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, my recollection of the hon. member's statement was that we had paid nothing for insurance, that we have paid nothing. He created the impression that we have done nothing by way of fringe benefits.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: What the hon. Provincial Treasurer is referring to is a statement that I read from the civil service association; and I told him that I did not know all the ins and

outs of the specific facts, but this was a statement they made at a specific time. It could be wrong. Certainly I did not make that statement. I do not say that you have done nothing about fringe benefits.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I accept the explanation because, after all, the contribution that we have made to fringe benefits of our employees is one of the highest in the whole province—22 per cent of salary. How many employers have contributed that much? The purpose of the negotiations was largely to readjust. We recognize, as well as the employees recognize, that it would be better if this were adjusted and that something might be reduced and other benefits increased.

I listened to the statements from the hon. members opposite in connection with the visit of some of our people to London where they visited an insurance company. We were told that we sneaked around the back of the civil service association, that we were acting unilaterally. As I stated last night, I did not know who had gone to London, but I know now and I am going to tell you. This is the statement of that particular incident. I will begin at the beginning.

Active negotiation began between the government and the association, through their negotiators responsible to their respective sides, at the joint council in September, 1964. From the outset, the government suggested a medical-surgical plan similar to the group medical-surgical plan of the public service in Ottawa. This is the only public service that I know of that has such a plan, and because this covers 200,000 members of the federal civil service and the armed forces, we thought that this could be a guide. It was recommended to the government by the advisory committee on fringe benefits. It is the only such plan in Canada, as I have already mentioned, to which the employer contributes, and which is of a magnitude to provide useful comparisons with a plan for the Ontario civil service.

The federal government plan was referred to in the government's proposal of October 29, 1964, and also formed part and parcel of the government's presentation to the civil service arbitration board at its hearings in January, 1965.

During the last six months the government has been contacted by numerous insurance companies and other carriers such as Physicians Services Incorporated and Associated Medical Services. Discussions have taken

place with representatives of several of these organizations, both before and after the receipt of the arbitration award on March 1, 1965.

The civil service association has also been contacted by prospective carriers of group insurance plans and has held discussions with representatives of some of these organizations. These include organizations which have been in touch with the government as well as some who have not. The association has retained as its consultant in this whole affair an agent of a life insurance company.

The London Life Insurance Company approached the government concerning the group insurance programme as early as December, 1964, on behalf of itself and a number of other insurance companies. These insurance companies are the principal carriers of the federal government's medical-surgical plan and one of these firms administers the plan.

In February it was suggested by representatives of the London Life that it might be helpful if representatives of the government and the association met with them in London to discuss some of the problems that a group insurance plan of this size might encounter. As a representative of the group of companies who insure and administer the federal plan, they were in a particularly good position to provide such helpful information.

The meeting of February 27, which took place at the suggestion of the insurance company, was attended by the executive secretary of the civil service association, Mr. Bowen, the government's director of staff relations and a member of the Treasury board staff. At this meeting there was a general consideration of the group life and group medical-surgical programme. The information was in response to questions raised concerning administrative problems.

Certain approximate premium rates were discussed, based on life insurance coverage that had previously been agreed to by the government and the association; based on the federal government medical-surgical plan, which had formed part of the government's proposal since the previous September, and based on questions asked by both the government's and the association's representatives at the meeting concerning approximate cost of including or deleting certain kinds of specific health benefits. At no time were any firm quotations given or received.

These discussions did not relate in any way to the arbitration award, which had not yet been received by the parties. No one knew what it was. Any reference to the

federal government medical-surgical plan was due to the fact that the government had made proposals based on this plan during the previous five months and also due to the fact that the insurance company, as one of the principal carriers of the federal plan, was in a position to offer useful information based on it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you if that is going around behind the back of the civil service association?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, it is not the fact that they were going around behind the association's back; it is that the civil servants for years were paying 100 per cent out of their own pockets and had what they thought was top-quality medical coverage from PSI, but here were the insurance companies in cahoots with the government and going around PSI.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, come off it now; we spend so much of our time straightening out your facts and when you do get them you will not accept them. You cannot take the facts that have been given to you here now and continue to reiterate that this government is in cahoots with any insurance company. You have been playing this tune for too long and it simply is not so and accept the fact.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Yorkview asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer some two or three weeks ago for an assurance that when tenders were put out for this coverage it would be a general tender to everybody, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer at that time had to be equivocal. He would not state specifically that it was going to be for everybody, and there is no doubt in the wide world that for a certain stage in the negotiations it was going to go to the insurance companies—

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is absolutely false.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Talk about drawing red herrings.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder you have bad relations with your employees.

Mr. Bryden: The reason for the bad relations is obvious, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer told me he resented greatly my suggestion that the government went behind—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do, because it is not true.

Mr. Bryden: I presented the evidence to you.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You certainly did not.

Mr. Bryden: Are you denying that this letter was on the bulletin board in this building? I saw it with my own eyes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: That is a statement of fact. There is nothing in there that was not correct.

Mr. Bryden: You see, Mr. Chairman, here is the difficulty. I am telling the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he will never have good relations with his employees because he does not understand what it is all about.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I will not go to the hon. gentleman for advice.

Mr. Bryden: It might be a good idea if you went to someone for advice because you apparently need it. You obviously did not learn much from the people in Britain because they would not think of doing a thing like this.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Neither would the Opposition there stir up trouble among the civil servants.

Mr. Bryden: Let us forget that old red herring. Are you accusing me of stirring up trouble in the civil service?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: In other words, everybody is to blame but you people. The civil service association is in a very bad state so far as its relations with you are concerned, but that is its fault. We dare to raise a matter of public policy here and we are stirring up trouble. You see, this is the attitude of the government, its smug complacency. Everybody is wrong except them. They can learn nothing.

But I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that it is still time he tried to learn something, because whether or not the statements here are true, is not the point. There is real dispute as to whether they are true. The civil service association says that many of them are not true. I am not even interested in trying to decide whether they are true or not. What I am trying to get across to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and it seems impossible to get it into his head, is that even if every single thing there is true, this is the surest way in the world to create bad relations with your staff. They have an association. You recognize the association as, in effect, the counsel for the employees. It is their spokesman. When a group of people have a spokesman, surely you deal with the spokesman.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He always says it six times.

Mr. Bryden: You should not go behind backs, but that is what you did. You went directly to the employees, instead of dealing with their designated spokesman and in a letter—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the hon. member for Yorkview wanted me to do.

Mr. Bryden: Would you just stay out of this? You have nothing to contribute at all.

An hon. member: You haven't!

Mr. Bryden: The trouble is that anything in this realm is so far above the heads of these gentlemen they cannot understand it. But I would suggest to them that they might do a little reading in the field. At least I would suggest that they read the British Treasury paper of 1955 that I referred to, which is in the library. You see, if they would bother to burden themselves with a few facts, they might have a better understanding of these matters. That document, I might say, is only about 25 pages long, so they could read it in quick order. I would certainly suggest that anyone who read that would never think of this type of thing. I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that this letter from Mr. McNab—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. Bryden: Well, it depends what it is.

Hon. Mr. Allan: A reasonable question, not in the heat of discussion. If you had been representing government in these negotiations and these discussions, and circulars such as you have mentioned—by now, probably 20—had been sent out by the employee association accusing the government and accusing our joint council of things that they had not done, would you have never sent out a circular stating the facts as they were at that time?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if I was dealing with an association—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No—

Mr. Bryden: Do you want an answer, or do you not? You see, the trouble with you is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: If I was negotiating with an association such as the civil service associa-

tion of Ontario, with a long record as a respectable and very restrained, I would say excessively restrained organization—and it was sending out memos along the lines that I have seen, I have not seen as many as you say there are, I have only seen a couple, I did not know there were as many—I would certainly be trying to understand why it was that relations were so bad. That should not be an association with which it is difficult to deal, but as long as the hon. Treasurer of the government takes the position that the association is always wrong—whenver there is a dispute it is the association that is wrong—there will never be good relations.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You just cannot understand.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He can understand, but he does not want to.

Mr. Bryden: This is the position that the hon. Provincial Treasurer himself has taken right in this House. Every time a matter that has been in dispute has come before us, his statement has been to the effect that the association was difficult to get along with—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I never said the association was difficult to get along with.

Mr. Bryden: The government was being so reasonable.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have never said that the association was difficult to get along with. As I said yesterday, your great ambition is to provoke me to say that, and I am not going to say it.

Mr. Bryden: Yesterday that was not what you said I was going to provoke you into saying. What I was then supposed to be trying to provoke you into saying, you said today from a prepared statement. It was to the effect that the civil service association had been at fault, in effect, because of the difficulty the cleaning women found themselves in. This is your basic position in every statement you have made—that the government has been thoroughly reasonable, but for some reason or other these people do not want to accept your propositions.

Would negotiation not involve differences? You put forward something you think is reasonable and the other fellows do not think it is reasonable, so you think about it and talk about it for a while and then maybe you see it is not quite as reasonable as you think and that maybe they have a point of view. Why not just consider the possibility? But no; they are sending out memos or

circulars or whatever they are that you say are unfair. Maybe they are. Were you not implying that those were unfair or unreasonable to you?

Hon. Mr. Allan: They did not represent the situation.

Mr. Bryden: Oh. They were false, in other words. So they were sending out memos that you think are false, but the basic point apparently does not come home to the hon. Provincial Treasurer in any form at all, except that these people are terribly unreasonable. He tries to justify the sort of thing that I have held up so many times, on that basis. A while ago he was denying that he had gone behind the backs of the association, but obviously he cannot deny that. Now, what he is presumably trying to say is that the government had a reason for going behind their backs.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This was not going behind anyone's back.

Mr. Bryden: It certainly was!

The association represents these people and you are going around behind the association directly to the people. It is on all fours with a situation in which one lawyer went directly to the client of another lawyer, bypassing that client's lawyer. This is exactly on all fours with that.

As I understand it, that is considered to be most unethical conduct in the law fraternity, and I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that it is most unethical conduct in staff relationships. I would suggest to him that as long as he thinks that sort of thing is all right, there is no hope for sound labour relations in this province.

The fault is essentially on the side of the government, because it will not even try to negotiate in good faith. It wants to retain its ancient, antiquated, paternalistic attitude while presumably pretending to go through the forms of negotiation.

It is no use trying to blame me for trying to stir up trouble. The hon. Minister had his trouble long before I opened my mouth about the matter. Except with respect to the cleaning women, I have not said anything about staff relations in the public service in several years. I was waiting, hoping that a better relationship would be worked out; but as far as I can see it is just as bad as it was five years ago, or twenty years ago. I see little hope for improvement unless the hon. Provincial Treasurer and the government sit down and honestly reconsider their

whole position and attitude in relation to the association.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 308 carried?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the hon. Minister's attention a matter, in a reasonable way if possible, a matter which I do not think is a subject of negotiation because this has been petitioned.

The paydays come on about the 9th and the 24th of each month, and when those dates fall on Saturdays and Sundays, the nearest day is payday. But a case such as we face this weekend, where the 24th comes on the Monday, which is a holiday, then payday does not come until Tuesday.

It seems to me in a case like this it might well be for the government to look into the possibility of payday coming on the Friday prior to the holiday if the holiday falls on a Monday. This just seems to me to make sense and it would help in the general employee relationship.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am very sympathetic to your suggestion.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer if this vote that is headed employee relations refers to a branch or other unit within the civil service commission? Is this a separate unit or branch?

Hon. Mr. Allan: This is public information branch, really. We have been endeavouring to strengthen this. We have published a magazine for almost a year now.

Mr. Bryden: It has nothing to do with labour relations?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Vote 308 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Civil Service.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present to the hon. members the estimates of The Treasury Department. With their permission, I will, in my opening remarks, express large amounts in rounded figures.

The total ordinary expenditure for 1965-66 is forecast at \$176.7 million, consisting of \$30 million in departmental expenses and \$146.7 million for expenditure in connection with the public debt. This is an increase over the estimate for the previous fiscal year of \$21.9

million, of which \$9.9 million is for departmental expenses and \$12 million for public debt expenditure.

The above amounts are gross payments on ordinary account, and thus do not represent the net cost to the government. Offsetting these gross payments for 1965-66 are \$1 million in reimbursement of expenditures by the Province of Ontario Savings Office, and \$33.7 million consisting mainly of interest on moneys loaned, advanced or invested by the province. Taking into account these applications of revenue to expenditure, the total net ordinary expenditure is forecast at \$142 million. This is an increase of \$14.1 million over the estimate for the previous fiscal year, of which \$9.8 million is for departmental expenses and \$4.3 million for net expenditure on the public debt.

I now propose to review the estimates for departmental expenditure, and then turn to expenditure on public debt.

About two-thirds of the increase in departmental expenses is attributable to two new items included in the estimates this year. These are a payment of \$4,131,000 on the unfunded liability of the public service superannuation fund, and an estimated contribution of \$2,500,000 for the employee group insurance plan which will commence this year.

The payment to the public service superannuation fund is being made in accordance with section 7 of the regulations under The Pension Benefits Act. The amount represents interest at 5 per cent on the initial unfunded liability of the plan as determined by updating the liability shown by the last actuarial report to January 1 of this year. The interest payable is at an annual rate calculated to prevent an increase in the initial unfunded liability of the plan.

The statutory payments to the public service superannuation fund are also included in the estimates of Treasury Department. In the coming fiscal year, these payments are estimated at \$13,675,000, an increase of \$2,183,000 over the estimate for the previous fiscal year.

During the past year, the staff relations branch of Treasury board has been established. This branch is important to our overall personnel policy in that it provides staff to carry out the government's side of negotiations with the civil service association. The branch has already proven its usefulness, and plays a significant role in negotiations on behalf of the official side of the Ontario joint council.

The Ontario committee on taxation is now

concluding its work, and is expected to submit its report later in the year. The coming year will be especially active for the research staff of the department, as they will be examining the committee's report, as well as those of the tax committees reporting in other jurisdictions. They will also be co-operating with other departments and governments in the development of studies and material for the tax structure committee, which was set up at the last federal-provincial conference in April, 1964.

The coming year will be a notable one in the history of The Treasury Department, with the opening of the Treasury building which is now nearing completion. The centralization of departmental functions within one building will enable us to carry out Treasury operations more efficiently and effectively than is possible at present. By providing space in provincially owned buildings for employees now occupying rented office space, we will also be effecting a real dollar saving.

It is appropriate to note here that under the Treasury board, an active programme of records management has been commenced. Members generally will be aware that The Treasury Department has custody of all expenditure vouchers. The accumulation of these has reached the point that disposal of such old records is essential. With the concurrence of the provincial auditor and the provincial archivist, we have adopted as a first step, the policy of disposing of such records which are more than 20 years old.

Studies have recently been made by the revenue division staff with a view to improving the operations of several tax branches. Certain operations of the retail sales tax and corporations tax branches are being transferred to the department's computer. This process is extending over a period of time and, together with the implementation of the recommendations contained in the above-mentioned studies, is expected to produce a more efficient operation and a more effective use of staff. We do not expect that there will be any excess staff as a result of these changes, but rather that a better utilization of staff will result, together with improvements in administration which were not hitherto possible at a reasonable cost.

A few comments are in order on the subject of awards to breeders of thoroughbred and standard-bred horses and, generally, on the Ontario racing commission. By statute, the object of the commission is to govern, direct, control and regulate horse racing in Ontario in any or all of its forms. It is our view that the commission has carried out this object to the point where horse racing in

Ontario has reached a high standard, and in so doing provides a recreational outlet for thousands, employment for many, encourages the breeding of good stock, and, I might add, contributes substantially to the revenues of this province.

A comparison with ten years ago may be of interest. The proceeds of the race tracks tax has grown from \$3,950,000 in 1954-55 to an estimated \$9,200,000 in 1964-65, an increase of 133 per cent. In the same period, awards to breeders of thoroughbreds have gone from \$28,910 to \$73,519, while awards to breeders of standard bred have gone from nil to \$80,781. In 1964, more than 675 breeders received grants, the total of which represented only $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the race tracks tax. It is worthy of note also that in 1964, awards to breeders of standard bred exceeded for the first time the awards to breeders of thoroughbreds.

The estimates for The Treasury Department also provide for capital disbursements of \$129.5 million. These consist mostly of loans and advances and repayments from special funds, and consequently do not have a direct bearing on the province's net debt. Loans and advances are estimated at \$114 million, the principal being the advances to the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation of \$100 million and to the Ontario Junior Farmer Establishment Loan Corporation of \$12.5 million. Of the \$15.4 million to be repaid from special funds, the major item will be the payment of allowances, refunds, and so on, of \$14.8 million under The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Turning now to expenditures on public debt, it is noted that expenditures thereon are estimated at \$146.7 million in the coming year. This includes provision for sinking fund of \$41.5 million to continue our debt management policy, which is directed towards an orderly retirement of the public debt. The remaining \$105 million is the estimated gross cost of interest, and so on, on the debt. Offsetting this cost are, as I have mentioned, receipts of interest, and so on, of \$33.7 million on loans, advances and investments, leaving an estimated net cost to the province for interest, etc., on the public debt of \$71.5 million. This net cost of servicing the debt represents about 4.9 per cent of the province's total net ordinary and capital expenditures, and is equivalent to about three weeks' revenue.

In connection with the public debt, I would point out to the House that, in relation to the huge capital programme that has been carried out, the increase in net debt in recent

years has been reasonable. In the three fiscal years ending March 31, 1965, while we have created physical assets estimated at more than \$700 million, our net debt has increased by an estimated \$214 million to \$1,423 million. Thus, over this period, we have been able to finance, including provision for sinking fund, close to 70 per cent of our capital programme out of current revenue. I would also note that the increase in net debt over the past three years has averaged \$71.4 million per annum, or \$31.4 million less than the average increase in the preceding three years.

In concluding my remarks, I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation to the officers and staff of the department. They have carried out their duties with diligence, care and dispatch, and I also wish to acknowledge my debt to my colleagues on the Treasury board. The fact that the board met on 88 separate occasions during the past fiscal year is an indication of the tasks carried out by the board and by its members in the continuous study of the financial affairs of the government.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words about the estimates of The Treasury Department. I noticed that my hon. friend was the soul of brevity in his introduction to these estimates and it may be that I can follow suit. I do not want to traverse the whole ground that is embodied in the Treasury estimates. Some of my hon. colleagues, no doubt, will have something to say about the various items that go to make up the estimates as a whole. I want to deal particularly and in some depth with one or two items in the estimates that are of prime concern to me and I think to many other people in the province.

My manner in dealing with these will not be a particularly critical one—not that I would not like to be critical with my hon. friend, but it seems to me that in these areas I wish to discuss I can do it by suggesting where I think the policies of the government in power have been in error, and where it would serve the public purpose if these policies were changed.

I want to talk for a little while on the provincial savings bank. I have been a long time in the Legislature and have grown up almost with this bank. I want to say at once, Mr. Chairman, that I am very disappointed in the manner in which not only this government has failed in its opportunity, I would say, to make the provincial savings bank a real

development bank for the province of Ontario, but the previous Liberal government has failed as well.

I remember one time in Mr. Hepburn's day, when he first came into power, we were finding difficulty in those days in getting the bankers to buy our bonds, so I am told, and Mr. Henry had difficulty before he left the ship—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That was the problem.

Mr. Oliver: —and we inherited that difficulty in some measure after the new government came into office. I was thinking that the provincial savings bank was used by Mr. Hepburn in those days as a threat against the banks if they would not come across. He would use the facilities that he thought he saw in the provincial savings bank to get out of the financial dilemma that the province was in at that time.

Of course, we did not have to use the facilities of the banks. Whether they would have been sufficient to alter the crisis by themselves or not, of course, I do not know. But the point I want to make is that after that little flurry, when it seemed as if the bank had a useful purpose and that it might serve in the public life of this province, it has subsided into a position of inactivity from that day to this. At the moment, stagnation would be the only word that one could apply that would describe with any accuracy at all, the position of the Ontario provincial savings bank.

We have an opportunity, I think—and I want to deal at some length with this. The figures reveal that the assets of the bank are little more today than they were ten years ago. If I can find the figures I will give them to you.

These are the figures, Mr. Chairman, that indicate that while other banks and lending institutions and new trust companies are coming into being every day and working to grasp a part of the savings of the people into their institutions, while all these institutions have grown by leaps and bounds in the last ten years, the provincial savings bank of this province has failed to keep company with

that forward march. Indeed, one could look at the figures and would find that in 1958 the total assets of the provincial savings bank were some \$79,100,000; in 1964, eight years later, and eight years in which there was a buoyant activity in the financial field when all these banks and trust companies were increasing their deposits and increasing their assets, we have fallen from \$79 million in 1958 to \$78 million in 1964. That, I suggest, is progress in reverse and it more than suggests that this bank is the forgotten child insofar as the governmental activity is concerned. It has lost its purpose; it can see no hope of coming into its own, no hope of living up to the original intention of those who wrote the law that brought into being this provincial savings bank. I want to deal with that, Mr. Chairman, for a moment or so.

On page 47 of the Revised Statutes of 1960, you will find The Agricultural Development Finance Act. The first section says:

The Treasurer of Ontario may borrow money by means of deposit in any amounts and from any persons and may open offices for this purpose at such places in Ontario as he finds expedient.

Then, in clause 3, the purposes for which this bank was founded, the purposes that were seen by those who framed the Act as being the road that this bank could follow to serve a public service. It says:

Moneys borrowed under this Act shall be used for any of the following purposes: for the public service—

surely that is all-inclusive and very wide:

—for works carried on by the commissioners on behalf of Ontario; for the covering of any debt of Ontario on open account; for paying any floating indebtedness of Ontario, and for the carrying on of public works authorized by the Legislature of the province of Ontario.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman—and I want to buttress that suggestion with some argument—that if it pleases your honour, I will leave it for a few minutes.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATA

(Tuesday, May 11, 1965)

Page	Column	Line	Correction
2768	1	37	Change to read: Father Bowers, in his dissent, said:
2770	2	53	Change to read: much further. Father Bowers said that the
2780	2	17	Change to read: by the shortage of staff, one must proceed.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 20, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan, continued 3157

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to 3182

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (continued)

On vote 2201:

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had put on record the pertinent sections of The Agricultural Development Finance Act, the legislation out of which the provincial savings offices grew, and I had enumerated the two sections of the Act which set out the purposes to which the savings bank or offices would apply themselves.

I want to make particular reference to the second one, in which the provincial savings offices were given the power, as I read it, to borrow money under this Act to be used for any of the following purposes: the public service, carrying on public works authorized by the Legislature, and so on.

I want to make particular reference to that quotation from the Act itself. I think we, in the House tonight, can marvel at the foresight of those who drew up this Act in the early 1920s. I think we should be happy indeed that the founders of the provincial savings bank saw in those offices an instrument by which and through which the development of the province could be enhanced and under which it could make progress.

I think it is rather interesting to recall that in the early 1920s it was foreseen that a development agency of some sort would be necessary if the full potential of the province was to be realized, and if it was necessary in the 1920s then certainly a development agency—call it a bank or savings office or whatever you like—is a thousandfold more necessary today.

We have, as we know, in most of the provinces of Canada, some sort of development agency. We have had the new suggestion—I guess that is all it is as yet—from the federal government that it is setting up a development agency. We have the province of Quebec actively in that field. Then I have on my desk Bill No. 50, which was passed in

1962 I believe, setting up a tremendous organization in the province of Quebec to foster development and to give support and aid to ventures which will distribute industry throughout the province and make for a balanced economy across the length and breadth of the province.

We have, of course—someone will be quick to remind me—a development agency in the province of Ontario. I want to say at once and as quietly as I can that I believe that agency up until the present time has been a dismal failure. It has been a dismal failure from two or three points of view.

In the first place the money that has been expended for the purposes contained in its legislation has been meagre in comparison with the problems that have to be met throughout the length and breadth of this province. The total amount of money lent by this organization to date would not do justice to the needs of one large municipality in the province of Ontario let alone to the whole ambit of the province.

Another thing is this, that in this development agency in this province there is no provision for the participation of the man and the woman on the street—the people generally throughout the province. I believe that it is fundamental for any development agency to have supporting it, the tens and the twenties and the hundreds of people scattered throughout the length and breadth of this province. I think they should and must be participants in a scheme that is going to be worthwhile, a scheme that is going to lend itself to the more even development of the province, a scheme that has as one of its main objectives the decentralization of industry, the helping of industry to start in those areas where at the moment it is difficult to sustain industry, and thus cut down this ever-increasing concentration of industry in a small area of the province.

Our future, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, will not be built soundly on a further concentration of industry in a small localized area of the province, but it will be established and it will be enhanced if we take note that half of our province is wealthy and the other

half poor and if we see to it that those areas which need industry and which need the development that industry gives and the stability that it gives are helped through a development agency.

We are not going to do it, I suggest, with the kind of money we are spending and the kind of agency we have set up in the province at the present time. This agency, and I do not want to be unkind—I do not know why I should not be, but I do not want to be particularly—which has been set up in the province, up until the present time has been a sort of salvage organization. It has been a rescue mission. It has gone in where the industries are in difficulty, where they are almost bankrupt, and attempted to save them.

That, to my mind, is not the primary function of a development agency. That may be one of its tasks, maybe a small portion of its agenda perhaps, but the main function of a development agency—and it has not been seized by the one we have in this province, I can say that—is to reach out into the areas in this province that need development, and to stabilize industry that is already there, and to make provision for getting new industry in areas that must have new industry if they are going to survive and if they are going to play their full part in the overall development of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, the day has come in respect to our provincial savings bank, when one of two things must happen. We cannot allow the provincial savings bank to die a lingering death. That is what is happening to it at the present time. I still feel that there is a great role for the provincial savings bank in this province, if we breathe into that organization the lifeblood that we should inject into it, that it is capable of receiving and responding to. If we do that, it can become the real development agency of this province.

I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, why we cannot pay four per cent on deposits in the provincial savings bank. I cannot see why we cannot use the provincial savings bank as an agency through which we can sell provincial bonds in this province of Ontario. I think that is a field we have not tapped at all in Ontario. I think we would find, if we put our hearts behind this endeavour, that the response of the people of this province would be beyond our present dimensions of thinking. I believe that Ontario people want to be a part of the overall even development of this province. I think they want their money to count in the further development of this province of Ontario.

We have missed, I suggest, a golden opportunity in the past in that we have not asked

them to contribute, in that we have not asked them to be shareholders and to be participants in the growing prosperity of the province. We can use the provincial savings bank as an instrument, as a focal point, through which we can induce and persuade the people of this province to invest in the province itself and in its future progress.

There are some, of course, who will say that we should not be competing with the other lending institutions. I do not share that view at all. I think we have a right and an obligation to collect money from our people for our own affairs, to finance our own undertakings as a province. I am sure that that would not be unfair competition. To me it would be good business and I say in concluding this portion of my remarks that there is a responsibility on this government at this time, in view of the condition of the provincial savings bank and in view of the fact that it is a dying organization at the moment, that either we shut up shop so far as the provincial savings banks are concerned or else we realize their potential and move to tap that potential in its full.

I am one of those who feels that we have the organization at the moment—20-some branches throughout this province—which can become the nucleus for a development policy in this province that will overshadow that which any other province in this country has. We will be missing a golden opportunity for the good of our province if we do not grasp this opportunity when it is presented to us.

I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) that he take this very serious matter under active consideration.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we can delay decision on it very much longer. Either we go ahead with the provincial savings banks or we admit defeat and abandon them. We are standing at the crossroads, and I hope we move in the direction of utilizing to the full the ability of the provincial savings bank to be a great instrument for good in the public life and the economic life of the province of Ontario.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer said something in his remarks about The Racetracks Tax Act and racing in general in the province of Ontario. I want to say a few words about that matter. I agree with my hon. friend that betting at races has certainly increased during this last number of years; I think there is a growing indication that it will increase even more. One is not safe to prophesy just how great the dimensions of interest will be that people will have racetracks in the future, but I am sure they will grow and one can

look at figures and get an indication of what is happening.

In The Racetracks Tax Act, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer will know, there is a provision for a five per cent tax on the part of the province. This five per cent is subject to change by regulation. I want to review for a moment with the House some of the changes that have taken place in this tax imposition during the last number of years. In 1944, the tax was ten per cent; in 1950 it was 12 per cent; in 1953 it was eight; in 1954 it was seven, and in 1956 it was six. In other words, it has been six per cent since 1956.

Let us trace for a moment what is happening in respect to the amount of money wagered on the tracks. In 1943, with the five per cent tax we collected \$1 million on wagering of some \$21 million. In 1944, with a ten per cent tax, we collected \$2.2 million on wagerings of some \$22 million. In 1950, with a 12 per cent tax, we collected \$4.1 million on wagerings of \$32.9 million. In 1951 to 1964 the tax was reduced to eight per cent and then to seven and then to six in 1956.

In 1964, with a six per cent tax, the one that has been invoked for the last eight years, we collected \$5.9 million on bets of \$99.4 million. That, of course, is in the thoroughbred section. When you come to standard breeds, you find that in 1960, there was \$8.6 million wagered. In 1964, there was \$57.4 million bet on tracks and we got a tax this last year of \$3.4 million.

I think we should look at that in this way. In New York state, for instance, the wagering last year was some \$703 million, just in that area. They collected by a ten per cent imposition, some \$74 million. During the years, they have steadily increased the amount of the tax, and while the amount of the tax went up, the wagering and the betting still increased on the tracks. I am saying that, to recall that in Mr. Frost's time, in 1956, when the debate was carried on when he lowered the tax to six per cent, some of us opposed the lowering to six. We asked Mr. Frost to tell us why it was being lowered to six per cent in 1956. I remember very clearly his explanation at that time. He said that he felt and the government felt that if we taxed too high, if we had the rate much above six per cent, then we would get into the area where the law of diminishing returns applied.

Now, I did not believe that then and I do not believe it now. I think we could have held to our higher tax rate and we would have found today that the figures on betting at the tracks would be comparative to what

they are. I mean the tax, so long as it is not an exceptionally high tax, it seems to me has little or nothing to do with the amount of money that is bet and with the number of people who participate in the sport of kings, as it is called.

I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, in all sincerity, that I think it is time we had a look at this tax in the province of Ontario. When we need money as badly as my hon. friend pretends to need it, then certainly if we had an impost in 1950 of 12 per cent, there is not any justification at all for having an impost of six per cent in 1964; none whatever. I suggest that particular industry is not contributing its just share to the revenues of this province. I make that suggestion for an analysis to my hon. friend at this time.

My hon. friend said something when he was speaking about the breeder award grants. I want to say just a word on that as I conclude because I feel, for one, that these grants to breeders who have winning horses is necessary in this province if we are going to maintain and if we are going to increase the calibre of the horses at the tracks. I think it is necessary.

In the debate last year, the House will recall that we did not have any figures to indicate what each recipient receives by way of award. These figures are now available and I want to again reiterate that in my opinion these grants are necessary for the improvement of the calibre of horses in this province; but I do suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, in all sincerity, that I think that the government of this province of Ontario should not be paying those awards. I believe that the industry itself is well enough established in this province and has the interest of increasing the breed of horses so much in mind that they themselves should pay their breeders' award and not the provincial government.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oliver: The state of New York, as my hon. friend probably knows, pays nothing by way of breeder awards. The industry as a whole pays those awards. I think it is time in this province that we revamp our legislation, our grant system, to the point where we would say to the industry that we believe these awards are necessary but that they should pay them and not the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I am happy to associate myself with at least

some of the remarks that my hon. friend from Grey South has made. His eloquent presentation of certain subjects, makes it unnecessary for me to deal with them at any length.

I was particularly interested in his comment upon the savings offices. A few years ago the hon. Provincial Treasurer, before one of the standing committees—I forget which one it was—said that he was going to look into ways and means of expanding the operations of the savings offices because he regarded them as a useful source of funds for the Treasury of the province. I have been raising that matter with him every year, I think, since he made that comment. Needless to say he has done nothing about it, but he said that a few years ago.

I have been raising the matter with him every year since, more or less at any rate, and last year I recall that he said that the trust companies are now offering such high interest rates on savings deposits that it is hardly worth the government's while to look upon the savings offices as a source of short-term capital.

That may be true—I am not completely sure that it is true and I have not yet clarified the matter to my own satisfaction, but let us assume that it is true. I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he could look upon the savings offices as a source of long-term capital. I would suggest to him in particular that it would be much better to raise long-term capital through voluntary savings than through the method now envisaged in the Canada Pension Plan of imposing a levy on the poor to force them to make capital available for some of the capital requirements of the provinces and municipalities.

I think that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should again look at ways and means of expanding the operations of the savings offices. Those offices, as I understand—and I confirmed my understanding with the hon. member for Grey South who is quite familiar with the entire history of these operations—were first established by the Drury government in 1921. Every government that succeeded that Drury government would have liked to have ditched them, but they never quite dared to do so.

Instead, my hon. friend for Grey South has suggested, they tried to destroy them by attrition. I think it is a significant indication of the fact that people want these savings offices that they have survived. Notwithstanding the fact that succeeding governments have done everything possible to torture them

to death, they are still there; but the government makes them as unattractive as possible and as inaccessible as possible.

At a time when trust companies are moving to shopping plazas and engaging in what used to be regarded as a most undignified form of advertising, the government does nothing to promote the savings offices. It makes no effort to mobilize this capital that it could at least use for its own long-term purposes, even if the interest rates were not attractive enough for short-term requirements.

I would ask once again that the hon. Provincial Treasurer remember his good resolve of a few years ago and consider doing something about it; at least make the investigation that he said he was going to make and at least make the offices that now exist attractive offices. They are located in ancient crumbling buildings with no attempt made to modernize them, although the banks and trust companies are making very modern offices available. There has been no attempt to expand their activities by increasing the number of branches. I believe that the government should show a little initiative and make a genuine effort to use these offices for the benefit both of the people of the province as individuals and of the people of the province collectively through their government.

I do not quite go along with my hon. friend for Grey South in regarding these savings offices as representing a kind of development fund. I am in favour of development funds, I think the government of this province should follow the example of Quebec and get into that field; but development funds as I see them are essentially for mobilizing risk capital. Admittedly they reduce the risk by spreading it, but it is still risk capital that is involved.

I do not think that people who are putting money in savings offices regard their money as risk capital. Therefore, I think we should have both. We should have a development of the savings offices and we should also have a genuine development fund in which the people of the province could invest whatever surplus funds they have available to assist in provincial development.

I also concur in the proposition that has been put forward—and not for the first time by any means—that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should reconsider the whole basis of the tax on parimutuel betting. I think my hon. friend for Grey South established well the fact that the rate the government now imposes is completely antiquated and

unrelated to modern conditions. It is possible to argue that 10 or 15 years ago this industry could have been regarded as a development industry with taxes kept at a low level so as not to discourage development. That is certainly not the case now.

The jockey club is in the position that it just does not know what to do with its surpluses. It has modernized every track that it considers it is profitable to operate—in fact, there are extremely plush establishments at its various tracks—it has money rolling in so fast that I do not know what it is going to do to hide it in the future.

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer should relieve them of this embarrassment. He should increase the tax on parimutuel betting to, shall I say, ten per cent, in line with New York state. If he did that he would be able to get at least some of the money that would assist him to cease paying starvation wages to approximately a third of the civil service of this province.

This would be a good source of revenue. Let him get rid of all these wage rates of less than \$3,000 a year, which are now paid to 17 per cent of the civil servants. Let him get rid, as far as he can, of all wage rates below \$3,600 a year which are now paid to about 35 per cent of the civil servants. This is a source he could use. In fact, some of the civil servants whose wages he increased might even pay some of it back by going out to the racetracks.

I am suggesting to him that this is a source of funds. It is not a tremendous source in relation to the total Budget of the province, but it is still a useful source that he ought to be exploiting.

I would like to mention one other area where I think our revenue capacity could be significantly increased. I do not want to get into the general field of taxation, even though it is relevant, I believe, under these estimates, since we have a Royal commission inquiring into this matter. It has been inquiring into it for some time; there is also a federal Royal commission inquiring into it.

I sometimes get a little alarmed about Royal commissions. They get started and sometimes they never seem to finish. The Royal commissions on taxation have been an unconscionable time doing their job. I hope they will present reports fairly soon. I am beginning to think we should not really wait for them to complete their inquiries before starting some reforms in our tax structure.

However, I am deterred from making any such suggestion. It is my observation that whenever Tory governments start reforming

the tax structure it is usually for the purpose of soaking the little fellow and relieving the big fellow.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): As usual you are wrong.

Mr. Bryden: This is particularly true of the small "t" Tory government we have at Ottawa which recently did make some change in the tax structure both by—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is an eloquent comment.

Mr. Bryden: Both by making an across-the-board reduction of ten per cent and also by imposing levies under the Canada Pension Plan. When you take the two together, you find that overall the little fellow is paying more taxes while the rich fellow is receiving a significant reduction in taxes.

I will not go into the figures; I presented my calculations on a previous occasion in this House. This is what happened when that small "t" Tory government in Ottawa went to work to make some revisions in the tax structure. I do not want to precipitate anything more like that. I am rather inclined to wait for the Royal commission to report in the hope that they might take a more progressive view of the tax situation, and I will not press the government for any major reforms in the tax system at this time.

However, there are two smaller reforms that I think should be considered. One of them relates to the income tax. The government, of course, does not levy the income tax payable in this province, but it receives a significant and increasing proportion of it. Therefore it has an interest in any proposal that might help to increase the yield. There is no question in the world, Mr. Chairman, that an area where the tax collector should start to ride herd is that of expense accounts.

The late Mr. Garland, when he was Minister of National Revenue, indicated that he was going to crack down in this field. I would judge from some of the cries of anguish I have heard from the poor rich that some cracking down has been done. The amount of chiselling that goes on in this field, nevertheless, is quite unjustifiable. A businessman will take a trip to Europe and probably take his family with him. He will say that he is visiting the company's European offices. He may spend two per cent of his time visiting the company's European offices saying hello to the local manager, and the balance of his time on a holiday. Yet he will charge this up to the company.

Mr. Peck: Not for his family.

Mr. Bryden: Probably not, as the hon. gentleman says, not for his family, just for himself. In other words he charges his own holiday up to the company. So the government gets cheated in two different ways: (a) This is income that this man enjoyed. He got his income in kind in the form of a free holiday. He ought to be paying tax on it, but he escapes it. (b) The company charges it up as an expense. It ought to be paying tax on it but it escapes that tax. So the government pays for most of this man's holiday.

This sort of thing, which is possible, of course, only in the higher income levels, ought to be brought to an end. The late President Kennedy had plans to do something along that line in the United States, but the business advisory council moved in and that was the last that was ever heard of that proposal. His proposals to reduce taxes were implemented but his proposals to reform the tax structure and tighten up collections somehow got lost along the way. I am afraid that similar proposals in Canada have been lost along the way, too. But it is time something was done about them. Many of these expense accounts are adequately described by the old term "swindle sheets." I think the income tax authorities in The Department of National Revenue ought to crack down on them.

I know that the hon. Provincial Treasurer does not have any direct control over this matter but he has a real interest in it because a significant part of his revenue comes from this source. I am suggesting to him that he should take up with the federal government the question of plugging up some of the loopholes in The Income Tax Act, out of which revenue is spilling in torrents. This is one of the most important loopholes.

The final matter that I want to mention briefly, Mr. Chairman, relates to a tax that is exclusively within the provincial field—the provincial sales tax. A few days ago the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch), who unfortunately is not here at the moment, raised with the hon. Provincial Treasurer the matter of the sales tax as it applies to children's clothing. I pointed out to the hon. Provincial Treasurer last year that it would appear that the sizing standards being used in the administration of The Sales Tax Act are completely out of date. We all know that children of this generation are substantially larger than they were 10, 20, 30 years ago, yet I take it that the sizing standards being used are those of a good many years ago. The result is that the sales tax has to be paid, in many cases, on clothing which is definitely

for children but does not fall within the antiquated size standards that the government is using.

The hon. member for Lincoln verified from his own experience that he has had to pay sales tax—or his wife has had to pay sales tax—on clothing bought for his children. They definitely are in the age group it was envisaged would be exempt from the tax, but because of the sizing standards that are used by the administration, it is found that the tax has to be paid.

I can assure the hon. Provincial Treasurer that this is not a peculiar experience of the hon. member for Lincoln. I have had many complaints from mothers of children of eight, ten and 12 years of age, that they regularly have to pay the sales tax in buying clothing for their children. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer should get down to business and do something about this. Maybe my explanation is wrong, maybe I am wrong when I say the standards they use are out of date; but whether it is because they are out of date, or whatever the reason, they are clearly wrong.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): You are wrong.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Lincoln at least supports what I say, and if you were in touch with reality you would know that is true, too.

Mr. McKeough: He is not here today.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Lincoln, speaking in the Budget debate stated that he had to raise this matter in the House, otherwise he would not be allowed to go home. His wife had told him that if he did not raise it in the House he could not come back home that weekend—that was last weekend.

Mr. McKeough: He did not say that at all. He did not say that at all.

Mr. Bryden: He managed to get back home last weekend because he did raise it in the House.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Now he is not here.

Mr. Bryden: Maybe she is keeping him there. Maybe he is a hostage, I do not know. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that a woman who would be intelligent enough to marry an intelligent man like him will not be satisfied with that answer for very long. She may be satisfied for a week or two to have

the hon. member raise the matter in the House, but I am sure that she will begin to realize there is very little future in that unless the hon. Provincial Treasurer does something about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: We have the juvenile section over here in full flight again tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I trust they do not bother you, out of order as they may be; they do not bother me a bit.

I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that for the benefit of our fine hon. member for Lincoln, if for no one else, he should do something about this. I would hate to think that the hon. member for Lincoln is now being held hostage through the hardheartedness of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, or alternatively that he may in future find himself unable to go home because the hon. Provincial Treasurer will not accept the perfectly reasonable proposition that has been put to him. I am sure that when he thinks it over he will do something about this. When I raised it with him in the past it had no effect on him, and I am hoping the hon. member for Lincoln may be more successful than I was.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer question No. 26 on the order paper which has been there for at least two months. I am certain that the hon. Provincial Treasurer must have the answer to the question.

I stepped out of the House for a few minutes this afternoon and while I was out I believe he made some references to the grants that are paid to the thoroughbred horse society, also to the standardbred horse society, but I think he spoke only in aggregates. He will notice that my question asks not so much about aggregates as the distribution of the grants. I am asking this question, and I have asked it only in terms of the thoroughbred horse society. I am not interested in the answer with regard to the standardbred society. My question was, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer had before him a similar question last year: In the current fiscal year—that means the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965; this question was put on the order paper some substantial time before the

end of that fiscal year—(1) How many breeders received grants from the government's annual grant made to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society? (2) What breeders received in excess of \$1,000 in individual grants and how much did each of them receive?

As I say, the hon. Provincial Treasurer had plenty of notice of this question. I think it is reasonable to ask him to answer it now.

Applause.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! Applause from the gallery is not permitted.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, in replying to some of the comments of the hon. gentlemen, I would like at first to say that it is always interesting to listen to the hon. member for Grey South. As a rule, and this was so again tonight, his criticism is usually constructive and I appreciate the thought that he had given to this matter and some of the suggestions that he made. I am not sure, but I might ask the hon. gentleman if he was not in the House as a member of the government when the savings banks were instituted.

Mr. Oliver: No, that was just a little before my time.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I thought the hon. member had been here then.

Mr. Oliver: No, five years before.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I recognize the criticism in connection with the savings banks. I would point out that they are not savings banks and we should not use the word "bank," we should use the words "savings offices," which they are. Especially in view of the feeling of our friends at Ottawa at the present time with respect to provincial banks we had better keep our savings offices.

I realize that there is a good deal to be said for using these funds for development purposes. There is something to be said with respect to the fact that these have not been expanded to a greater extent than they have. However, I would like to point out that in our overall policy of obtaining funds for the use of this government through the years, this has been a useful tool in this connection and it does provide us with about \$80 million of money which really costs us about four per cent. Keeping that in mind and recognizing the suggestion of the hon. member—I am not sure whether it was the hon. member for Grey South or the hon. member for Woodbine—that the interest rate be raised, all the

hon. members in this House will realize that there has been intense competition for savings, especially during the last few years and since the time of much greater competition in the trust company field, and they will remember that the funds we obtain in this way, that is the cost of the funds, must be looked at on the basis of the cost of our money that we receive. If we were to increase our interest rate one per cent, we would find that those funds would then cost us more than the average cost of the funds that we are borrowing in the manner in which we are borrowing them today.

Mr. Oliver: Will the hon. Provincial Treasurer tell me what the average cost is?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The average cost would about 5.25 per cent.

Mr. Oliver: You are getting it for four now on a three per cent basis. If you raise it to four, it would cost you not more than five, which would be a comparative rate.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This is a pretty close margin. Mention was made of Ontario government savings bonds. We have looked at this very carefully and I would not say that at some time we may not want to have Ontario government savings bonds, but we would not introduce them as long as we are able to obtain the funds we need at the cost of the funds we are now obtaining. We are getting this money at a lesser cost than if we had the Ontario savings bonds. These are a revolving fund, as it were, and not particularly a source of cheap money. Of course, the cost of savings bonds in other provinces is in the neighbourhood of five per cent, and this policy does not lend itself as well to the overall borrowing policy as does the policy which we are following at the present time, when we know when the maturities are going to happen.

I appreciate the remarks from the two hon. members in this connection and assure them that we are always looking at our Ontario savings offices and will continue to look at them. I do not agree that they are dying. As a matter of fact, we have had a steady policy of improving these offices during the last few years to a much greater extent than has been so before.

The other matter that was mentioned had to do with our taxes in connection with our racing in this province. I would point out to the hon. members of the House that I have given this matter a good deal of consideration, too. Although the opinion was expressed tonight that we should increase the

percentage of our tax on the money that is wagered, I would like to point out that as a result of a careful study throughout this whole North American continent, there are only two or three small states that take a greater percentage of the money that is wagered than we do in this province.

In each of the provinces of Canada, the track takes the same amount as is taken here. In connection with that, I should point out that we do not determine the take of the track; this is determined by the federal government. It is part of the criminal code, and the criminal code places a limit upon the amount that the tracks can take of the wagers. This amount is nine per cent and this is taken by the tracks in every province in Canada.

I would like to correct the hon. member for Grey South in his figures on New York. They have a complicated formula, and although it begins at ten per cent, it drops to nine per cent, and even to four per cent. I am not familiar with the details of the sliding scale but they do not take ten per cent. It is generally agreed, and you will get those who are supposed to be authorities on horse racing to agree, that the greatest amount of money can be obtained from the betting if the take on the part of the track and the state or the province is 12.50 per cent, although the states are all practically higher than that.

In New York state, the take is 15 per cent. Here it is 15.50 per cent. In Kentucky the levy of the two is 14 per cent; the state takes four per cent on a sliding scale to six, and the track, of course, the balance. In California, which is where a great deal of betting takes place, the overall takeout is 14 per cent; the state takes five per cent on a sliding scale to eight per cent. Maryland, another state where there is a good deal of racing, the takeout is only 13 per cent, the state takes five per cent.

The only states I see here where the take is greater than 15 per cent are the states of Vermont, Rhode Island, Ohio, Maine and Louisiana. So the takeout here is a reasonable amount.

When you consider that we have nothing to say about the amount that the track is able to take out, it leaves us, I think, with the six per cent, which seems to be a reasonable amount. I am quite sure it enables us to get as great a revenue from the operation as any percentage that we could take out. You have to remember that—

Mr. Oliver: The 12 per cent in 1950 must have been in the view of the hon. Minister an unreasonable amount then, was it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would point out to the hon. member, and I have the figures here, that in 1955 our takeout was seven per cent, our revenue was \$5,154,000. The following year it was reduced to six per cent and the revenue was \$6,363,000.

Mr. Oliver: That does not seem right.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It proves that we got more money, more—

Mr. Oliver: Because more people were betting.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Certainly more people were betting. This is the principle that is acknowledged by those who are supposed to be knowledgeable in the horse racing business.

Now I make no excuses for the grants—that is the breeder's award to the various breeders. I have looked into this a little bit this year. I find that the percentage of winners at our tracks, that is the percentage of winners that are Ontario-bred horses in both the thoroughbred and the standardbred, is steadily increasing. This is because of the improvement in our stock.

I was surprised to find that even now we expend a million dollars each year in purchasing standardbred horses in the United States. We look at this province of ours and think of the splendid climate we have, and certainly some of those who are interested in the developing of our horse breeding have the feeling that instead of being purchasers of horses in other areas we should be raising horses here to sell in the United States.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Are some not sold to the United States?

Hon. Mr. Allan: There are some, but nothing like the amount we buy from the United States. I was very interested in the state of Florida. The state of Florida pays breeders' awards of 10 per cent of the purse. They will tell you now that in the last 10 years—as a result of their effort in improving their breeding stock and in developing the industry, the state has had two winners in the last ten years in the Kentucky Derby. They give credit to the breeders' awards in assisting to improve the standard of the breed in that state.

There was some discussion and something in the papers a year or so ago with respect to doing away with breeders' awards. Surprisingly, the letters that I received—and I think this was pretty general—were received from the small breeders. I think we have to remember that horse racing is sport, that those

who are interested like to have a little something of the unknown in it; and as no doubt it is in the minds of some persons who, it is said, buy sweepstakes tickets, they are always hopeful that they are going to make a killing. I think that the breeder's award has a value altogether out of proportion to the amount of money that is paid out in these areas. I think we should continue this, I think we should do everything we can do to develop the breeding in this area.

I can give you the number of breeders of thoroughbreds, the number of breeders receiving over \$2,000. I look at this and it is very encouraging. In 1962 it was three, in 1963 it was four, in 1964 it was five.

Mr. Bryden: How many over \$1,000?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Five in 1962; 16 in 1963; and 13 in 1964.

Mr. Bryden: That includes the five who received over \$2,000, does it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not have the names. I am not ashamed of the names, I do not know who they were. I suppose you are referring to E. P. Taylor. I suspect he was one of them, but mind you, I think he did a great deal for horse racing and a great deal for our province—

Several hon. members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Bryden: Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer tell us the total amount received by all breeders and also the total amount received by the 13 who got more than \$1,000 apiece?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I do not believe I have that information.

Mr. Bryden: How many got grants of any kind, of any amount, in 1964?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Last year, in the thoroughbreds, there were 529.

Mr. Bryden: Five hundred and twenty-nine?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, that was the standardbreds. I am sorry. The thoroughbreds, 147. The average size of the award was \$500.13. You will be very happy to know that Mr. Taylor got much less last year than he had been getting.

Mr. Bryden: How much less?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is an indication of the improvement in the breed, that is the progress that other breeders are making.

Mr. Bryden: The total number of qualifying breeders was down from the previous year if there were only 147 of them. It was 160 the previous year.

Hon. Mr. Allan: There were 156 the previous year, but the average size of the award last year was \$500.13. As we improve the standard of the horses, the attendance at the track increases, the betting seems to increase, and the revenue that we receive as a province increases.

To give you the number of the standard-breds, last year there were 529. Naturally, with the increase in the harness tracks no doubt this number will continue to grow. Of the total amount last year, as I already stated today, the standardbreds received greater awards than do the thoroughbreds.

I feel this: It is decided that we are going to have horse racing in Ontario; once this has been decided I think that every hon. member here will agree with me when I say that we want such horse racing to be well conducted. I think it is. I give the racing commission credit for doing a good job in the carrying on of the racing in the province, and I give credit to those who have provided good equipment and good tracks, and who carry them on in a way that is a credit to the industry.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with respect to item No. 10, in vote 2201, the grant for the Canadian thoroughbred horse society, is put in nominally again at \$70,000, I have no doubt that is approximately the figure the hon. Provincial Treasurer—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, if I could explain to the hon. member. We did not know the amount. They were larger than we expected they were, and the \$70,000 this year really is not going to be enough.

Mr. Bryden: For the thoroughbreds either? I understand it is not for—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, I do not think it will be.

Mr. Bryden: At any rate, the amount that is put in is \$70,000, and it will be somewhere in that neighbourhood. I want to emphasize again I am talking only about item No. 10, grants to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society. The hon. Provincial Treasurer was, shall I say, somewhat less than fully illuminating in answering the question I asked, which was: How many breeders received grants, what was the total amount that all of them got, how many breeders received more than

\$1,000, and how much did each one of them get? The hon. Provincial Treasurer was a little less—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I almost answered your question tonight.

Mr. Bryden: You almost did, but you have had it in front of you for two months and I am sure it would take 15 minutes to get the information.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am going to get it for you, too.

Mr. Bryden: No doubt, but failing that, at the moment I will have to go on the basis of the information I now have. I would judge from the answer the hon. Provincial Treasurer gave to my question, as far as it went, that the situation continues very much as it was in the past. This year 147 breeders qualified for some sort of grant. Last year, I have the figure as 160, but the hon. Provincial Treasurer says 156, so I will take it at that. The total number is down. The number getting \$1,000 or better is up a bit. The number getting \$2,000 or better is up a little bit too. Only a small minority got more than \$1,000 and an even smaller minority got more than \$2,000, and yet that small minority got most of the money. That is what I object to.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, that is not so.

Mr. Bryden: I will take it on the basis of the figures for last year. I suppose it would be the 1963 racing season, the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964, for which I have complete figures. In that year, the total distributed was approximately \$70,000. I do not have the exact amount, but I think it was a little over \$70,000.

Ten breeders got \$1,000 or more. Those ten between them got \$37,000, or more than half of the total. I say more than half is the lion's share, so a small minority got the lion's share of the money.

Mr. Peck: They have got more horses than the others.

Mr. Bryden: I have no doubt there are many reasons why they are getting the larger amount. One poor barefoot boy from Bay Street, by the name of E. P. Taylor, got \$3.75 less than \$21,000, or by himself he got about 30 per cent of the total. Some of the other poor breeders that needed this encouragement so desperately were people such as Beasley, Conklin, Armstrong, Conn Smythe and so on. I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): They support your job, do not forget.

Mr. Bryden: I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that the purpose which he has in mind in making these grants is defeated by the method of distribution. Nobody has to encourage E. P. Taylor to breed horses. I am quite satisfied that he will do it whether you give him \$21,000 or not. But I could think of many small breeders who could very well be encouraged if they got a little bit out of this pot.

The little fellows are being squeezed out; the big fellows are taking it all. It is small change to some of these rich men. I would doubt if E. P. Taylor even knows he gets it and I am sure that he could not care less whether he gets the \$21,000 or not. To be honest about it, Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why the people of this province should hand out \$21,000 to E. P. Taylor, or whatever the amount is this year. It was \$21,000 last year and it was \$18,000 the previous year. There is no valid reason that I can think of, especially when we have people in this province who have a much greater need for the money than E. P. Taylor will ever have, and especially since he has now moved off somewhere to the Caribbean, I am not sure where, to escape as much income tax as he can.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The insurance companies are probably behind it. It is a conspiracy.

An hon. member: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I certainly would not go to you for advice in any case. The figures I have cited are figures provided by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and the hon. member can judge for himself how reliable they are. I, personally, accept them as reliable but I would not care to speak for the hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, ignoring the cheap comments from the cheap seats and getting on with the business of the House, I would like to move that item 10 of vote 2201 be struck out, that is the item for the Canadian thoroughbred horse society. I am not necessarily against the policy of awarding grants, but I think the basis of doing it is so completely wrong. The type of inane, moronic comment coming from there indi-

cates, I think, that I have a pretty good argument. They cannot answer with logic, they can answer only with inanities.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that that item be struck out of the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bryden moves that item 10 of vote 2201 be struck out.

All those in favour of the motion—

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, I think there are one or two misconceptions that ought to be cleared up before we vote on any amendment. One is, if you agree, as I agree, that breeder awards are valuable, then I think you have to agree that the one who gets the most by way of awards has rendered the greatest contribution toward the improvement of the breed. As I said when I was speaking a little while ago, I am absolutely in favour of breeder awards, but I think the day has come when those awards should be shifted from the public purse to the shoulders of the industry itself.

It is pretty hard to tell the little fellow—I should not say little fellow, but I do not mean it in any derogatory sense; the ordinary chap in the country—it is pretty hard to tell him that we should be paying any particular individual \$10,000 or \$15,000, even if it is to improve and better the breed of horses. While I think it is valuable, I think it is valid for me to say that the time has come when we should have the industry pay these awards. There is no reason in the world why it cannot, and let the public off the hook. The public has served the association and the breeder well through the nursery stages, but we have got to the place now where they can stand on their own feet and so, Mr. Chairman, I want to move an amendment to the amendment:

That the racing commission direct that awards to breeders be paid by the industry rather than by the government.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Oliver moves—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a very few words in connection—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We have not had the motion.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Oliver moves an amendment to the amendment—or an amendment to the motion:

That the racing commission direct that awards to breeders be paid by the industry rather than by the government.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have only a very few words that I want to say in

this respect and they are these: that my feeling toward breeder awards is entirely an impersonal one. I have no concern as to who gets the breeder awards. I am quite willing that everyone else should make up his mind as he likes, and perhaps I have that privilege too, but I have the feeling that breeders' awards are given for the purpose of improving the standard of horses that carry on the races on our tracks in this province, and that is the reason that I think what we are doing is a sensible thing to do.

The other point that I would like to make is that it is essential, if we are going to build this industry on a sound foundation, that the purses be good, because if the purses are not good—and we find that this is so to some extent in this province now—a number of our good horses leave the tracks here in the summer and race in the United States where the purses are larger.

I can hardly agree with the hon. member for Woodbine when he said we have matured. It is my opinion that this industry is a growing industry and that we have not matured, and I am firmly of the opinion that, as outlined in the estimates, it is the proper course to follow.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before the debate proceeds any further, I would like a ruling on this alleged amendment to my motion. As I heard it, it would have this House direct what other people would do with their money. I cannot see that that is relevant, either to the estimates before us or to my motion. My motion is to strike a certain item out of the estimates.

The amendment proposes that certain other people should be required to pay that money to still other people. I submit to you, sir, that the thing is completely out of order. It is totally irrelevant. I would rather have the matter dealt with—

Mr. McKeough: Puts you on the spot—

Mr. Bryden: It does not put me on the spot. I am quite prepared to direct what the jockey club or others will do with their money, but unless we pass specific legislation to that effect, I do not really see that we have the power to do that. I would much rather not have the water muddied up; I would rather see the matter dealt with on its merits. The question is what will be done with the money that the government is asking us to vote, not what we want somebody else to do with his money. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the amendment is out of order.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to propose that both amendments be voted down, and I personally do not propose to support either one of them. First of all, if we believe that horse racing is an industry—and I think it has developed into that stage and it has developed very, very rapidly during the last few years—and second, if you want even to categorize it as a sport, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the House that we either have to decide, in the first instance, whether we are going to continue horse racing in this province or whether we are going to eliminate it.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): That is a stupid statement—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are about as familiar with stupidity as anyone in the House. I would say that the hon. member for Grey North—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I simply propose to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. members of the House here tonight, that if we believe, first of all, that it is a sport in which each individual citizen in this province has a right to participate, either as a breeder, an owner or a spectator, then I think we have to determine the extent to which we, as a government, or the public, or any other sector of our industry—if you like—or our economy, are going to support this thing.

I firmly believe that if we are going to develop a breed of Canadian horses, and if we are going to be able to meet the competition that from time to time is introduced into this country from other jurisdictions, either by horses entering this country to race, or by attracting our better horses outside of this country to race, then we must sensibly look at this.

I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, and to everybody who has proposed amendments here today, that the very fact that one man, who is a man of means, or any number of men who are men of means, has seen fit to make a contribution to an industry that many people admire, should not, in any sense of the word, prevent them from being recognized in the form of breeder awards. Mr. E. P. Taylor's name has been mentioned rather loosely, I would suggest to you here today. Mr. E. P. Taylor is, and I think everyone will admit, a great Canadian citizen—

Mr. MacDonald: He is such a great Canadian he took all his money down to the Bahamas—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well. He has developed enterprises and industry in this country that people like you, who believe the way you do, will never accomplish—never, if you live to be 1,000 years old.

The very fact that he has done this and seen fit to make a contribution to an industry that he has some admiration for does not in any way, I suggest to the House, indicate that he should not reap some of the sensible spoils that may go toward the development of this breed and the development of the industry.

Mr. MacDonald: Spoils is right—out of the public Treasury.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We do not live in Sherwood Forest any more, we are not a band of Robin Hoods; we do not rob the rich to pay the poor all the time—

Mr. MacDonald: You rob the poor to pay the rich!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, we do not do that. I simply suggest to you that these amendments should both be voted down. I am prepared to concur with the sensible observations of the hon. member for Grey South; maybe the proportion of tax revenue accruing to the province from racing should be reviewed. I am prepared to admit that that is a sensible thing to look at.

Mr. Singer: He is a sensible man.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is a sensible statement that I can concur with. Maybe that should be reviewed, and I think it is fair to say that this is something that has been under review by the hon. Provincial Treasurer and certain hon. members of the government and government agencies who are interested in it. But to propose to this House that one man who has decided to make this type of contribution to a good sport, and to a good industry, and decided to develop it, should be restricted from receiving breeder awards as long as they are in effect, to me is preposterous nonsense.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, if I may, that there are many breeders and owners of racing horses in Huron county. Certainly standardbred horses are there in great numbers, and thoroughbreds as well. I do not know of one breeder in Huron county, Perth or any of those areas in western Ontario, who objects to Mr. Taylor or anybody else receiving these awards, because they are strictly balanced against the contributions they have made to the development of a very good

industry and a very good sport that many people admire, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief comment here. I think there is some merit in the idea involved in the sub-amendment, namely, that industry rather than the public purse should be paying this. I think there is some merit particularly if, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer has indicated—and I draw this to the particular attention of the hon. Minister of Highways—there is little likelihood that he is going to change these figures. Indeed, the whole import of his remarks tonight was to defend and justify what we are now doing. So if the public Treasury is not going to take any more and the jockey club is going to be left with the present “take,” now that it has expanded this industry as much as it can expand for the immediate future, I certainly think it is an idea that should be considered, that the industry should pay the money, not the public purse.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): The industry is paying the money.

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that my hon. colleague from Woodbine is absolutely correct, that you cannot have a motion in this House which directs some other body, some other corporation in this province, as to how to spend its money. This is simply an impossibility. If this is within the rules of the House, we have to rewrite all the rules. I would suggest that those who want the public Treasury to cease to underwrite this—so that it will then become an obligation for the industry and the jockey club—should support the motion that was moved by the hon. member for Woodbine. I can assure you that as long as this government continues to pay them, the jockey club is not going to. If this motion passes the House tonight, the public Treasury will be relieved of the burden and then it will be necessary for some other body—and the obvious body would be the industry—to pay breeders' grants. I agree that there can be a case for paying breeders' grants; but I still disagree with the proposition that one-third of the breeders' grants, which come from the public Treasury, should go to a man who would continue to breed and develop horses even if he never got a cent out of this Treasury.

And remember this: For every \$20,000 we give to E. P. Taylor, who does not need it, we deny a wealth of other interested breeders in Huron, in Perth and in other part of this province. They have not got the money. This

is a fact. If the hon. Minister of Highways has not talked to a single horseman up in his constituency who objects to E. P. Taylor then he has not talked to very many, because I have rarely run into people who are interested in horse racing—and I have talked to many of them—who do not object to the domination of the racing industry by E. P. Taylor and to the excessive proportion of the breeders' grants that goes to him even though he has no need for it.

However, I do not want to argue that point. We have argued it and I think the case is made. The basic point I am making is: I think there may be some merit in the idea that the hon. member for Grey South has raised, but I do not think we have any jurisdiction in this Legislature to treat it as a subamendment. I suggest that those who want to relieve the public Treasury, support the amendment. Then it will be free for the jockey club to pick up the tab.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, of course I would have to rise and report the contention that this amendment to the amendment is in order. In the first part of it, my hon. friend from Woodbine says that it is not in order because he moves to strike it out. Well, this simply moves to do it in some other way. Now, I think as far as that is concerned, it is all right.

Now then, my hon. friend from York South says that we have no authority to direct any other body to do something. I quite disagree with that.

Mr. MacDonald: By a bill?

Mr. Oliver: Well, what is the difference, actually, between a bill and a motion?

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously we cannot—

Mr. Oliver: Between a bill and a motion, there is no difference at all. The racing commission is an agency of this government and, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that we are quite in order in saying that we will not pay it from this pot, but we will direct it to be paid from another one, through an agency created by this Legislature and under our supervision and control.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to the item in the vote in reference to the motion and the motion to amend, which are presently before us. I can understand the interest produced by the hon. member for Grey South, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is not within the competence of this Legislature during the

course of the estimates, to direct a body outside, or a group of undetermined individuals within the body of our province, how they must spend their money. I put that to you, because were that to be the case, it would have to be the subject of some legislation in some other form, rather than a consideration of the estimates before this House.

While I do not wish to speak in a technical sense, there is such a thing as having proper procedure before the House and I must submit, Mr. Chairman, that this motion to amend, from the hon. member for Grey South, be ruled out of order, and I urge you to so rule.

But speaking to the original motion to amend this vote, the facts are simply these, that thoroughbred breeding is a legal business within this province. It is a legal operation to race horses, provided that the legalities and the supervision requirements are complied with. And it is of some interest to bear in mind that this province, or in other words, the people of this province, receive something in the order of \$10 million a year revenue, which goes into the general funds of the Treasury and are available for the legitimate purposes of the government of this province.

I submit to you that a donation, or a grant, of \$70,000 is little enough to improve the calibre and the standard of the *raison d'être*—If I could put it that way, namely, the horses—of these exhibitions. Our grant of \$70,000 toward improved breeding of thoroughbreds is not a large amount of money and I think it is the least that the people of this province would want to approve, having in mind the revenue of some \$10 million, which accrue to our benefit from the operation of racing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would be of some help if we might have some direction from you as to your intentions about your ruling, with respect to the motion and the motion to amend. In any event, I take it that at the end of the vote on the motions before us, we will carry the vote in its entirety at its conclusion.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, before you make any ruling, it is my contention that this motion is perfectly in order, because it would allow the government to direct the racing commission to take a certain course of action. The government directs most of its commissions to do certain things. My hon. friend, the House leader, was here—

Mr. McKeough: The motion does not mention the racing commission.

Mr. Oliver: Yes, it does.

Mr. McKeough: You changed it then.

Mr. Oliver: I never changed it at all.

Mr. Singer: My hon. friend, the House leader, was present when Mr. Frost suddenly determined that there was going to be night racing and an announcement was made that there was going to be night racing. Nobody amended any statute. It was there and the racing commission was told there was going to be night racing, and the commission acted accordingly to administer it. Now, this is all that we are asking be done tonight. We are suggesting it is fully within the competence of the government to tell the commission that this is the way the award should be granted. It is exactly the same, sir, and for those reasons I suggest it is perfectly in order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on that basis, as a taxation measure, it certainly could not be moved by, or proposed by, a private member of the House.

Mr. Oliver: We are not proposing that at all.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member is proposing that a certain levy be imposed on—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I have very grave doubts as to the validity of the amendment, and yet knowing something of the sincerity and dedication of the two members, I am going to allow the amendment, first of all because—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Actually the first amendment says we will stop payment altogether. The second amendment simply says we will stop payment by government but have the commission direct how the payment will be made.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Was not the word, "industry," Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I am saying they will have the commission direct the industry as to—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The commission cannot direct the industry to pay.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to permit the amendment and we can vote on the amendment. If the amendment is lost, the motion is lost or the first amendment is lost, and more than that, then item 10 is automatically carried.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: We are writing rules as we go along.

Mr. Bryden: Just because we departed a mile from the rules in one point does not mean we do it right down the line. Now, there is no proposition—

Mr. Chairman: We are going to vote.

Mr. Bryden: We will vote on both and then the vote, other than item 10, is still open under the rules, and under the procedure that was followed as recently as—

Mr. Chairman: I just said that. The amendment to the motion: Mr. Oliver moves that the racing commission direct that awards to breeders be paid by the industry rather than by government. All in favour of the amendment to the motion, please stand. All opposed to the amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 19, the nays 46.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment to the motion lost.

Now we shall vote on the motion by Mr. Bryden, that item 10 of vote 2201 be struck out. All in favour of the motion, please stand. All opposed to the motion, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 19, the nays 46.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion lost.

Item 10 of vote 2201 agreed to.

Vote 2201 agreed to.

Vote 2202 agreed to.

Vote 2203 agreed to.

Vote 2204 agreed to.

On vote 2205:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague, the hon. member for Grey South tied down the thoughts of most of us in the Opposition in regard to the Ontario racing commission, in that there is a very sympathetic policy on behalf of the Ontario racing commission towards the Ontario jockey club. In fact, a lot of us feel, a lot of the racing fraternities feel that there is a liaison there—in fact that the Ontario racing commission is a tool of the Ontario jockey club. This may or may not be news to many of you but I think hon. members of the House know that in the estimates last year the news came out

that in New Orleans, through the betting of \$411,000 per day the track profit was \$12,000. Ontario, with the same amount of betting, \$460,000, the track profit was \$22,000 per day. In other words, in Ontario the track profit is \$9,000 more per day than in other provinces.

Now along the same line of thinking of the \$4 million bet in 1961 in purses: \$1 million in purses went to 47 horses owned by 37 men; and five of these 37 were directors of the Ontario jockey club. So I think it is pretty well established with the people in the racing field that anything that the Ontario jockey club feels is profitable and politic, the Ontario racing commission will enact as legislation. Further, in the United States, all uncashed tickets go to the state. In Ontario, all the uncashed tickets go to the jockey club. This runs into figures of half a million dollars a year. So, instead of the hon. Provincial Treasurer concocting ideas to increase the gasoline tax and hospital taxes, let us go after this money that rightfully belongs to the people.

Another item along these lines is called "breakage." This is the uneven amount of money paid out. In the USA this is split 50/50 between the track and the state, here all the breakage goes to the jockey club.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I could give him some information that I think would save him the effort or the embarrassment of continuing this discussion. This is a matter with which the federal government deals entirely. We have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Sargent: I am not asking you for information. I would like to show hon. members of the House—most of you are fair men but to show the arrogance of this commission insofar as the little fellow is concerned, you sit over there like a bunch of fat cats and you pound the desks—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to show for a few moments this evening, on this vote, the wide powers of the Ontario racing commission insofar as the racing people are involved, and how completely unfair that the racing commission is to the drivers, in relating to the House three specific cases where I think you will agree, when you have heard the evidence, that the commission is most unfair. In any judgment handed down by the racing commission there is no appeal possible. Here we have a situation which has no parallel in any jurisdiction, where a

body can lay a charge and then try the case. I think you will agree that the racing commission would naturally be prejudiced when it lays a charge and then tries it. And it has to judge itself right or admit it was wrong in the first place. This is a situation today where a race driver, if there is an infraction—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the racing commission appeared before the committee on commissions. The conduct of racing is the responsibility of the racing commission, which is an independent body. I am in no position to defend the treatment of drivers in those races. I think the discussion here as to suspension and that sort of thing having to do with drivers is completely the responsibility of the commission and I think any discussion of it is entirely out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is what I thought would happen. In every case this powerful, arrogant government in power—

An hon. member: Get off the kick.

Mr. Sargent: For 20 or 25 years, I do not know how long it is, you have appointed all these commissions which are not responsible to elected people.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They came and met your committee.

Mr. Sargent: And here we have a case of people who have no recourse and the only time we get a chance to let the public know what is going on is through the House here. I demand my right to put the case of these citizens of Ontario, who have been dealt with unjustly.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in considering this point of order, with respect, the hon. Provincial Treasurer is obviously away off base. When we had the water resources commission before us, it came before the standing committee, but when The Department of Energy and Resources Management came in here, the head of the water resources commission sat in that chair and answered any questions we wanted to ask. I trust the procedure will not change so that, when the estimates of The Department of Health are here, the head of the Ontario hospital commission will sit in that chair and answer any questions.

I submit to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that he cannot separate the purely financial end of raising the money from the Ontario racing commission from the other important aspects of the Ontario racing commission.

This is a fit topic to be discussed in the House here, and therefore I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is in order. Indeed, I have some things I want to say on it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Chairman, and I quote from The Racing Commission Act—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, who has the floor?

Mr. Chairman: The Provincial Treasurer is speaking to a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Section 11(d):

To enforce the carrying out and observance of all regulations, rules and conditions established under this Act by a fine or other penalty or otherwise.

With the very greatest respect I say that I am not in a position to go into the details of this legal matter which was in the courts. One case is still before the courts and I think it is most improper to discuss that in this House and these drivers who are referred to.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, let me address myself to the point of order. The hon. Provincial Treasurer comes before us and he asks for the sum of \$239,000 for the Ontario racing commission, in the same way as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) spoke in answer to the request for money for the Hydro in the Energy estimates. This matter is at present before the House. With the greatest respect to my friend, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I think this is here because it is in his estimates. The sum of \$239,000 is asked for and it is my submission that my colleague, the hon. member for Grey North, is perfectly in order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. leader of the NDP—

Mr. MacDonald: The Chairman has not made his ruling yet.

Mr. Chairman: Just a moment. I will make the ruling in a moment. Please be seated. It is unfortunate that the member for Grey North did not appear before the government committee on government commissions and there ask his questions, but I still maintain as a member of the House, as chairman of this committee, that any member of this House has a right to ask questions in the estimates about any commissions. We have had precedent after precedent. As one of the members of the Opposition has said, we have had the Ontario hospital commission and the Ontario water resources commission before us; its man was on the floor of the

House. I believe in a democratic House and that any member has the right to ask any question during the estimates.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must apologize to the House but this matter came before me a few hours ago and I hope I can put the facts to you clearly. I know that you all, in fairness to small people, will give me a good hearing on it and I apologize for any gaps I may leave.

The two men in the first two cases are highly regarded in their communities. They were charged with collusion or fixing a race.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not want to interrupt but just so we will have the rules clear, are you ruling, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sargent: Are you rising on a point of order or what are you doing? Who is running this show?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I want this ruling clarified.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: So that we might have your ruling clarified, sir, what is the effect of the fact that certain of these cases are at present before the courts of the province and what effect does that have on the debate on those particular items and the facts surrounding them?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is in error. There is no case before the courts. There is one before the commission, but the commission is not a court, it is a body that is before this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the information that I have here, and this is in connection with the appeal of Clarence Lockhart, is that this motion of certiorari has still not been heard.

Mr. Chairman: Then it is quite simple to make the ruling, although I made the ruling before I knew anything about this part. If it is before the courts it is sub judice, it cannot be discussed here in the House. If it is not before the courts, then anyone in the House has the right to ask a question.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, before you make the ruling, from my knowledge of this situation, the hon. Provincial Treasurer is in error. As far as the Clarence Lockhart case is concerned, it came before the racing commission and he was, in effect, convicted and suspended for a year, and he is now sitting out his suspension. There is nothing before

the courts at all. He appealed the suspension to the courts.

Mr. Sargent: And won the appeal.

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, you are mixing it up. There is another case which has been before the courts.

Mr. Sargent: I have the document in front of me here. Mr. Chairman, the motivation behind this is the fact that these people cannot get the facts before us, the people of Ontario, or before anyone, because there is no chance for an appeal—they cannot appeal these charges.

Now, the case is this: These two men were charged with fixing a race, or collusion. When the hearing was held they were found not guilty and they were absolved of the charge.

October 1, 1964, the ruling of the Ontario racing commission: The appeal of Clarence Lockhart from the decision of the judges suspending him indefinitely for collusion in the seventh race at the Greenwood Raceway on August 4, 1964, is allowed—his appeal is allowed:

—and the penalty imposed by the judges is nullified.

Immediately after this was given by the Ontario racing commission, another charge was laid by the Ontario racing commission. They laid the charge and the charge was—somebody had been in the army—an all-embracing charge, “racing contrary to the public interest.” This is a charge ranging from soup to nuts and could mean anything. Now, the daily report of that race shows that \$279,000 was bet. That was August 5 and 5,924 people were there. Concerning the seventh race, a claiming race, there was no comment by the judges of the day. All the races were completely fine according to the board. Yet he is charged with racing contrary to the public interest.

The transcript is very lengthy and I will not bring it before the House, but the essence of it was—this man has 14 horses. He is highly regarded in his home community of Collingwood, as the hon. Chairman knows. He is trusted by all, by the complete council, by all the citizens. And the chairman at that hearing said that in 17 years of racing this man had always tried to drive hard and tried to win his races.

Going back a question, the report says:

Mr. Hall: What is the rule? You mentioned a rule for letting a horse go through in the middle.

This is technical, but I will be through in a moment.

What is the rule?

Answer: Well, it says “for needlessly letting a horse through on the inside.”

Briefly, the fact was that Mr. Lockhart was racing on the outside and the horse on the inside was choking and he heard the horse choking, and he felt the best thing was, that if the horse choked and went down there would be a tumble so he let the horse through.

The horse he let through and his own horse finished seventh and eighth. They both finished last. For this, the man was suspended for one year. He has 14 horses tied up. It damages his income, his reputation; it will cost him \$25,000.

Now, I am going to tell this House briefly of how an employee, the manager of the mutuels, employed by the jockey club, in charge of the mutual betting, was placing bets with these drivers—an infraction of rules right down the line. If this man is allowed to continue his job, he does not lose his licence; but a highly regarded man in the profession is suspended and has no chance to appeal.

Now, being fair in my demand, this is not very important to this House probably, but it is of importance to an individual to have his rights looked after. And this commission, and I say this respectfully, are appointed by this government and naturally it behooves them to be taking orders from the OJC who pull all the strings. I recognize that, but this can happen. For this man, it is the first offence and he has no appeal. I understand, in speaking about his licence again today, that he was told there was no guarantee he would ever get it back.

Now, this is the serious thing this man has done.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Could I ask the hon. member about whom he is speaking?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Clarence Lockhart. A glaring case, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You mentioned something about betting.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I hesitate to go into that. I have a letter here. It is doubtful. It was written by the judge of the racing commission to a man who has been suspended for five years. The judge, in his letter to this man says in effect, “if you did no more wrong than Mr. Dunbar, who is the man in charge

of the mutuel betting and who is placing bets for these drivers on countless occasions"—

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister without Portfolio): For the drivers.

Mr. Sargent: For the drivers.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: What drivers?

Mr. Sargent: Oh, this is in many, many cases. It was in the transcript, it will come out. But before I go into that, Mr. Murray Waples—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I say this in the best terms to my hon. friend from Grey North: Could he define his terms a little more carefully? Frankly, thus far it is completely incomprehensible to me, as a member of this House, I admit I am a novice in this field, but I would like to understand a little better. Can he be a little more specific in the people he names and the terms he uses?

Mr. Sargent: The motivation, the end result of this will be to show injustice and the mechanics of trying to get justice in this profession, because of a government commission which is responsible to no one.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They are.

Mr. Sargent: Well, to whom are they responsible?

Hon. Mr. Allan: He can appeal to the courts.

Mr. MacDonald: You should read some of the transcripts.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I am told by this fraternity, Mr. Chairman, that these people have no appeal.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, I can give you two instances right here and read them out to you, where two men did appeal.

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is absolutely wrong to say that these men have no appeal. Mr. Lockhart did have an appeal. His counsel made an appeal through what is known as a certiorari motion. Now, the term is unknown to me, but these men who are lawyers know what it means. He had his appeal. And any one of them has an opportunity to appeal if his counsel is acting for him in a proper way.

Interjections from hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I have already made a motion—the motion for

certiorari has still not been heard, but he made a motion for certiorari and I do not think we should be discussing this.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, could I ask what was the date of that motion for certiorari?

Hon. Mr. Allan: March 10.

Mr. MacDonald: Of this year?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: If the matter is before the courts it is sub judice and it cannot be discussed here in the House.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think it is entirely improper. I can give you a statement as to what went on; I am not worried about all this, but I think it is improper. It is not fair to Mr. Lockhart.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Lockhart is here—his lawyers were here this evening and they feel that the very fact that this commission can lay a charge and try the case themselves is the first point that is wrong.

The other case of a Mr. Waples—

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the hon. member for Grey North that we have already agreed that it is before the court and I made the ruling. We cannot change a ruling of this kind. I have no authority to change it. This is an old-established rule of this House.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer if this is before the court?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes. I could give you a statement on it here. I could tell you just what has happened. This is the information that I have been given by the chairman of the commission, and the last line of this is:

This motion of certiorari has still not been heard.

The certiorari motion is scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1965—

Mr. Sargent: What case, Mr. Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Lockhart. I continue:—and will be adjourned until after the disposition of the Waples case.

Then on March 10, there is a notation:

This motion of certiorari has still not been heard.

Mr. Singer: That is March 10, and this is May 20. The hon. member for Carleton is on the commission—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I was only taking the word of the chairman of the commission.

Mr. Singer: But that is as of March, sir. The hon. member for Carleton indicated that, in his opinion, the motion for certiorari had been heard and dealt with and was finished. That was the way—

Mr. W. E. Johnston: I did not indicate that; I was simply saying that they had a means of appeal, through a certiorari motion.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I will deal with another case then—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Sargent: —not Mr. Lockhart's. Mr. Lockhart's suspension is here and the appearance of suspension is on.

Mr. Waples was in this same race and he was charged with collusion. He was tried and acquitted of collusion—of fixing a race. Immediately after the hearing the ORC charged him with driving contrary to the public interest. The thing he did wrong in this race was he lost by a nose. He is allowed to run, not in Ontario, but he was convicted and suspended because he was driving contrary to the public interest.

How a man can lose by a nose—and he said he was trying to lose the race—is hard to believe. But he is allowed to race under the Canadian trotting association in Montreal, and in all its history for any such charges it has had suspensions for from three to five days. But this man's case comes up for review on Tuesday, and using the past actions of the commission as a yardstick, he could get a three-year suspension.

In the case of Mr. Kingston, this letter to Mr. Kingston is signed by Mr. Floyd Milton, a judge—a racing commission judge, is that correct?

Mr. S. Lewis: What happened to Mr. Lockhart?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Lockhart is still under suspension.

Mr. Oliver: What about the fellow who lost by a nose?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Kingston was charged and suspended for five years for betting \$150 of someone else's money with his own horse in the race.

Hon. Mr. Allan: On another horse.

Mr. Sargent: On another horse. But he also bet \$200 on his own horse, and his own horse did show. The letter from Mr. Milton, the racing commission judge says:

Hi, Gord,

Re our phone calls. First don't quote me or show people my letter—

An hon. member: Who did he say that was?

Another hon. member: One of the judges.

Mr. Sargent: I do not very often get browned off with this nonsense here, but I think it is important that you people in your arrogance realize that the lives of some people are at stake here. I do not have the complete facts neatly arrayed in front of me, but the facts are here, and there is an injustice here. I think you owe it to your people. If you have not got the brains yourselves to listen to some facts that have done wrong, then you should not sit in this House.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North is having an exceptionally good hearing and I do not see that there is any call for this outburst.

Mr. Sargent: That is my opinion, Mr. Chairman. This is a free country.

Hon. Mr. Allan: What is the name of the racing judge who wrote the letter?

Mr. Sargent: This man, who is chairman, who is a judge on this commission, writes this letter and he says:

First don't quote me or show people my letter—

He goes on to—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Could we have his name?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Floyd Milton.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He said, "Please don't quote me," and that is what you are doing.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly am and this letter is coming out to show what is going on in this racing commission.

This man is appointed by the racing commission—and you will know by the grammar, the intelligence of some of the people on this commission.

The hearing has been set back one day and due to the standardbred sale so they will now start on September 22, one each day, I believe.

Now you should have the man that you had in front of Mr. Mooney that you claim it was his money, and if he says [blank] and gave you \$950 or \$1,050 to bet for him, you just handed it to Mr. Dunbar. He is the manager of the mutuels, who is taking bets for the drivers. His word should be as good as Mr. Dunbar's.

Now if you can talk to this commission meeting, without getting nervous and keep to the point, if not, you should have someone talk to you.

I would start from the time Mr. McKee made you acquainted with Mr. Dunbar, then Dunbar coming to you that he would do the betting for you in secret, and so forth.

You lost a lot of bets. He used to come to the paddock to pick up the money. All through the night he handed the \$1,200 back with Max, when your horse won, and paid \$830. He said he couldn't bet it because Mr. Body was there and that sounds like a bookmaker to me.

[Blank] He says you have raced horses for so many years and have never been in such serious trouble and you have a lot of faith in horse racing. You realize that you have made a mistake but you are not the first man that ever made a mistake around the racetrack, and Mr. Dunbar is as guilty as you are for dealing in this underhanded way.

I believe if you had someone like Leslie Erlick—

he goes on about the commission. He tells Mr. Kingston to get a lawyer:

—if you did make a mistake and you believe the commissioner will deal fairly with you for your mistake. I talked to Bev last night and asked him to keep his chin up and keep going under his handicap and that the presiding judge and myself and Mr. Dickerson were trying to help him. Once again, now, don't go saying Milton said this or that when I am trying to help you. Keep my name out of it.

Signed, FLOYD MILTON.

This man is a judge on the racing commission and he implicates Mr. Dunbar as being as guilty as the man who lost his licence for five years. I have told you he is the manager of the mutuels, employed by the Ontario jockey club. His practice was to take bets from the drivers, which is illegal, and this man did not lose his licence, but Mr. Kingston lost his licence for five years.

Mr. Chairman, in view of these three cases

of injustice to people in this racing field and the fact that they are not given a chance to appeal, regardless of what the hon. member says, I feel that there is need for a real searching inquiry into the activities of the racing commission and I would so move.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise some matters and I am a little puzzled at the moment to know what can be done. May I try to sort this out?

First, with regard to the Gordon Kingston episode and that letter which the hon. member for Grey North read, I have nothing to say on it. It has been put in the record. It obviously was a confidential letter to begin with, but I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that it is an important issue that you cannot now ignore.

Second, with regard to the Clarence Lockhart case, I was not aware, I had not been informed that there was an appeal and that it is before the courts. If the hon. Provincial Treasurer is accurate that it is before the courts, that cannot be dealt with and I shall not discuss it.

The Murray Waples case—Murray Waples of Coldwater—has been in and out of the courts and I am going to speak to it, because it illustrates the point that I want to make, at least, and I think it is an important point.

I have always been puzzled by the procedures of many of these commissions and particularly the racing commission. Indeed, this is a matter of considerable concern, there being representations made almost weekly, if not daily, before the McRuer commission on what happens to the rights of the individual, in the operation of these commissions. Now, in the instance of the Ontario racing commission, it has regulatory and disciplinary powers, and the remarkable thing, Mr. Chairman, is this: that while the Act does not state that the Ontario racing commission has the right to delegate these powers, in practice the Ontario racing commission does delegate these powers to the Canadian trotting association. So, in many instances, in the first case when charges are laid, the charge will be laid by the Canadian trotting association, which as far as this Legislature is concerned, is a sort of subsidiary body of the racing commission.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it is not. Why, they are as separate as day and night.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, just bear with me for a moment then, if you think that is the case.

For example, in the instance of the Waples case, when the charge is laid, and here it is

right here: "Murray John Waples, Canadian trotting association summons, Ontario racing commission, King Street East." Now, there is the summons that went to Mr. Waples, a summons from the Canadian trotting association, and yet at the bottom of it is "the Ontario racing commission." Now, this is my first point.

I do not know what the law is. I am not a lawyer, but as a layman, and as a legislator, I object to the proposition that we give certain powers to the Ontario racing commission and that it apparently, in fact, delegates its powers to the Canadian trotting association for charges and for penalties being imposed—if those charges in the trial that the Canadian trotting association holds, result in a verdict.

Let me illustrate what happened in the instance of the Waples case, because this is a fascinating thing, and I am glad the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) is here, because I sat on the committee yesterday, in which the solicitor—Mr. Harris who is acting independently, I think, but has been hired in connection with The Milk Act—said that there is absolutely no doubt at all that there is an appeal from the commission by mandamus, prohibition, or certiorari. Now, before I am finished, I will give you reviews of the chairman of the Ontario racing commission, in which on the record, in the transcript, he obviously looked for three or four ways to deny a right of prohibition when it was brought before him, so that this has really got to be clarified.

Now, what happened in this instance is this: There was a race on August 4. The judges' record, or what they call the "daily report of the judges," a copy of which I have in my hand here, has not a single notation on the bottom of it. In other words, as far as the judges who are responsible for reporting on this race, were concerned, there is nothing to indicate that there was anything untoward, illegal, or what you will, in the conduct of this race. Now, some three weeks later, a charge was laid against Waples and Lockhart, and I shall have to bring them in for the moment because it was a joint charge of collusion. And this trial was held by the Canadian trotting association. There was an appeal made from this, by the two gentlemen involved, to the racing commission.

Now, here, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to the attention particularly of the lawyers in the House, that we give the Ontario racing commission certain powers, and it delegates them to the trotting association. The trotting association hears the case in the first instance and there has to be an appeal from it back

to the body to whom we originally delegate the powers, namely, the Ontario racing commission.

Well, three weeks after the race, this trial was held and these gentlemen were going to be suspended. They appealed their case from the trotting association to the Ontario racing commission and the appeal was heard about a month later. As a matter of fact, it was on September 22 and 23, a two-day hearing. They were asked to come back two or three days later to get the judgment, and when they came back, Mr. Chairman, here was the fantastic thing that happened. The racing commission said to them, in effect, "We have quashed the charge for which you were convicted by the trotting association. We have accepted your appeal, but we immediately charge you with something else." And the other charge was a very vague thing. It is for "driving in a manner contrary to the public interest."

Now, in the instance of Mr. Lockhart, he was there and they made arrangements and proceeded immediately and it was heard by the racing commission and he was convicted by the racing commission, suspended and apparently he has appealed.

In the instance of Mr. Waples—and I want to pursue it, because it is not before the courts—he did not happen to be there and his lawyer was not there when the racing commission in effect accepted his appeal from the trotting association suspension, but immediately was going to lay another charge. And this charge was delivered to him two or three weeks later on October 15. I have the transcript of what happened before the racing commission at that particular time.

October 15, 1964. His lawyer was the late W. E. MacDonald, and I just want to quote two or three instances, brief quotes from the argument of Mr. MacDonald, which strikes me as having considerable validity. He said:

I, of course, object to this and I said in my opinion as a counsel that it was a denial of natural justice because we had come to the commission on an appeal from the judges at the race track—

namely, the Canadian trotting association hearing:

—and the commission had, in fact, sat as a court of appeal. I have never heard of a court of appeal taking and instructing another charge be laid, instead of the one that was appealed, and yet that is precisely what happened.

But let us go on a bit further, to quote from the transcript of the day at page 6. This is

his reference to Magistrate Bigelow, the chairman, in which he really took the gloves off and spoke rather frankly. He said:

I felt that, as a counsel—and these are not my personal views or my professional views, but I felt that the chairman—

the chairman of the racing commission:

—had dominated this commission during this appeal, so as to be authorized to bring this other set of facts before the commission and put us in the position of saying, “Well, we are going to have to get Waples anyway. He is not guilty of what the judges say he was guilty of, but he is guilty of something else and we will get him this way.” And having said that, the subpoena was issued.

And then—and this is what I draw to the particular attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, and indeed, to every hon. member in the government who is arguing, for example, that there is the right of an appeal—you see, what happened was, that when this second charge was laid against the racing commission, which was actually acting as a court of appeal from the trotting association, the lawyer for Mr. Waples moved in and said, “I am taking a motion before the court for prohibition.” In other words, it would be to get the rights from the courts to say that “this is beyond the ORC’s powers and you are prohibited to deal with them.” And they immediately got into quite a discussion between Mr. MacDonald on behalf of Waples and Magistrate Bigelow, as chairman of the racing commission, and a Mr. Hall, who I think was counsel for the racing commission when it was there. For example, just let me give you a few quotes:

The Chairman: Well now, Mr. MacDonald [This is W. E. MacDonald, the late W. E. MacDonald] I take it then that you and your client refused to stay for any hearing that the commission is going to conduct.

Mr. MacDonald: We say that the commission is without authority to conduct any hearing pending the outcome of the motion for prohibition. It is in the nature of an appeal and it absolutely stays all proceedings, and I think Mr. Hall will agree with that. If the order of prohibition is granted, you are forever stayed from the inquiry and if it is not, then you can proceed. [Precisely the kind of information that was given to us yesterday by Mr. Harris.]

The Chairman: The only thing that concerns me [This is Magistrate Bigelow] in the allowance of an appeal is that it

restores Mr. Waples to good standing. [Because he had been under suspension.]

Mr. MacDonald: I don’t think you need to worry about that. Mr. Waples’ horses are going to the farm and he does not intend to race. It was not my purpose to have him reinstated.

The Chairman: I was just wondering, in any event, if we have the power, in view of Mr. MacDonald’s statement on behalf of his client, to suspend Mr. Waples’ licence for conduct the commission considers to be contrary to the public interests, namely, refusing to attend a hearing of the commission.

In other words, because he would not attend a hearing of the commission then, because his lawyer wanted to take it off and get a writ of prohibition, here is Magistrate Bigelow saying:

I wonder if we cannot suspend him for action contrary to the public interest, namely, his refusal to attend a hearing of the commission as is provided in section 11 subsection (c) of The Racing Act.

I continue:

Mr. Hall: May I see a copy of the Act?

Mr. McKee: This is the same as the other one, isn’t it?

The Chairman: Here is your ribbon copy, Mr. MacDonald.

And then, facetiously, I think:

Mr. MacDonald: Why not suspend him for appealing to the courts while you are at it?

The Chairman: I was just asking that question, Mr. MacDonald, of our counsel.

Then the counsel, Mr. Hall, comes in:

I do not believe this can stay any decision, and it is my off-the-cuff opinion that this cannot stay a hearing or stay a suspension, because if that was the case, then with all due respect, counsel at any time a motion was brought, instead of saying October 24, could say April 27, 1965.

Mr. MacDonald: You could not bring it unless there was seven days’ notice.

Mr. Hall: But the date you set would be set sometime in the future. It does not have to be brought on the seventh day. That is what I am saying. You have chosen October 27, and you could have chosen February 15, 1965, or any other date—

The Chairman: October 27, 1990.

If I may just interject here, here is all of this going on between the counsel and the chairman of the Ontario racing commission—sort of facetious comments about why they were objecting to the right in coming with a motion of prohibition. However, Mr. Hall comes in:

I think the commission could suspend Mr. Waples for not appearing at the hearing now.

The counsel to the racing commission: I think he could be suspended now. I think the commission could suspend Mr. Waples for not appearing at the hearing now.

Mr. MacDonald: He is here!

Mr. Hall: But you don't want to give evidence.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I just said that the application for prohibition is the same as an appeal and it just stops all proceedings.

The Chairman: I don't agree, Mr. MacDonald. I think the proper procedure is, it seems to me—and again I am taken by surprise, as Mr. Hall is—but it would seem to me that the thing to do would be to call Mr. Waples to the stand and swear him and then start to ask him questions and if he refuses to answer questions, then that would take care of the matter.

Mr. MacDonald: If you were sitting as a magistrate and you had an application for an order of prohibition served on you, you would not proceed with the matter, pending the outcome of the motion. And that is what would happen under law. Any counsel can give advice—and Mr. Hall has the study of the matter and he can give advice too.

Mr. Hall: If you could give me about ten minutes.

The Chairman: Yes, certainly.

A few moments later they reconvened. Apparently Mr. Hall had thought the matter through and the chairman announced:

On the advice of our counsel, this hearing should be adjourned sine die, if that is the feeling of the other members of the commission that it should be done.

The shocking thing, Mr. Chairman, is the whole approach of a magistrate, sitting on one of our commissions, who clearly had no appreciation at all of what was explained to us only yesterday as almost a fundamental right in this province—to be able to appeal from one of the decisions of these agencies on mandamus, writ of prohibition or certiorari. In this instance, they did get a writ of prohibition. They went before the court.

Mr. Chairman, I have just two or three

more brief comments that I want to make here. This went before the Ontario Supreme Court and they got a writ of prohibition. It was appealed by the Ontario racing commission and the court of appeal quashed it. However, I want to go back to the first hearing before the Ontario Supreme Court. I have not seen the transcript or the judgment in the instance of the quashing, but I want to go back for two or three brief quotes and evidence with regard to the racing commission, which I think is factual in the judgment that was handed down at Osgoode Hall on December 29, 1964.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the hon. member if there is much involved by way of time?

Mr. MacDonald: I think I can finish this in about ten minutes.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I was just thinking of the session in the morning.

Mr. MacDonald: In the judgment, the judge said this, and I think this is pertinent when we are considering the racing commission, Mr. Treasurer:

I draw attention to section 14 of The Racing Commission Act:

"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations with respect to any and all matters or things as deemed necessary for the carrying out of this Act."

On a search I find [says the judgment] that there has not been one regulation made under the provisions of the Act. On the material files, on the other hand, I find that the racing commission administers by rules and directives.

At first blush, therefore, the fact that the rules and the directives have not received approval and have not emanated from and with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and its lack of publicity in acquiring a public character, leaves them in a state of flux and uncertainty. This, to my mind, is not to be condoned.

The existing three volumes of revised regulations of Ontario, 1960, established the wise practice of boards and commissions to set down, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, their rules and regulations. For instance, under The Optometry Act, regulation 474, "disgraceful conduct" is defined.

There is no definition that I can find of what constitutes "driving a horse against the public interest." By virtue of this section 92 of the Act, the members of the commission are civil servants. To operate

without regulations invites the abuse of discretionary power.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is extremely important. I was not aware of this. The Ontario racing commission has not a single regulation which is incorporated in the compilation of regulations for various bodies in the province of Ontario. The members operate in their very secret fashion and the hon. Provincial Treasurer must be aware of the amount of criticism that has gone on with regard to the secrecy of many of these bodies, but particularly this body. Not only do they operate secretly in many of their hearings, but their actual rules and directives are to a considerable degree secret, in that they are not regular regulations that are authorized by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and therefore published in what is known as the *Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1960*.

What the Ontario racing commission does is this: We give the members some power and they run off in the corner and run their own show—not with regulations but with rules and directives. They delegate some of their power to the trotting association, the trotting association issues summonses, with the racing commission listed at the bottom of the summons, holds trials, and then people have to appeal from this unauthorized illegal trial—it is certainly without legislative statute that I am aware of. They have to appeal to the Ontario racing commission. I think it is about time that this kind of empire building should be looked into.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It must have been the judge who represented the trotting association.

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know who represented the trotting association but all I am saying is that it is held under the trotting association—

Hon. Mr. Allan: My information is that the original decision is made by the judges.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this may be true, but I ask you where, for example, in the Act that sets up the Ontario racing commission, is there the power to delegate these responsibilities to another body with a power of appeal back to the Ontario racing commission?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I think there is an error there somewhere.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree with you. In this judgment—just one other comment—any commission or board which gives itself such right usurps power far beyond what the Legislature would grant even to itself.

Well, I think I have made the point. I could make further quotes from this, Mr. Chairman, but I submit to you that in the instance of the operation of this, we have to take a solid look at it and at the proposition that individuals should have their rights taken away. In this instance I am not in the position, I am not competent, to judge the merits or demerits of the charges. I would not for one moment do what the hon. member for Grey North has done, and try to assess whether a horse was driven up the middle. I am not competent to judge this.

But I am competent—and it is my responsibility—to examine the exercise of power that we have given to these bodies and I suggest to you in the history so far of the Waples case that it is an extraordinary story with great abuses of power. What has happened now is that having got a writ of prohibition from the supreme court, having had it quashed in the court of appeal, it is now coming next Tuesday before the Ontario racing commission. And what will happen, who knows? But in view of what appears to be something of a closed mind on this whole issue, by the racing commission, I suspect that Mr. Waples is going to be hit with a year's suspension as Mr. Lockhart was. But, you see how a racing commission—I say this finally, Mr. Chairman, and I just go back to one small point in the Lockhart case. In the Lockhart case, when it was appealed to the racing commission and the racing commission quashed the decision of the trotting association or the judges at the track—

Hon. Mr. Allan: The judges, I think.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, the judges at the track—they immediately slapped another charge on him. The other charge was with regard to another race on another day.

Hon. Mr. Allan: This, I understand, was as a result of pictures.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I do not know. I repeat, I am not competent to deal with the details but the proposition that you have a daily report here from the judges that has not a single mark on it and then three weeks later you start laying collusion charges and they get quashed and then you start slapping another charge—it strikes me that this has all the possibilities for vindictive action against people, which bears no relationship at all to justice or what may have gone on in the courts.

I invite the hon. Provincial Treasurer—without carrying this further, because I have other points and other issues on this particular

vote—but I invite the hon. Provincial Treasurer to have his authorities look into it. I would also invite the hon. Minister of Agriculture to take a serious look at this business, Mr. Chairman, because if the chairman of one of our boards has this concept of what the right of appeal is from the board, I am going to have a healthy look at any amendments the hon. Minister may bring in in The Milk Industry Act, because I have to be persuaded when the head of one of the commissions—who is a magistrate—did not think you had these rights.

Hon. Mr. Allan: You know they do have the right to appeal?

Mr. MacDonald: I do, but why would not Magistrate Bigelow?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning, following the flag-raising ceremony and when the House sits, we will have certain second readings. There will be a Budget debate to enable some of the hon. members to participate and we will continue thereafter with estimates.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.40 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 21, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Friday, May 21, 1965

Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	3185
University of Guelph Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	3185
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, first reading	3185
Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	3193
Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	3193
Department of Public Welfare Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	3193
Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill intituled, Mr. Robarts, first reading	3194
Introducing representatives from the Government of Michigan, Mr. Haskett	3197
Statement re Toronto newspaper strike, Mr. Rowntree	3198
Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	3199
Seed Potatoes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	3199
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	3200
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Sargent	3202
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3206
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3206

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as visitors to the Legislature today in the east and west galleries, students from North-view public school, London.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF ONTARIO ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH ACT, 1964

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The University of Guelph Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, a very brief explanation of the two bills that have been introduced. It was roughly a year ago when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) introduced the Act establishing the University of Guelph. When he introduced this bill he drew attention to the fact that for the relatively short term the federated colleges would maintain their traditional association with The Department of Agriculture. He further explained at the time that it was the intention of the department to transfer both effective control and the assets of the colleges to the university, but that time, careful study, negotiation and a good deal of effort were required to settle these matters

effectively. I am pleased to say this morning that, consistent with the general progress that has marked the first year of the University of Guelph, the questions related to the transfer of assets and the future relationship between the university and The Department of Agriculture have been satisfactorily resolved.

This bill provides for the transfer of land, of buildings and equipment and provides that certain property will be retained by the department for its own future needs in agricultural research and other matters related to that department.

The bill now presented, provides for amendments to The University of Guelph Act consistent with agreed arrangements and I am very pleased to present it to the House on this occasion.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to make a somewhat lengthier explanation of this bill than is normally my custom, but the bill is of some real significance and I think it requires a fairly complete statement, so that it will be properly understood by the hon. members of the House and, of course, by the public at large. So I would ask the hon. members to bear with me when I trace the background, the need for this bill and some of the plans that are contained in the particular legislation.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, and the introduction of it in this assembly, provides for the establishment and operation of a system of colleges of applied arts and technology and I believe this to be an historic occasion in education in our province. The bill, Mr. Speaker, marks a major step forward in the development of our educational system; it provides for the introduction of a new level and type of education, one which is still in

keeping with our traditions and our present accomplishments. Above all else, it goes far towards making a reality of the promise—indeed, I believe, of the policy—of this government and, I believe, of this House. And the policy is to provide, through education and training, not only an equality of opportunity to all sectors of our population, but the fullest possible development of each individual to the limit of his ability. In this new age of technological change and invention, also, it is essential to the continued growth and expansion of the economy of our province, and, I suggest, of our nation, that adequate facilities be made generally available for the education and training of craftsmen, technicians and technologists.

Dr. John Deutsch, chairman of the economic council of Canada, made this point abundantly clear in his address of March 1, 1965, to the Canadian Club in Toronto, and I just quote very briefly from this address:

The world in which we live and must make our way is one which demands an ever-changing pattern of occupations and rising levels of skills. The occupations which are growing most rapidly are those which involve advancing levels of basic education and training. The occupations requiring the lowest levels of formal education are declining. Much has already been done to meet the educational needs of our times, but there are significant deficiencies and gaps which remain to be overcome, especially in respect of research, the retraining of workers and the development of highly skilled manpower.

I am sure the hon. members have read the complete version of Dr. Deutsch's speech. I think it underlines the importance of the recommendations for the expansion of technical education and trades training made by our own select committee on manpower training, under the chairmanship of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), which reported in February, 1963; and of the emphasis placed on the implications of technological change during September, 1963, at the conference on automation and social change.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of this government was set forth with equal clarity by our hon. Prime Minister in his major statement to this assembly on February 23, 1965. The implications of technological change for economic growth and for education were stated by our hon. Prime Minister at that time.

The government of Ontario recognizes that, while there are differences of opinion

as to the nature, extent and timing of public policy, there is nevertheless basic agreement on certain fundamental assumptions about the problem of technological change.

It is generally agreed that changes in technology have always affected and will continue to affect our social and economic system. It is also agreed that the rate of change in our social and economic system is related to the rate of change in technology and that the rate of technological change is accelerating. Further, there is general acceptance that the first implication of technological change will be the change in the nature of individual jobs and each such change eventually leads to changes in values, patterns of behaviour and our social institutions, including government itself.

The policy of this government with respect to education and training in this connection was laid down by hon. Mr. Robarts in the same statement and I think it is a very fitting statement to read on this occasion:

Our true wealth resides in an educated citizenry; our shrewdest and most profitable investment rests in the education of our people. A general phenomenon of our day is that brainworkers—"knowledge workers," as they are more frequently labelled, to contrast with "manual workers"—in the future, of an ever-higher calibre, are the prime economic need for societies in advanced states of industrialism.

I think this states very clearly the policy as represented by our hon. Prime Minister.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed legislation for colleges of applied arts and technology must be viewed in the light of the economic and social demands not only of today but of tomorrow. It will be recognized, I am confident, that this expansion of our school system is imperative to meet the needs of individual citizens as well as those of society as a whole. This development is another step towards the fulfillment of our efforts to expand and redesign our system of schools and universities to meet more adequately the changing demands of very challenging times. We have recently completed, as the hon. members are well aware, a far-reaching reorganization of our secondary school programme and, under the federal-provincial agreement, have built vocational schools sufficient in number to ensure that courses of study in the commercial and technical fields, as well as in the academic, are provided throughout the province.

I may add, parenthetically, that these new

courses have met with enthusiastic acceptance and support—almost embarrassingly so in some communities, I must admit, where the realities of actual enrolment have somewhat outstripped the expectations of the planners. At the same time, we have approved, and this House has approved and underwritten an expansion of our university facilities unprecedented in our history.

Now, having put in train our plans for other areas of our school system, we must and can focus our attention on the design of this remaining section, directly related to the applied arts and technology, for full-time and for part-time students, in day and in evening courses, and planned to meet the relevant needs of all adults within a community, at all socio-economic levels, of all kinds of interests and aptitudes, and at all stages of educational achievement. Our efforts here could, I suppose, be considered also as a co-ordination and culmination of all previous work in this area: a welding into a coherent whole, so to speak, of the parts which have sometimes seemed fragmented and—I think the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) made this observation when we were discussing adult education a year ago—of the parts which have sometimes seemed fragmented and unrelated, so that we have a complete system extending from the kindergarten to the postgraduate level.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to give a brief review and evaluation of recent changes and developments in the worlds of work and of education which have made essential the creation of this new level of our school system. In terms of the factor of need, there are two or three main items which stand out above all others. First, there is the matter of the so-called “knowledge explosion,” by which is meant that recently, knowledge in certain fields—science, in particular—has been doubling about every ten years. One very natural consequence is that a longer period of schooling is demanded by the circumstances. Where the limit may be, I simply do not know, but obviously a much higher level of education is going to be required of all of us.

We now have accepted the principle of secondary education for all. We probably must now recognize the inevitability of some form of post-secondary education—i.e. beyond grade 12—for all of those who are capable of profiting from it. Further education must be provided in a variety of courses or programmes, varying in length from a few weeks perhaps to six or more years, in new types of institutions as well as in universities, and for part-time day and evening students, as

well as for full-time day students; for adults as well as for youth, and for the upgrading and updating of workers either on the job or in evening courses, as well as for the unemployed.

Secondly, the new technological revolution in which we have been caught up has seen the disappearance of most of the unskilled, and a high proportion of the semi-skilled, jobs. Indeed, the occupational world has altered beyond recognition during the period of 25 years extending from the beginning of World War II. Much higher levels of basic educational qualifications, and of technical skills, for instance, are demanded of those who supervise or work in our new automated factories and offices.

These higher levels of skill and knowledge simply must be attained by employees, either before employment or through upgrading courses while in service, as Dr. Deutsch pointed out. I admit, however, that I experienced a considerable sense of shock when, during our recent visit to California—and I am sure the members of the committee on youth experienced this as well—where we were studying these and related matters, we were informed quite casually and as an accepted fact of life, that employers in that jurisdiction were not really willing to accept high school graduation as a minimum qualification for new employees, but were demanding graduation from junior college as the irreducible minimum.

As I review the situation developing in our own very highly industrialized province, though, I not only appreciate their situation better, but realize that I had probably been afforded a preview of things to come in our own province and in the not-too-far-distant future. We simply must provide the facilities for education and training at these higher levels if we hope to continue to compete for markets on even terms at home and abroad.

The third and final factor which I wish to mention is what is commonly known as the “population explosion”—and I guess the hon. members think I am being somewhat melodramatic in using the terms “knowledge explosion,” “technological revolution” and “population explosion,” but I assure you I am not; these are, of course, the simple facts of life with which we must live today. Probably I need stress neither the facts nor the implications in this matter of population growth; all hon. members are well aware that we have just experienced the first of the many tidal waves of students that will threaten to engulf our secondary and post-secondary educational institutions for the next

20 years at least. Nevertheless, a brief review of the facts may not be amiss.

Let us start with the live births. These had reached an all-time low before World War II, at about 60,000 per year—the small pool of talent, incidentally, from which we have had to recruit our teachers for many years—then climbed dramatically right after the war. We have the first wave in grade 13 this year, hence the 25 per cent increase in grade 13 enrolment. After a short period of levelling off at around 100,000, the number of live births climbed steadily each year to reach a new high of approximately 160,000 in 1960. I am sure the hon. members will realize, of course, that the survivors of those born in 1960, will probably graduate from high school in 1978, and 1979, and from our universities in 1982, or 1983.

In addition, we must take into account the added load arising through immigration from other provinces and countries; and I would point out to you that it is not an insignificant load. I note that in the period 1949 to 1962, Ontario received 261,000 children under 18 years of age from other countries—and, from other provinces, a net gain of 40,700 children under 16 years of age. Excluding those children under five years of age, we have had to supply during those few short years about 8,000 additional classrooms and teachers for immigrant children alone, over and above our own natural increase.

At the secondary level, enrolment was 37.6 per cent of the population aged 15-19 years in 1946, but reached 74.1 per cent in 1964. Actually, up to 1957 and 1958, the secondary school enrolment increases arose mainly through the increased retention rates; and, of course, under the reorganized programme of study such rates will no doubt continue to increase. I am comforted by the fact, however, that there is an automatic 100 per cent limit on the age group, and we are nearly three-quarters of the way along that road. But I think we can take some pride in the fact that these pressures have developed; nothing else could so dramatically illustrate the success of the policy of this government to extend secondary school facilities to all parts of our province, thus going far towards making equality of educational opportunity a reality.

As for the future, the predictions are rather staggering. For elementary schools, we started with 539,000 pupils enrolled in September, 1946, reached 1,278,500 by September, 1964, and anticipate that we should reach two million elementary school youngsters by 1982 or 1983. The secondary: 123,800 pupils in September, 1946, reached

395,300 in September, 1964, and will reach at least 700,000 about 1983. The enrolment figures of the universities I have given to the House on other occasions. And I see from my notes, after some study two or three days ago, that we may anticipate a levelling off in university enrolment in the early 1980s.

Now, for a glimpse into the more distant future, may I point out to the hon. members that, whereas the 0-5-years age group in 1941 totalled about 300,000—and some of the academic survivors of this group are presently pursuing their studies on the graduate fellowships—we anticipate that the same age group will total about 1,700,000 by 1986. And this may seem a long time in the future, Mr. Speaker, but really it is only 20 years hence; and the academic survivors of that group will constitute the high school enrolment of the year AD 2001.

Now, with such growth patterns—and I do apologize for taking so much time, but I think it is really rather relevant—with such growth patterns facing us in the segments of the present school system, why then do we add another part to the structure? Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we really have no choice; certainly not as we press forward with our reorganized programmes in secondary schools. It is not feasible, and I suggest it is not indeed desirable, that all graduates of our high schools should go to university. The real needs of a very substantial number of our young people lie elsewhere; they would be served poorly and fare poorly in the traditional university programmes.

Perhaps the best summary of the situation may be found in the report of the grade 13 study committee, 1964, and I quote very briefly from it:

The truth of the matter is that we are now in an entirely different world from that of the 1920s and 1930s, and it is necessary that we extend our educational system to meet the demands of this new world. In the past, when we have faced that sort of crisis, we have solved the problem by expanding our secondary school programme—in 1871, for example, when we added general education for the many to special education for the few, or in the 1920s when technical training was introduced in a considerable number of high schools. In the present crisis, the need cannot be met simply by alterations or additions at secondary school level; this time we must turn our attention to the post-secondary level, where we must create a new kind of institution that will provide,

in the interests of students for whom a university course is unsuitable, a type of training which universities are not designed to offer.

Fortunately, a beginning has been made in the establishment of the institutes of technology and vocational centres. The committee is therefore recommending the establishment of community colleges to provide these new and alternative programmes.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence of need and of demand for this new sector of our system is overwhelming.

Many people have assumed, but quite erroneously, that I am planning simply to import and implant, unchanged, in our province the system of junior colleges, or community colleges, that has been developed in the United States. It is true that the American junior college has had a long and honourable history, for 50 years or more in some states, but our "senior matriculation," so I am told, admitting to what was then the second year of a four-year BA degree course at the University of Toronto, dates back to 1853. We have, therefore, had experience for over a century with a programme half the length of the junior college transfer courses. Moreover, we have had vocational education at the secondary school level for over 40 years.

What we have in mind, therefore, as you will see in a few moments, is not the imposition of an imported or alien institution on our educational system, but the development and expansion of our present system to meet the particular needs of this province. Although it is true that our colleges of applied arts and technology may resemble some of their United States counterparts in many respects—and this is not surprising, since the age group is the same and the basic needs of youth in our two countries differ little—yet there will be real differences in programmes and in emphasis.

I hasten to add that, far from refusing to profit from experience elsewhere, we have deliberately sought to learn from others and to select the features which strengthen our own proposals. I have personally visited many of these new institutions in the United States, more recently in Florida and in California, and have discussed our tentative plans with knowledgeable educators and laymen in other provinces of Canada as well. As you no doubt know, a form of junior college, differing fundamentally from our proposed colleges in the emphasis on university-parallel courses, is being developed

in Alberta and in British Columbia. We are observing their experience, Mr. Speaker, with great interest.

What programmes do we plan to offer in these colleges? As indicated earlier, we have in mind composite or comprehensive institutions, preferably with several buildings on the same campus, providing a wide variety of programmes of varying length, including work-experience programmes, by day and in the evening, for adults as well as for youth, and for probably more part-time than full-time students.

Nevertheless, some features will be common to all programmes: They will be to a substantial degree, occupation-oriented, they will be designed to meet the needs of the local community—and they will be "commuter" colleges. Residence or dormitory facilities will not be provided, except possibly in some areas of northern Ontario.

We have not yet determined the number and location of these colleges, or the final criteria which should determine the area that each should serve. I have initiated studies of all these matters, but definite decisions must naturally await the formation of the provincial council of regents referred to in the legislation. My hope is that a few such colleges will be in operation in the very near future. I would hope by September of 1966, when the first four-year graduates will be coming out of the secondary school programme, but I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, to have a planned and intelligent programme on a province-wide basis, this cannot be developed overnight.

Studies of local needs and requirements must be made in each case, and much will depend on evidence of real local interest in the establishment and operation of such an institution. We must decide what part our present institutes of technology and trades and vocational centres will play in the new plan. It may well be that the provincial council of regents will recommend a complete integration of existing institutions and efforts, using the present buildings, staff, and programmes as nuclei for the development of the new colleges.

As for the programmes, our plans are not yet advanced to the point where I can be specific and definite. Besides, the emphasis not only could but should vary from one community or region to another. In general, however, one may recognize three major responsibilities of every such college:

(1) to provide courses of types and levels beyond, or not suited to, the secondary school setting;

(2) to meet the needs of graduates from any secondary school programme, apart from those wishing to attend university; and

(3) to meet the educational needs of adults and out-of-school youth, whether or not they are secondary school graduates.

I would hope to see the following range of offerings in most if not all colleges of applied arts and technology, the choice to be determined by local circumstances, as indicated above, and extended where a particular need exists in a community.

(a) engineering technician and technologist programmes below university level;

(b) semi-professional non-engineering type programmes—e.g. in the paramedical field—

(c) high-level programmes in office and distributive occupations, specifically of junior and middle management level, and including courses for small business;

(d) agricultural and agricultural-related programmes, at least in rural areas, in co-operation with The Department of Agriculture;

(e) general adult education programmes, including cultural and leisure time activities;

(f) programmes of recreation, including physical education;

(g) general or liberal education courses, including remedial courses in basic subjects, and often incorporated as part of the other programmes;

(h) Retraining, upgrading and updating courses;

(i) pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship;

(j) service industry courses;

(k) commercial courses; and

(l) other courses to meet local needs.

With respect to the general or liberal education courses, and the general adult education programmes, I would point out that these are not thought of as university-level courses. Nevertheless, and I wish to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, no able and qualified student should be prevented from going on from a college of applied arts and technology to a university and, indeed, such a pattern exists today for able graduates of institutes of technology, as you may know. The university doors should always be open to capable and ambitious young men and women. It is our intention to set up a committee of representatives of the department and of the universities to determine, as proposed by the Ontario council of university faculty associations, in their recent brief to me, the conditions and procedures under which universities may grant admission to

those students who have completed successfully an appropriate programme at one of our colleges of applied arts and technology and who have demonstrated that they are prepared to undertake university work.

Moreover, I have no doubt that where circumstances warrant it, some of our universities will make arrangements with particular colleges of applied arts and technology, as provided in the proposed legislation, to conduct one or two years of their own degree courses within those colleges. The present university extension courses leading to a general arts degree might be a logical beginning point. I should explain, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation provides that the board of governors of the college of applied arts and technology may enter into an agreement with an existing university to establish the first, or the first and second year of the actual university programme in affiliation with that institution. In such a programme, the academic content to be administered or supervised by the university.

You will note from the remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I have not included in the list of courses what is popularly referred to by the Americans as the "transfer" or "college parallel" courses, leading to advanced placement in universities, and I want to make this clear because there is no need for such courses in Ontario at the present time at least. In Ontario we have the grade 13 course in our secondary schools now, and will probably long have its possible successor, the proposed matriculation year, specifically designed as a university-preparatory programme for our academically able students.

May I remind hon. members also, that we have studied very carefully the needs of university-type courses and have adopted as government policy and, I think, with the general support of this House, an expansion of existing universities and the establishment of new universities sufficient to meet that particular demand for the foreseeable future. Present plans for expansion of university education should suffice for the remainder of this critical decade of the "sixties"; and we are now studying the demands of the "seventies." If circumstances so require, we will naturally change or make adaptations to our present plans.

I should mention some of my own thoughts on the organization, administration, and financing of these new colleges. We must, of course, have a province-wide system, carefully planned in its development, and built upon experience with institutes of technology and vocational centres. We have no choice

but to press forward as rapidly as possible with the establishment of such colleges and if we are to do so they must, for the immediate future at least, be fully financed by the province, without local taxation. The headlong pace of technological change gives no chance of a pause in the development; the needs of young people, of the unemployed, and even of the employed are indeed urgent. It might take up to five years, and I think this is an optimistic estimate, to set up a provincial system of local administration and financing of such colleges, of the type I observed in Florida and California. We simply cannot wait five years; indeed, we cannot afford to mark time for even one year. As I stated earlier, the Ontario council of regents should co-ordinate our efforts and provide for a healthy growth. The legislation also provides for the establishment of local boards of governors who shall have the powers of incorporation, subject to regulation, and also for the establishment of local advisory committees in the various branches of studies.

For the foreseeable future, I think that these colleges will not be "free," but that a tuition fee, modest in amount, will be charged. It is anticipated that bursaries and Canada student loans will be available to many youngsters entering these colleges. However, the final details of administration and financing must await the result of studies already underway. At the present stage when plans and regulations are being drafted—which is a task my officials will undertake almost immediately—we shall invite the widest possible presentation of comments, suggestions, and proposals from interested parties. I have in mind, in particular, representations to be sought from leaders of industry, labour, and commerce; parents; trustees; and experienced educators.

We have not had an opportunity to investigate thoroughly the source of supply and the form of training required for the members of staff of these new colleges. From experience gained elsewhere, and within our own province in the cases of institutes of technology and vocational centres, however, I have gained the impression that many of the teachers will come from industry and commerce, and hence will already possess the essential technical skills. I recognize, of course, that it is inevitable that some of the teachers will be recruited from the present secondary school staffs, and from the university staffs, which will naturally pose some irksome problems of supply of staff for those already hard-pressed institutions. This is a difficulty that I acknowledge, but we are

aware of and which will require careful study and consideration.

For the present, at least, it is my intention to commence operation of these new institutions under The Department of Education, not under the new Department of University Affairs, although the colleges will be post-secondary institutions and the fullest co-operation between these two departments of government will be essential. There are many advantages to be gained—and perhaps even a few disadvantages to be suffered—under such an arrangement. I would remind hon. members, for instance, that we have had in The Department of Education some considerable experience with institutes of technology and vocational centres, and in many respects these older institutions have served, and are serving even today, as prototypes in some areas, at least, of the new colleges.

Indeed, our present technological and trades training branch within the department might well be reconstituted and expanded to fulfil the necessary functions at that level. Further, we have over the years developed reasonably satisfactory financial working arrangements with the federal government authorities in the field of technical education and trade training, and we plan to take full advantage of these financial arrangements for our new colleges of applied arts and technology—and I should interject here, Mr. Speaker, that we have had some very excellent discussions with the federal Department of Labour and we are most encouraged by their attitude toward this proposed programme. I need hardly remind you that the new Department of University Affairs certainly has its hands full trying to cope with the vexing and significant problems of university expansion. In the meantime there must be some overlapping of functions and duties—without serious duplication. I realize that the presidents of our universities suggested that the so-called "city colleges" that they advocated should be administered by The Department of University Affairs, but in our discussions they readily admitted the logic of my proposal, and have never pressed this particular point. Perhaps sometime in the future, a change of jurisdiction will appear advisable, and if so, it will be made; for the present, however, the arrangements I have suggested seem much more advantageous.

I readily admit, Mr. Speaker, that this concept of colleges of applied arts and technology has captured my imagination; I am enthusiastic and optimistic about the probable outcome of this new venture in education. I am confident that it will go far to

meet the needs of youth and adults in the future.

I wish, quite frankly, sir, that opportunities were generally available throughout our province today and we intend to see that developments take place as rapidly as possible. I recognize full well the scope and magnitude of the undertaking and I think this is rather relevant, Mr. Speaker; in numbers enrolled, if not in costs, the experts indicate that the new college system could eventually well outstrip the university family. But once more, and more particularly now that our four-year secondary school programmes are becoming accepted and are rapidly expanding, we simply must provide opportunities for the higher education of this segment of our population as well as for the university-bound group.

In closing, I wish to express my appreciation to the individuals and the groups such as the Ontario university presidents, the Ontario council of university faculty associations, and the Ontario teachers' federation who submitted briefs for our study.

The new colleges, Mr. Speaker, I think, will perhaps pay in returns to the individuals concerned some rewards in technical advancement, but I would hope more particularly, in human happiness and satisfaction.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, would you permit me very briefly to say that we on this side welcome the introduction of this bill, and although we looked for notice of it on the order paper, it is apparent, of course, that notice was delivered through the morning newspaper, and a very interesting notice it was, indeed.

We look forward, certainly, to discussing this, and I would compliment the hon. Minister on what he has called his "sketch"—but I would say a rather complete sketch—of what the bill entails.

If I may be permitted to ask, perhaps the hon. Minister would add to his lengthy statement a word or two on just what the involvement of the federal authorities might be in the financing of this great project.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been no final conclusion, but we would estimate the federal authorities may contribute in the neighbourhood of 50 per cent to the vocational or technical aspects of the proposed development. Where the line will be drawn is very difficult to determine at this stage.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister will look after remedial liberalism himself, then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not sure whether that is the correct terminology—

Mr. Speaker: I may say to the member for Brant that I am informed by the clerk that notice was given some days ago and for some technical reason it has not been entered on the notice paper.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): If a little latitude is being given here this morning, I think on this occasion I can use it in a fashion that the other side of the House will quite likely approve of. Rarely has any bill come into this House that I felt as enthusiastic about as this one. Undoubtedly there will be points in it that, as we begin to dig into the great range of problems, we will have our differences on, but this is indeed a historic development in the educational system in the province of Ontario.

I listened to, and I would like to read with some care before I come to a final conclusion, the hon. Minister's apparent resolution of the difficulties in the two points of view as to a community college. Indeed, in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I think the time may well have come for us to cease leaning over so far backward and arguing that we are not going to import alien institutions into our system, because I think quite frankly we are fighting some myths here.

When I not only listened to the hon. Minister say that there is going to be worked out in studies that he has set up, a procedure that will assure the opportunity for the bright student to move ahead, but when I also heard him say that universities will, in effect, work out courses in these colleges and have them staffed and supervised by the universities—in fact, using these institutions as a junior college in the American sense—I thought maybe that part of tradition in Canadian history of saying that we will not have anything American is a bit of a hang-over from the American revolutionary war, and the emergence of the United Empire Loyalists in our midst is becoming a bit out of date.

There may well be some things in the American junior college system that are worthy of emulation, and I suspect if one examines carefully, they are being emulated here while we are saying that we will not have anything of it. Let us cease fighting these myths. Generally speaking, I welcome this and I congratulate the hon. Minister on coping with and solving many of the prob-

lems. I note that he stresses that the day may come, and is not too far off, when he will have to do some reorganization in his own Departments of Education and University Affairs, and I predict that that perhaps will be earlier than he thinks, or that he has publicly conceded it this morning.

THE CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the amendment to The Children's Institutions Act increases the financial participation of the government in these centres of group care.

The provincial subsidies for construction of buildings and new additions will be doubled, it is raised from \$2,500 per bed to the new maximum of \$5,000 per bed. If the organization purchases an existing building, the grant will be up to \$1,200 for each bed thus acquired.

Our financial support for the day-to-day maintenance and treatment of children has been extended, and the provincial subsidy has been increased from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of actual costs.

We have also removed the determination of the financial circumstances of parents. That is to say, 75 per cent of cost will be paid through my department for all children in the institutions, except wards of children's aid societies. These wards, as you know, are fully covered by the society, which recovers 100 per cent of such expenses from public funds.

As hon. members know, children's institutions were operated by private charitable organizations who give special care and attention to the child who is unable to live in his own home or a foster home. There are at present 21 of these institutions, and their programmes vary from normal group residences to the highly specialized treatment centres. Among the latter are the Boys' Village of Toronto, the Warrendale home at Newmarket, and the Sunnyside children's centre in Kingston.

Many of these groups are vitally concerned in maintaining and extending residential care for children. There are, for instance, nine orders of Catholic sisters; the Mennonite Church; the Salvation Army, and the Orange

lodges. I believe that these amendments give fitting recognition to the private organizations which are doing such fine work in the field, and we are hopeful that with this encouragement, more treatment centres will result to the benefit of children who need such special care and attention.

THE HOMES FOR RETARDED CHILDREN ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment to The Homes for Retarded Children Act is to give greater encouragement to the chain of local associations for retarded children throughout Ontario. There is a need for additional residential facilities which, in the main, operate in conjunction with special schools for the retarded child.

The amendment to the Act provides capital grants from the province of up to \$5,000 per bed for new construction. This doubles the previous figure of \$2,500 a bed. Where an existing building is acquired the grant will be \$1,200 for each bed established.

We are satisfied that these grants will be most acceptable to local organizations and will stimulate an expansion of the accommodation available for retarded children.

A further amendment increases the provincial contribution to maintenance expenditures. The grant is now raised from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of daily costs for supporting a child in the home, and besides this percentage increase, we have eliminated the \$5 daily maximum, so that the 75-per-cent subsidy is payable on actual costs. We have also removed the determination of the financial circumstances of the parents.

I am given to understand that the fine groups of citizens' associations who are concerned with the lives of retarded children in their own communities, will find these financial improvements of immense advantage in pressing forward with the programmes of residential care.

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Public Welfare Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this amendment to The Department of Public Welfare Act, we are recognizing a need to encourage further consideration of municipal welfare services. We would like to see more local municipalities unify their welfare programmes under the authority of the county council, or in northern Ontario, under a district welfare administration board.

This amendment provides that the provincial administration may share in the administration of expenditures of a county or district's consolidated services. Through the regulations we intend to make our share 50 per cent, in relation to the personnel and services directly involved in the welfare operation.

Participation in such costs is a new departure on the part of the province. This aspect of welfare responsibility has traditionally been an obligation of the local municipality. I should mention, however, that at this time, sharing in municipal administration does not apply to cities, which would normally remain outside a unified welfare service. It is known that few rural municipalities have a full-time welfare officer. In a consolidated administration, the county or district will likely employ a regular staff qualified to carry out the programme.

It should be noted that there are now four such welfare units established in Ontario. These are the counties of Wentworth, Prince Edward and Welland, and the district of Sudbury. We believe that consolidation of welfare services is a progressive step from many viewpoints. It assures, for one thing, that in general welfare assistance and the other municipal programmes, standards will be maintained at a high level and the services will be extended to the fullest possible.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this seems to be government legislation day.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves first reading of bill intituled, The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reasonably exhaustive statements concerning this bill, in order that it may be well and truly understood. There has been a great deal of misunderstanding in the area of pensions during the last two years and I think it is proper that we get this bill in perspective and that the hon. members know where it fits in the overall picture.

As hon. members know, The Pension Benefits Act became law during the 1962-63 session, and was amended in 1964 to repeal the standard plan provisions, which were rendered no longer necessary in view of the intervening announcement that the Canada Pension Plan would be introduced on a national basis. The establishment of pension plans by employers under this Act is no longer compulsory, but the plans that exist are regulated by the terms of this legislation.

The purpose of the Act, as it now stands, is to strengthen the existing system of private pensions by requiring that the pension benefits should, under certain conditions, be portable and by establishing standards of solvency. While no employer is required to establish or maintain in force a pension plan for his employees, those who do so must provide vested pension benefits in the form of deferred annuities for employees who leave employment over age 45, after having completed ten years' service. Moreover, to help ensure that the pension promises will be kept, the plan must be funded and the pension fund must be properly invested.

The Pension Benefits Act came into full effect on January 1 of this year and the pension commission has received more than 8,100 applications for registration of pension plans operating in this province. The vast majority of these plans have already been amended to a greater or lesser degree, in order to comply with the new standards.

To illustrate the positive achievements of our policy, I need only mention that in more than half the plans, the vesting rights were seriously inadequate before the Act came into effect. Statistics published by the pension commission show that in the case of 4,359 pension plans covering some 553,000 Ontario members, the employee was not entitled to full vesting of his pension benefits until he had in excess of ten years' service with the employer or participation in the plan. All these plans affecting that number of people have had to be amended and the amendments were, of course, in favour of the employee members.

Moreover, 98 plans were completely unfunded, being operated on a pay-as-you-go basis, and 76 plans were unfunded except as regards retired people. These two classes covered some 43,000 employees. Many other plans were not funded up to the level required under the Act and in all these cases the financing will be strengthened, resulting in a greater measure of retirement security for the employees.

The necessity of making the amendments

to the terms of pension plans and filing them for registration has, in many cases, imposed considerable burdens upon employers and their pension advisers. The response has been most encouraging and we greatly appreciate the co-operation of employers in industry, commerce and elsewhere in this very necessary task.

The Canada Pension Plan will soon be providing an additional source of income for those retiring in the future, but this will obviously not meet all the pension needs of our workers. The supplementation of the public plan by private plans is essential if we are to have a well-balanced pension system. I want to make it very clear that there is no conflict between the aims of the Ontario Act, which regulates private plans, and the new national plan.

I have pointed out on previous occasions that the Ontario Act is a piece of pioneer legislation which we are ready to expand and improve in the light of experience. Some of this experience has now been gained. The Pension Benefits Act has been subject to careful review during the last 12 months and a number of improvements can now be made to strengthen the legislation and in the interest of achieving uniformity of legislation across Canada.

Following my proposal to the other provinces at the conference of provincial Prime Ministers held at Jasper Park last summer, two interprovincial conferences have been held to consider a model or uniform pension benefits Act to be used in the provinces right across Canada. The representatives of the provinces, as well as the federal government observers, have made many helpful suggestions in producing uniform legislation for consideration by each province. A very large measure of agreement was reached by the representatives who attended these conferences, on the need for uniformity and how it might be achieved across Canada, in the basic rules governing pension plans, and on such matters as the vesting formula, locking-in of contributions, interprovincial co-operation and the need for ensuring solvency of pension funds.

I am pleased to be able to report to the House that the province of Quebec has indicated its intention to introduce its own Act regulating private plans, to be effective on January 1, 1966, as was foreshadowed in the resolution of the Quebec Legislature on June 9, 1964. We understand that in spite of some differences of form due to legal technicalities, the Quebec Act will closely follow the uniform pension benefits Act in all its essentials.

In other words, we are reaching a point where we can co-operate with the province of Quebec in this area.

The uniform pension benefits Act provides for making agreements between provinces to avoid duplicate reporting and duplicate examination of pension plans where the employer operates in more than one province. We are ready to enter into discussions on such an agreement with Quebec and with any other provinces adopting this uniform legislation.

In view of the understandings reached with the representatives of other provinces and the favourable position taken by Quebec, our goal of uniform rules regulating pensions across Canada is in sight. In addition, the federal Minister of Finance has stated that as soon as there is a wide measure of agreement by the provinces, the government of Canada will introduce similar legislation applicable to employees under federal jurisdiction.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the concept of portable pensions is finding support in the United States. In January, President Johnson's committee on corporate pension funds and other private retirement and welfare programmes recommended that a "private pension plan, in order to qualify for favoured tax treatment, must provide some reasonable measure of vesting for the protection of employees."

Hence it is evident that the initiative that we have taken in the last few years—and it has taken a few years to develop this—has borne fruit in many places. We are therefore moving to the next stage by introducing at this time a revised Pension Benefits Act, which has been developed from our discussions with representatives of other governments.

The pension commission of Ontario announced earlier that the new uniform bill will not contain any changes that will require re-registration of pension plans already registered with the commission. The bill that I am introducing for first reading adheres to this undertaking. This is naturally a very important consideration for employers who have amended their plans in the last few months and who may have to make even further amendments in consequence of the Canada Pension Plan.

Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the widespread misunderstanding of this legislation, I should like to summarize the differences between the provisions of this new bill and the provisions of the present Act.

First of all, we have introduced the concept of a designated province, to refer to a

province that enacts legislation substantially similar to this bill. The statutory rules will become applicable in each designated province on the date named by that province under the terms of its pension benefits Act. In this way we will be able to achieve the uniformity that we seek across the country.

This will mean that the vesting and locking-in rules will become applicable at different dates across Canada. This problem is temporary and has been solved by linking the rights and obligations of a member of a pension plan to the qualification date in his particular province. The qualification date in this province is January 1, 1965.

Second, as in the case of the present Act, this bill does not require employers to establish pension plans. It merely lays down the terms and conditions under which pensions must be provided under pension plans that are now, or in future will be, established. Although none of the proposed amendments of The Pension Benefits Act requires any retroactive improvement of pension benefits, they do close several loopholes which have existed.

Third, the definition of "employer" has been broadened to include the successors and assigns of an employer in order to prevent evasion of liability under the Act through corporate reorganization. The definition has also been broadened to include the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and its local boards; other municipalities were included in the original Act but Metro Toronto was omitted.

Fourth, the vesting of employer contributions and the locking-in of employee contributions commences when an employee has been in the service of the employer for a continuous period of ten years, or has been a member of the same pension plan for ten years, and has attained the age of 45 years. The reference to pension-plan membership for the ten-year period has been added to include so-called multi-employer plans under the Act. This simply means that an employee may work for several employers while at the same time participating in one multi-employer same pension plan.

Fifth, in order to prevent possible evasion through suspension of employment intended to interrupt the ten-year qualification period, the definition of "service for a continuous period" provides that periods of temporary suspension will not interrupt the period of employment for the purposes of the Act.

Sixth, supplemental pension plans will be required to be registered. A supplemental pension plan is a plan established for em-

ployees who are entitled to become members only if they are members in another plan. In many of these plans the employer is not required to make contributions—they are sometimes referred to as employee-pay-all plans. If they are supplemental to a separate plan they must be registered notwithstanding that the employer is not required to make contributions.

Seventh, plans that do not require employer contributions—except the supplemental plans that I have just mentioned—will not be required to register. This exception is introduced to exempt employee-pay-all plans and union or fraternal plans controlled by union or fraternal membership.

Eighth, the provisions for reciprocity and co-operation among the provinces of Canada have been broadened. The bill provides that the pension commission may, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, not only enter into agreements with other provinces for the reciprocal registration, audit and inspection of pension plans, but also delegate to other provinces such functions and powers under this Act as the commission may determine. The purpose of this provision is to make it possible for every employer to register his pension plan in only one province, and by so doing qualify in all provinces. It is probable that the rule will be that an employer will register in the province in which the majority of his employees report for work.

Ninth, the commission may, in addition, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, authorize a Canadian association of pension commissions to carry out such duties as the commission may require. The purpose of this is that uniformity not only must be achieved at the outset, but it must be maintained as the whole proposition of pensions develops. One of the functions of the proposed Canadian association of pension commissions would be to conduct interprovincial consultations to maintain uniformity in the changes that lie in the future.

Tenth, the former provision of the establishment in 1970 and thereafter of an advisory review committee is to be repealed. The functions of such a committee will, to a large extent, be assumed by the pension authorities in the various provinces who will confer among themselves through the proposed Canadian association.

Eleventh, a new provision is added to enable members of pension plans to designate beneficiaries who may receive benefits upon the employee's death.

Twelfth, the existing Act provides penalties which, upon reconsideration, have been found to be too severe. The bill therefore drops the penalty of imprisonment but provides that an employer who is convicted of an offence must pay to the pension plan all amounts that he has wrongly failed to pay as required by the bill. Our purpose is to protect the rights of plan members and this can be done most effectively by requiring financial compliance. Officers and directors of a corporation who acquiesce in an offence under the Act may be made personally liable for the default of the corporation.

Thirteenth, the present Act unintentionally locks in employees' voluntary additional contributions and the bill corrects this error. Employees are permitted to withdraw up to 25 per cent of the commuted value of their deferred life annuity under a pension plan prior to attaining normal retirement age, but apart from this exception employee required contributions made after January 1, 1965, are locked in. Voluntary additional contributions may be withdrawn at any time if a pension plan permits such withdrawal.

Fourteenth, the statutory restrictions upon surrender or commutation do not apply after the death of an employee.

The bill introduces a new provision here permitting variation of the amount of a deferred life annuity by employee election. It simply gives an additional measure of flexibility in the plan, and if a plan so provides, an employee may elect to receive a reduced annuity upon early retirement or an increased annuity if retirement is deferred. He may also elect optional annuities to survivors and he may elect to vary the term of the annuity payable to his beneficiaries after his death.

Fifteenth, the formula for the benefits and contributions may be governed by regulations in order that the obligations imposed by the Act shall not be avoided by an unreasonable type of plan.

Sixteenth, upon termination or winding up of the pension plan all vested and locked-in contributions to the plan must be used to provide the deferred life annuity to which every employee and former employee is entitled, as if the employees had left the service individually. This provision is necessary to prevent retroactive evasion of the provisions of the Act by the winding-up of a pension plan.

Seventeenth, a further rule affecting plans that are terminated will require the employer to pay to his pension plan all amounts that he has failed to pay as required by the solvency

regulation up to the date of termination of the plan. The employer must be up to date and acting in conformity with the regulations. As hon. members know, the present requirement is that plans have 25 or 15 years to make up unfunded deficiencies.

Eighteenth, to provide needed flexibility, the commutation for cash of small annuities of less than \$10 a month is allowed, and a lump sum payment or series of payments may be made in cases of mental or physical disability, as prescribed by regulations. Except in such circumstances, a retiring employee may not commute the pension in respect of service after January 1, 1965.

Nineteenth, the bill includes a new section to protect employees from any loss of existing pension rights as a result of the coming into force of the Canada Pension Plan. Pension plans may be amended to integrate with the Canada Pension Plan, but no such amendment shall have the effect of reducing pensions purchased by contributions in respect of service prior to January 1, 1966.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and to summarize what I have said, this Act remedies certain weaknesses and fills certain loopholes that have been found in the present Act.

1. It does not depart from the principles of the present Act.

2. It protects employees from loss of existing rights in private plans that are amended because of the Canada Pension Plan.

3. It is independent of the Canada Pension Plan and does not conflict with any federal pension legislation.

4. It has been drafted in co-operation with other provinces.

5. It does not require the re-registration of pension plans that already qualify for Ontario registration.

6. It further strengthens the retirement security of one million present members of Ontario pension plans and those who come after them.

7. This Act not only protects pension rights in this province, but is an important part of a larger edifice which will, we believe, ultimately cover pension plans across Canada with uniform rules.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we have with us today a distinguished group from the neighbouring jurisdiction of the state of Michigan. The group comprises a government committee studying methods of indemnifying the victims of motor vehicle accidents. It is interested in Ontario's motor vehicle accident claims fund, and with the officials of The

Department of Transport is reviewing the content of our Act.

We welcome these fellow legislators to Ontario and I would ask now that Representatives Boos, Stempien, Holbrook and Swallow, and Mr. Sanders, from the government of Michigan, rise and be recognized by our Chamber.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to take this opportunity to report briefly to the House in connection with the dispute between the three Toronto newspapers and Local 91 of the International Typographical Union.

You will recall, sir, that on March 15 of this year, the hon. Prime Minister made a comprehensive statement to the House in connection with the dispute. At that time he asked me to call a meeting of the two parties to explore their current position with a view to reopening negotiations. This meeting was held on March 22. At the meeting I asked both the publishers and the union to prepare written statements of their respective positions to determine whether or not there was any reasonable basis upon which negotiations could be resumed.

After extensive analysis and study of these documents, my officials and I met with the union on April 6 and discussed its submission in an effort to clarify a number of points.

To ensure that every resource at our disposal was utilized, I met on April 9 with His Honour Judge Anderson of Belleville, Ontario. Judge Anderson, Mr. Speaker, had acted as the chairman of the board of conciliation earlier in the dispute, and needless to say he is widely respected in the field of industrial relations. I reviewed current developments with him, and he agreed to make himself available to attend all future meetings with the parties and to act in the capacity of a mediator should the opportunity arise.

I would like at this time to record my deep appreciation for the efforts that Judge Anderson so unsparingly gave to this undertaking.

On April 12, I, along with Judge Anderson and the deputy Minister of Labour, met with the publishers and members of their staffs. We discussed the publishers' position with respect to prior approval from the international headquarters of any proposal for a contract by the local union. We also discussed the question of return to work for strikers in the face of existing staff. The results of this meeting were communicated to the union representatives at a meeting with them on April 22. Several days later I met again with

the union for a further discussion concerning the steps that it might take in the light of the publishers' decision.

In the interval between these meetings, I was in contact with Bishop Wilkinson of the Anglican Church, the Reverend Mr. Howse, the moderator of the United Church of Canada, and Bishop Morroco, the auxiliary bishop of the Toronto archdiocese of the Roman Catholic Church. These gentlemen had expressed concern over the situation that had developed during the last few months and I endeavoured to keep each of them informed as to the efforts that were being made to assist the parties in reaching a settlement. Naturally, the church leaders were interested in the effect that this dispute was having on the individual members of the union.

However, it must be acknowledged that individual hardships resulting from a lengthy dispute of this nature are difficult for government to deal with. First, as a government we are obliged to deal with the elected leaders and appointed representatives of the union who, we must assume, serve the best interests and majority wishes of the membership. As well, organized labour is firm in its opposition to government intervention in the internal management or supervision of union affairs. I should also mention, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the deep involvement of the International Typographical Union in this dispute, on April 27 I sent a telegram to Mr. Elmer Brown, the international president, asking him to meet with me in Toronto at his earliest convenience to discuss the international union's role in this dispute. However, I was subsequently informed that it was inconvenient for Mr. Brown to come to Toronto.

On April 30, the local union advised me that it had prepared a proposal which in its view embodied a basis for fruitful discussion. At its request, I scheduled a meeting for the union with the publishers, but before the meeting could take place I received a wire from the president of the local union asking me to cancel the meeting because of "certain developments." I later learned that these developments were in the form of a directive from the international headquarters, instructing the local union to refrain from making its proposal to the publishers under threat of suspension to the officers and members of the local union.

In a dispute of this character, there are two possible approaches to settlement as far as government is concerned. The first is to impose a solution by compulsory arbitration. The second is to employ the most forceful persuasion in an endeavour to bring the

parties together so that they will settle their differences themselves. From the outset neither party has been in favour of compulsory arbitration as a means of settling this dispute, nor do management and labour as a whole endorse this principle as an accepted method of resolving industrial disputes.

Support for the union's position was illustrated recently when a resolution calling for compulsory arbitration to settle this strike was defeated at the meeting of the Ontario federation of printing trade unions.

Accordingly, the second method was utilized throughout this dispute. There is general agreement, even among the parties themselves, that the government has exhausted every means at its disposal to assist them in resolving this dispute. Under these circumstances, I cannot, at this time, see any further steps that can be taken by this government to effect a settlement. Nonetheless, we shall continue our efforts to this end and shall be available. The entire resources of The Department of Labour and, indeed, of the entire government, stand ready to assist in such undertakings.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE MEAT INSPECTION ACT (ONTARIO), 1962-1963

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on Bill No. 138, The Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963. The original intent of this Act was that the bill should provide for a joint provincial-federal agreement whereby the actual inspection would be done by the federal inspectors and these inspectors would be paid by the province. There were certain difficulties inherent in such an arrangement, one of them being the fact that the federal inspectors were used to enforcing very stringent and strict regulations. Even though in our province we would have our own regulations, the fear of many of us on this side of the House—and I believe on the government side as well—is in the fact that the interpretation of the regulations by the inspectors themselves would be rather strict, the enforcement of which would, perhaps, put many of the smaller operators, butchers and processors in this province out of business. So it was, and presumably this is so. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has taken it upon himself actually to do our own inspect-

ing in this province with our own inspectors, and frankly I think this is the way we have to do it.

There are a few questions that I would ask in this respect. One of them is, will the entire province come under this Act all at one time, or will it be done on a regional basis? Second, will northern Ontario and perhaps the more remote parts of the province come under this Act as well? Third, are all the inspectors hired? Are they veterinarians or will there be some lay people involved in the actual inspecting of the meat across this province?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, first of all I want to say I appreciate his support of the fact that the province of Ontario has introduced meat inspection on its own.

In reply to his questions: First of all, dealing with the entire province at one time, I think it would be impossible and impractical to declare the entire province under inspection at once. The proposal being carried out now is first of all to engage a group of inspectors who have had as much experience as possible, to start the inspection. This has now been done. The second group of inspectors is now being trained. They are not all veterinarians, although many of them are veterinarians, particularly in the first group. In the second group they are mostly all lay inspectors. We have tried, insofar as possible, to hire people who have had experience in the meat business. Many of them have had previous inspection experience. We would hope that as time goes on we would gradually expand the service right across the province.

As far as northern Ontario is concerned, this will be taken in. As a matter of fact, northern Ontario may be covered with meat inspection sooner than other parts of the province. We are trying to work out some details now as far as inspection in northern Ontario is concerned and I am hopeful that they will result in the early implementation of meat inspection in northern Ontario. Certainly it will be covered, and I would hope as expeditiously as possible.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SEED POTATOES ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, very briefly on Bill No. 140, there are two matters that I would like to mention to the House.

One of the principles in this bill removes from those who have the responsibility of operating a farm marketing board, the danger of suit on a personal basis, and the hon. Minister may be already aware that there is a suit before the court involving the tobacco marketing board.

When this was introduced on first reading, I mentioned this to the hon. Minister, and asked him if he felt that there would be a retroactive effect. I know that the people concerned would be very interested in the opinion of the hon. Minister, or his advisors, on what effect, if any, this bill would have on the suit that is at present before the courts.

As you know, the tobacco farmers involved—the freelancers, as they have come to be known during the months of their difficulties—have been trying every legal device open to them to test the legislation that has been passed by this House and have been unsuccessful to this point. Apparently this is a last attempt to make the officers of the tobacco marketing board personally responsible for refusing them the right to grow their crop.

Certainly this case would be of much interest, and I would hope that the hon. Minister might comment himself as to what effect, if any, this amendment might have on the case I have brought to his attention.

Second, the rest of the bill deals with means of appealing on behalf of certain farmers, or any farmer who would have some dealing with the marketing board set up under legislation that we in the farm community have become so familiar with. This question has come up two or three times in this very week in the Legislature and in the committees of the House, as to whether or not suitable appeal procedure has been built into the legislation or is proposed for other legislation of a similar nature that is before the House at the present time.

We were interested to hear the views of the attorneys advising the hon. Minister, who feel that without any specific inclusions, other than what are present in this Bill 140 and bills similar to it, a farmer has ample opportunity to appeal beyond the marketing board and through the legislation, and this would be available.

But he referred to the prerogative writs—which names I have difficulty with—the writ of mandamus, writ of prohibition and writ of certiorari, and evidently these have nothing whatsoever to do with facts in dispute. In the words of the hon. Minister's own advisers, natural justice—whatever that is—is available. However, this does not permit the farmer to appeal facts of the case to any higher authority. So often, I would submit to him, this is the frustrating aspect of a bill that according to the hon. Minister's advisers would have ample appeal built into it.

But there is some reason to doubt whether appeal in this respect is in fact sufficient, particularly when we realize that these bills when they become Acts have very far-reaching and sweeping authority, which is administered by those appointed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture and has economic life and death influence on the farmers that are subject to the rulings.

I would appeal again to the hon. Minister—and I know that he is very sensitive on this point, as all of us must be who would go back and talk of the farmers' concern—that appeal be made as broad and simple and easy and cheap and clear as possible.

With these few remarks, I would otherwise support the inclusion in The Farm Products Marketing Act, the safeguards set out in section 2 for those who have to take the responsibility of administering the Act and for the appeal procedures that have been included in this bill.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I make a few brief comments? As a layman, as I understand it, this problem of being able to appeal only certain features and not able to introduce new facts, is a general problem in appeals, not just regarding farm products marketing. Therefore I do not know, I just plead incompetence, as to how one solves that aspect of the problem my hon. friend has raised.

But on the other aspect of the problem, and I now go back to the discussion that we had on the similar issue in the standing committee on agriculture the other day, I must say now, Mr. Speaker, I am persuaded of the wisdom of the proposal that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Kerr) made in the committee, and that is that no harm will be done and certainly some assurance will be given to spelling out in all of our marketing legislation, the fact that there is a right of appeal through writ of mandamus, prohibition or certiorari.

Now I was assured by the hon. Minister

and by his solicitor that this power is there, and quite frankly, I think it is there. I am persuaded that it is there, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture perhaps would agree with me, from the case that I cited in the House last night. And when we get to as high places as the chairman of one of these boards in the province of Ontario, himself a magistrate, expressing such serious doubts as to whether or not there is a right of appeal, and even exploring, as the record would indicate, half a dozen different ways to penalize this person and deny him his right to a writ of prohibition, I think that the time has come that we lay this down in the Act.

Now maybe I am beating the gun on Mr. McRuer's report. Conceivably this is going to be what he is going to report, but we are now dealing with legislation at the very moment and in light of what I presented to the House last night, I think the proposal in the standing committee of the hon. member for Halton has validity, and I wonder if the hon. Minister would not give some consideration to it here, as well as in The Milk Industry Act.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the matter first of all that was raised by the hon. member for Brant in connection with the suit, as it is outlined here in section two of this bill, is I must confess, not retroactive. At the time I introduced the bill, the hon. member asked if there would be a retroactive feature in it and I believe at that time I replied that I assumed that it would have a retroactive effect; and really I felt it would have, and I still feel it would have, because to my knowledge there is only one suit now before the courts, and that is the one he mentioned pertaining to the freelance tobacco growers against the members of the flue cured tobacco growers marketing board and the members of the farm products marketing board, and I believe, some others.

Now, quite frankly, I cannot for the life of me, see the wisdom of pursuing this suit, because it has proceeded through every stage of appeal that is possible in the province of Ontario, right up to the Supreme Court of Canada and has been thrown out. In effect, the supreme court has said that they uphold the flue cured tobacco growers marketing board in the decision that they made, which decision was in turn referred for appeal to the farm products marketing board, from there to the Ontario Court of Appeal and from there to the Supreme Court of Canada.

This is why I said I would assume it would have the effect of being retroactive—but I

must confess that in the legislation it is not retroactive.

Now, with regard to the means of appeal—and I would like to deal with what the hon. member for Brant has said, as well as what has been said by the hon. member for York South—I had not felt that we would get around to debating this matter quite so soon. I felt it would likely come up in debate in the committee of the whole House, in regard to The Milk Act. However, I am quite prepared to discuss it this morning.

I think the surest proof that the right of appeal protects the individual has happened in regard to the freelance tobacco growers in what I have just outlined. This has gone right through the whole process, not spelled out in The Farm Products Marketing Act, but taken as a natural action of common law. Now, I know that the hon. member for Halton made this suggestion in the committee the other day, of spelling this out in legislation. I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that the fact that in the bill, in the new milk bill—if I may refer to that as well as in The Farm Products Marketing Act—there is a responsibility lying to the Minister.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this must imply the protection of the individual and the right of the individual to appeal on any decision that may pertain to that which might be decided to be only a point of law. This is really the point to which I think both hon. members were referring this morning. I think it is taken care of in that.

Were we to say to a commission or to a marketing board, "You are set over there as a completely independent authority to do as you see fit in every respect, without any regard or any responsibility to this House," then I think we could rightly so feel that perhaps sometimes, under some circumstances, some individual might feel that he had not received justice. But as the Act is worded, I feel that this is taken care of.

Now, I quite frankly feel that as this bill, and indeed, the milk bill, is drafted, all of these things are taken care of.

I would like to read just a brief paragraph here that has been provided for me by our solicitors in consultation with Mr. H. E. Harris, QC, and I would like to say that Mr. Harris, whom hon. members met the other day at the agriculture committee, is perhaps, as I said in the committee meeting, the most profound authority on marketing legislation in Canada that I know of—on farm products marketing legislation—and we value his opinion very highly. That is why we engaged

him as a solicitor to assist us in the drafting of this legislation.

Now, under the laws of this province, I am advised that the courts, by means of orders known as mandamus, prohibition, and certiorari, may exercise control over the commission and every person has the right to apply to the courts for one of these orders. Now my understanding—and I asked what all of these things meant—is as follows:

First, by an order of mandamus, the court may require the commission to carry out its lawful duties. Second, by order of prohibition, the court may prevent the commission from taking some action which it is not empowered to take. And third, by an order of certiorari the court may remove a proceeding that was before the commission into the court, and if after a hearing the court is satisfied there has been a denial of justice it may quash the decision of the commission or may direct the commission to take or refrain from taking such action as the court directs.

It appears, therefore, that the right to obtain these orders preserves the right of every person to test in the courts any action or decision by the commission where (a) he believes that it was taken or made without lawful authority or was based upon a wrong interpretation of the law; or (b) he alleges that he has been denied a fair hearing or otherwise has been denied what is known as natural justice.

I would feel that with these precautions we have surely provided the individual with every right to protect his interest in so far as it is humanly possible to do so under British law. It is quite right that I am very sensitive about this; I feel there must be every right provided. But I would point out with respect to the people with whom this legislation may have to deal from time to time that we do not want to leave the legislation so open that every appeal of the marketing boards to the farm products marketing board, or in the case of milk from the milk marketing board to the milk commission, will always be open to dispute and the cases will be before the courts of this country.

I think all hon. members of this House would agree that this might be placing in jeopardy—I would not say in jeopardy—but certainly placing the administration of these respective Acts in the position of having constantly to be before the courts on matters of appeal. I feel that a responsible board or a responsible commission in turn, must surely express its responsibility for the administration of the legislation that is afforded it to carry out, whose responsibility it is to ad-

minister; and that surely we must respect their decisions and get on with the business for which they were originally set up, always bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we have the guarantee of the rights of those individuals who feel that they have been aggrieved.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, before taking off, I would like to add to the rest of my colleagues in complimenting the government on the community colleges education, and to add that this is a mounting sign that the government, in spite of their lethargy, will have to do something about taking the education costs off real estate, which I plan to show shortly here.

Before the House is an Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services. This legislation is good legislation, I believe, under which the Golden Horseshoe will spend a capital sum of \$7 million out of consolidated revenue and a subsidy of \$2 million a year thereafter. I do not think anyone can quarrel with the idea to give more mobility to this wonderful area and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has made the statement that this will project more revenues into other parts of the province for highway development. Now, this kind of thing we have heard before; going back to the \$20 million subway grant from the province of Ontario to Toronto. I suggest to the hon. members that if we follow the same line of thinking, the hon. Prime Minister should in all fairness, to those of us not in this area—if he is going to give \$7 million for commuter mobility, he should set aside a like sum of \$14 million for the rest of the province and say, "We have allotted \$14 million capital to subsidize your transit plans, your mobility"—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I understand there are a lot of commuters from Owen Sound to Chatsworth.

Mr. Sargent:—"and a \$2 million maintenance fund every year along the same basis." The same line of thinking was suggested back to the \$20 million we gave to Toronto; in other words \$40 million should have been set aside to municipalities across Ontario and I

suggest that this is not inequitable. It is inequitable to dig into the public purse at a time when we are talking about redistribution, when rural Ontario is losing its voting power through this Act, and to continue to discriminate because the government has the foresight to see that the most votes are in metropolitan areas.

An hon. member: On the contrary.

Mr. Sargent: And I think it is most unfair for the hon. Prime Minister to tell this House that this will project more revenue for highway development when he will not lay down the amounts he will set aside and make available to municipalities.

Along the same line, I think we are all conscious of decentralization, we all talk a lot in that regard, but we feel the \$50 million development around this operation here, a \$600 million nuclear plant in this area, \$5 million for the centennial, \$5 million for research, \$5 million for adult training, and I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) did not ask me if I would like Mercer reformatory located around my riding. These things do not happen; they just place them where it fits the government policy.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): What does the hon. member think about Douglas Point?

Mr. Sargent: Not very much.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is Douglas Point he is talking about.

An hon. member: There is nobody up there who needs Mercer anyway.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the decentralization scheme is very important to those of us in outlying Ontario. The fact is that the present government is ignoring the rest of the province for Toronto.

I have a great respect for the hon. Prime Minister. In my inaugural speech in this House I said that he was the average man but a bit smaller and I do not go back on that, but in this House yesterday, he had occasion to call the hon. member for Woodbine stupid. Well, I think—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I sometimes disagree with my hon. friend from Woodbine, but I certainly do not think he is stupid.

Mr. Sargent: All right, and last night the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Mac-

Naughton) suggested that I had a corner on stupidity over here—

Mr. Bryden: He said the hon. member lost the chance to observe.

Mr. Sargent: I may go along with that, but I would say in a light vein, recalling the crime bill, if I ever saw a lesson in stupidity it was the hon. Prime Minister taking advice from his back benchers and trying to stick-handle that one, when all he needed was the intestinal fortitude to admit that he had goofed and made a mistake. I think from now on the hon. Prime Minister should think twice before he says anyone is stupid.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would never make such a remark.

Mr. Sargent: As long as we know where we stand. The hon. Prime Minister should always look at his hole card.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will take the hon. member's advice.

Mr. Sargent: Now we are going to build this \$50 million development in the Metro area and these buildings will house many more civil servants. It is noteworthy that in Canada after the war there were 130,000 civil servants; I imagine the population then was about 17 or 18 million. Today, in Canada there are over 400,000 federal civil servants, not counting the provinces, and we have only three million more people. So we have tripled our civil servants with only three million people. So we are going to have a lot more civil servants housed here in Toronto.

And I am not questioning the need for these. But I do question the need that so many of them should work in Toronto. For instance, the Ontario water resources commission is supposed to supervise the water resources of this province, yet the only office is in Toronto. It would seem to me that the representatives and offices of such an organization should be located in the various centres throughout the province. This would place the services in the areas of the need and also distribute wage-earners to the small centres outside of Toronto. There are likely other government sections which could also be decentralized. I believe this should be a part of the government policy, to look for regional development of this great province.

Speaking of regional development, there is a prize editorial in the Cobourg newspaper and it calls this government the "game fixers." It says:

Why did the Ontario government appoint

a select committee when Mr. Robarts was already there with his prediction?

It goes on to quote:

Hon. Mr. Robarts goes on to say:

"Our thinking tends toward the regional approach."

It is like fixing the hockey score, they say, before the game. The government agent cannot properly serve the town of Cobourg by running our affairs in Peterborough. The more regional a government, the more remote the control. Absentee ownership is the precursor of insolvency.

Now the government committee chairman, Hollis Beckett, PC, York East, in looking down his nose at every vulnerable municipality in Ontario, stated: "That local grassroots governments may eventually be left to deal with licensing dogs, building sidewalks and connecting sewers.

It goes on to say:

Do you remember when the Hon. Leslie Frost became astounded one memorable day when he suddenly learned that education was costing some million dollars more? The government was supposed to control the education dollar; it didn't, it ran out of money, and the taxpayers became the scapegoats again. They were charged a new three per cent sales tax to cover up the government's delinquency. Is that the way to run a business, Mr. Government Representative? Is your government competent to administer the affairs of every municipality in Ontario when it can't run its own show, when it has no clue where lavish expenditure is leading?

If every federal MP at Ottawa and every MPP at Toronto were made to serve an apprenticeship by operating a business in the black with one of two or ten employees for five or ten years before being permitted to go into Parliament, then we might hope to expect some form of economy in Canada. Until government can prove its own efficiency and get out of debt, every move it makes along this line should be challenged, as it seems every time government proposes some new deal, whether the proposition is regional government provincially or a new federal post office, we know it is going to cost each one of us more.

So when the government talks economy and regional development, it does not mean what it says. Its business is to run deeper and deeper in debt and you can take it from us that is one hell of a way to run a country.

That is a quotation from the *Cobourg Sentinel*. That expresses the views of a lot of people in rural Ontario on the plan for regional development.

In an issue, a week ago, of the *Globe and Mail*, the banner on the editorial page said, "Bankruptcy Feared." This article went on about Peel county and about the increase in education taxes. To sum it up, it said, and I quote from the second paragraph:

Bolton Reeve H. M. Allen says the increased education costs will deter new development. "No industry in its right mind would come into Bolton with the costs facing us," he said.

Last week in Owen Sound they said they had to have a new school of \$1,200,000 and a new \$1 million water plant, and the municipal board will not let them build them. We are talking about putting schools into used factories because we are at the point where the debenture debt is more than 25 per cent of the assessment. There are many, many municipalities within this province which are going to be bankrupt within five years unless this front bench gets off and moves along the line of taking the education costs off real estate.

Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Ottawa is planning a march on Queen's Park because he is getting, and I quote, "an unfair share of provincial revenues." We feel that there are so many people on fixed incomes paying 50 per cent education costs in their taxes that this is unfair, and it is unfair for this government in spite of this to launch the capital building programme it is doing.

The hon. Minister of Labour, I think, has been trying to do a job on automation in the settlement of the strike with the newspaper ITU local, and I think that this was the first test in which the government could have made a noble step forward. He related the steps available to settle the strike, but I think, Mr. Minister, that you could have made trail-breaking history by installing the Kaiser plan which is now in force in Kaiser Steel in the USA, and which I mentioned before. Somewhere along the line they are going to have to take a stand and make a decision because the government in general is well known for not doing anything until it has to.

The Kaiser plan gives workers a share of any cost saving and guarantees those with half a year or more service against any lay-offs. It is working very well. The ship-owners are paying \$5 million a year into the fund for the right to automate, which the newspapers here could have done. This

money guarantees that every one of the 17,000 workers have full pay envelopes each week. To quote Mr. Harry Bridges:

There is a simple underlying philosophy to this agreement that workers have a proper right to their jobs. Our contract means that a man owns his job for life unless he is discharged for cause or bought off through disability or early retirement.

The same kind of basic philosophy is inherent in demands made by other unions for lifetime job security.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that to date you have not been interested in job security in meeting this challenge, the first challenge you have had. Business leaders in both the United States and Canada face the fact that if private industry cannot provide full employment—and so far it has not—then government will have to play a stronger, more positive role.

International Business Machines president, Mr. Watson, recognizes this dilemma. He said:

I hate anything to do with government control of business, government control of my private life, of anything, but if you have to offer a choice between high unemployment or more government control, most people will choose more government control, within reason.

Jobs for our people is the responsibility of this dynamic province and the government in charge.

In my part of the province, we are basically a resort country and seeing the great exodus from Toronto on weekends brings me to suggest to the House for consideration that it deal briefly with recreational areas and how I hope that some day better use might be made of them.

It is particularly true of the metropolitan areas in Ontario that during the hot summer, and on weekends, our camping grounds, our parks, our beaches, our golf courses and public swimming pools are engulfed in a mass of people, and some areas are almost super-saturated with humanity. But this is a Saturday-Sunday thing. From Monday to Friday, these same recreational facilities are, by comparison, hardly patronized; they suffer for customers. It somehow strikes me that being unreasonable, full use should not be made of them during the week days. But on the weekends you have to elbow your way into them and the obvious answer is to stagger the Saturday-Sunday exodus over the whole of the week. If this could be brought about it would mean that employers of all sorts would

have to adopt a seven-day schedule and every two days they would have to give a week-end off to two-sevenths of their employees.

Now, of course seven-day weeks with staggered days off are not uncommon in many districts, as you know—in service and transportation industries; in hospitals and restaurants; theatres and service stations, employees are used to time off during the middle of the week and I am sure many of them regard this as an advantage. I feel that if manufacturers, offices and shops were to adopt a seven-day week—that is, if the seven-day week were to become almost general, the weekend crush would be dissipated and recreational facilities would be more available for the greater enjoyment of all people.

Of course, this is a pipe dream. The seven-day week could hardly be legislated, although it is obvious that a relaxation of many government statutes could encourage it, and it is hardly something that could take place in Ontario alone.

There are a few disadvantages, particularly church and school, and I do not pretend to have the answers for these things, but I think it is an area where the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) could sit down and kick it around and explore it because it has a great future.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That idea is being explored right this moment in the current dispute, I think it is, with Anaconda Brass.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is kicking the ball to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I will take it.

Mr. Sargent: We in the Opposition can pass the buck and say "You do it," and the government finds the answer.

In a discussion with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) he was very patient with our deputation, but he became very incensed with the fact that I asked him to set up capital funds for a project that would help agriculture. He is bound by the fact that he does not have any capital funds to support agricultural development in agricultural areas. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we can give money to the ODA for development of industry. If you have \$100 million in the pot to further industrial development and the most serious problem in the agricultural industry is lack of capital funds to further this industry, I think, in strengthening the budget next year, it would be smart business to give this department a capital fund of X millions of dollars to further the needs for agriculture.

Along that line, we have been talking in the House about FAME, and with all its shortcomings, I sincerely say that if we allow the concept of FAME, to go down the drain, it will set agriculture back for many years.

We had no hesitation in giving \$4 million last year to the ODA for nine or ten different projects and they lost a pot full of money, too, on that development, but the FAME concept will be the first step toward blocking vertical integration and supporting those principles. I firmly believe that this House, this hon. Minister and this government should take it upon themselves to see that FAME becomes a living organ and arm of agriculture in the future.

I have been watching this clock, but I would like to say that we are conscious about the needs of regional development of this province and surely it is our aim here to make the needs of Ontario all our needs. We must make the future of Ontario our future, too, and it means that first and foremost we recognize the very needs of this province and we have equal social and economic opportunities for all people. The present trend of this government today is not along those lines.

I thank the House, in the time that is left on the speech on the Budget, but I do want to get across the fact that more and more, we in the outlying parts are getting fed up to the teeth with the concentration of wealth in this province and particularly in this metropolitan area.

We have in Owen Sound an OPP office in an old house and there are 17 officers in that house. They use it as a divisional point for the 17 OPP officers. Before the election the owner of the adjacent property was told he could sell his garage because the government was going to buy it for the OPP set-up. Following the election, which the Conservatives lost by a very small majority, the owner of this property went to the police and he said, "Is the deal going to go through?" and they said, "No, the deal will not go through now because a Liberal was elected."

I do not suggest that is true or anything like that, but the fact is that I have spoken to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) about this matter and he gave me a sheepish grin and said that it was not on the estimates or in the projects for some time to come. He knows nothing about this. I can tell hon. members that the minute a Tory is elected in this riding there will be a lot of government spending there because it needs it badly.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that Monday being May 24 there will be no sitting in this Legislature, and on Tuesday, May 25, having in mind the state dinner that evening, I submit that it would be desirable that the House start at 2 o'clock, with a view to a somewhat earlier rising than 6 o'clock, in view of the events of that evening. Accordingly, I move that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof, we stand adjourned until 2 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon, May 25.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday it is proposed that we will sit in the evening, and I would put the hon. members on notice and also remind the hon. members that the debate on Tuesday, May 25, will deal with Medicare, or as it is more officially known, Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance. After that debate, we will continue with the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:55 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Statement re new approach to English language teaching to adult newcomers to Canada, Mr. Yaremko	3209
Medical insurance, bill respecting, Mr. Dymond, on second reading	3209
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Trotter, agreed to	3238
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3238

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have as visitors to the Legislature today guests from the following schools: in the west gallery, Anna Melick public school, Dunnville, and West Nissouri central public school, Thornedale; in the east gallery, Hillcrest public school, Hamilton.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to make an announcement which I think will be of some interest to the hon. members.

A new and more effective approach to language teaching has been developed by the citizenship division of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship. At present, daytime English-language classes for newcomers are conducted by the department in Toronto at the international institute of Metropolitan Toronto, at COSTI, and at the education centre at the West End YMCA.

The department has been aware for some time of certain weaknesses in the traditional system of teaching English to adult newcomers. Traditionally, classes were started each fall and progressed into the school term. New registrants often found they did not fit into the class level, finding it either too advanced or too easy for their needs.

By having classes at different levels and a promotion test every three weeks, a flexible situation was created in which some students could advance at their own speed and others who were prevented from attending regularly could always find a class at a convenient level for them. This new approach to language teaching is known as the escalator system of language teaching because the teachers teach

at the same level all the time and the students are able to step into classes at any level and continue on up. It has become a continuing programme in order to take care of continuous registration.

This sort of flexible continuing programme is necessary to meet the needs of adult newcomers who find many normal hindrances to regular attendance. For the escalator system to be workable, there must be enough students to make up a sufficient number of classes. However, the growth of the department's English-language teaching programme in daytime classes in the past three years, from seven teachers and 200 students at peak enrolment to 21 teachers and 800 students this year, is proof of its appeal to students. Attendance has been better than that of past programmes. The morale of the students is excellent and student progress has been beyond expectation.

Our objective is always to devise ways and means of encouraging more and more of our newcomers to enrol in English-language classes so that the newcomers may be quickly and more completely integrated into the social and economic life of our province. The results of the escalator system of language teaching have so far been very encouraging.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

MEDICAL INSURANCE

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical insurance.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I might as well start by being completely frank about this bill, in terms of myself and my party. We think it is a completely inadequate bill to present to the people of Ontario.

I can look at a copy, for example, of a pamphlet sent out by the Ontario federation of labour and I think the federation describes it most effectively. It suggests the bill is a dud, and gives reasons. Perhaps I will just

state these reasons at the start, Mr. Speaker, and then elaborate on them. The federation suggests these are the reasons why this bill is a dud:

1. It does not recommend coverage for everybody at rates based on ability to pay. Apart from the poorest people, low-income, middle-income and the high-income families will have to pay the same rate.

2. While the poorest people will be subsidized, the subsidies suggested are too low. Even the poorest could have a heavy burden of sickness costs.

3. There will have to be a means test to separate the poor from everybody else. Organized labour has always opposed the means test as degrading.

4. The recommendations cover only medical care. All other essential services, such as dentists and drugs, are ignored.

5. The suggestions therefore are of more advantage to the doctors and insurance companies than to the general public.

6. The insurance companies are in business for profit. The plan is made to order for insurance companies and thus introduces the profit motive into social welfare legislation.

7. The suggested advisory committee will have a majority of doctors and insurance company representatives. The public will be in the permanent minority.

8. Very little attention is paid in the report to necessary expansion of personnel and services and none to group practice.

I want to elaborate on a number of these points, Mr. Speaker. Before I do, I would like to get into focus the fact that today in this province we have probably been more fortunate than many parts of the world, in that we have great advances in medical science. In fact I recall visiting someone two weeks ago who was dying, and being told that in another few years they may have an answer to his problem. I think all of us know of situations of relatives and of others, who today are able to live because of these medical advances.

I think we should recognize, and I want to get this point across, that the reason why we have these medical advances is because collectively we have taken the responsibility to pay for the very costly research that they entail. Collectively—through government; that is what I mean by collectively—we have been financing and assisting in the finances of hospitals, of doctors' training, of laboratories, and so on, right down the line. I want to emphasize this, because for some reason, it

seems to me that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has a nervousness about government helping in finances. I think I may be unfair to him in this, but I notice in his introduction of the bill he talked about compulsion and how in philosophy his party was against compulsion. The only kind of compulsion that would be suggested in a comprehensive government-sponsored scheme would be the compulsion of people paying taxes in order to support it. The only kind of compulsion would be similar to that of the hospital insurance scheme. This would be the approach that would be taken, and yet for some reason that I cannot understand he has never considered this kind of approach. He believes that this area of health should still be left up to profit-making organizations, such as the insurance companies.

I suggest, sir, that medicine and health are entirely different from other free-enterprise endeavours. First, because collectively we all together are helping to produce the doctors through the schools, through the hospitals, through the teachers, and so on. I would suggest that there is no comparison between this and a factory, where someone producing in the free-enterprise system has a factory where he trains his men and they produce some kind of product which they hope to sell.

The doctors and health services in this province, and indeed in the most of the civilized world, have their factories—if I could call hospitals that—provided for them because of the enormous costs of many of the needs which they have in a hospital. They have this provided collectively.

We really have moved, to an extent, into the area of government-sponsored health services and our question is why we have not moved further in this to provide a universality of service to all the people of this province.

It seemed to me that there were contradictions in the hon. Minister of Health's introduction. He started off by telling us that the government had been taking part in a number of areas of health. He referred to mental hospitals; public health; tuberculosis prevention and treatment; school health programmes; maternal and new-born care; general hospital construction grants, and hospital-care insurance.

The debate today is really whether we should have universal coverage for everyone in this province, whether we should have everyone paying for the opportunity of getting medical care when they need it—and by

medical care, I am thinking of more than just a physician's care. I find, sir, that the government has come out in favour of a compromise; it is suggesting that it will set up a government department for almost a million people who are below a certain income bracket; the others will have to go through whatever carrier they wish but they will not go through the government department.

I suggest that this government, in the compromise, is showing a consistency which is unusual in its affairs. It is showing a consistency to emphasize the worst features, the most expensive characteristics of both alternatives, and it has done it in such a way as to add operational chaos to excessive costs. It managed, with remarkable ingenuity, to provide a framework in Bill 136, which will offer the least possible health care at the highest possible expense.

How has the government managed this? Bill 136 provides, as we all know, for a complete administrative system for public health care services within The Department of Health for persons without taxable income. In this way, the government has contrived to propose a system which will operate a complete health services programme for a minority of our population—or in fact, about 15 per cent of our people.

It should be obvious to everyone, even the government, that the more people involved in a particular programme, the lower the per capita overhead and administrative costs will be, but here we find the government setting up a system which could provide the framework for universal health services for all the people of Ontario, but which, in the wisdom of the government, will serve only a minority of the people. Then, on the other hand, we find the government leaving everyone with more than \$1,000 taxable income, to select or find their own medical services coverage from among the handful of non-profit, prepaid carriers in this province, or from among the multitude of private profit-making insurance companies—very close to 200 of them, I believe.

The Hall commission presented some figures on the administrative costs involved; the retention factor, to give it its proper name. In health insurance plans offered by private insurance companies, according to the commission's figures, the retention factor for private, profit-making health insurance plans, runs to more than 25 cents on the dollar. What this means, of course, is that for every dollar collected in premiums by the company, less than 75 cents is paid out in benefits. Not all of this is profit, as any insurance official will tell you—in fact, health care in-

surance has proved to be comparatively unprofitable for the insurance industry—thus that 27 per cent retention factor, the Hall commission figures reveal, comprises only a small profit. It also includes sales commissions, taxes, administrative costs of all kinds and reserves for unsatisfied claims.

The Hall commission figures also indicate that a universal, public health care plan can operate with an administrative cost of around five per cent. In Saskatchewan, I think it is about 5.7 per cent today—and there we see an example in reality right now, not a matter of academic talk. Thus with public medicare, 95 cents out of every dollar committed is actually paid out for health benefits while under private health insurance plans, only 70 cents to 75 cents is paid out.

Bill 136, of course, leaves 4,500,000 of our people with no alternative but to see 25 cents of their health care dollar spent on administration and other factors not contributing to the paying of their medical bills. Taking the public course for lower income groups, it adopts a system which can be administratively much more economical, but does it in such a way, for a minority of the population, that there is no possibility of realizing the potential economics of universal public health care insurance. That is why I say that the government has chosen the high-cost road for most of the population; they have corrupted the administrative principles of low-cost public health care insurance.

And that is not all; earlier I called Bill 136 a "patchwork" and an "administrative nightmare." Just how nightmarish it is will only be apparent to the people affected, if and when it is adopted. But in the meantime, it is possible to sketch in the sort of bureaucratic atrocities which this bill can perpetuate. Let me take a hypothetical example—before I do, may I say that we still have very few facts about this bill while we are debating it. The hon. Minister of Health said that he studied it carefully for six years and yet, as we saw in an article in the *Globe and Mail*, during that six years he has, it seems, not been able to come up with certain answers. I think the hon. Minister himself must have read this article which lists pertinent aspects to this bill, including the rate of premium. We do not have any answer to that when we are asked to debate this very important measure in this House, and I suggest that shows either a nervousness, or an ignorance on the part of the hon. Minister. Either he has not done his homework or else he has a premium, that is so high in comparison, for example, with Saskatchewan, that he does not want to bring it in during this debate. However,

let me go ahead on the kind of situation that we envisage with this bill from the little facts that we have in connection with it.

Let me take a hypothetical but typical case. Consider an ordinary Ontario family, husband, wife and two children. The husband is a breadwinner and provides the family income. Now Bill 136 says that this family will receive free public health care if they have no taxable income, and subsidized premiums for health care if their taxable income is under \$1,000. Bill 136 is scheduled to come into effect on June 1, 1966, so let us follow this typical family in and out of government offices for a year or so after June 1, 1966.

The head of the family is earning \$53 a week on June 1. Since his income tax deductions amount to \$2,700—\$1,000 for himself, \$1,000 for his wife and \$300 for each of his two children and \$100 charitable—and his income is \$51 a week, which amounts to \$2,652 a year, then this family qualifies for the public medicare plan which the hon. Minister proposes to establish within The Department of Health. So, being good managers and good citizens, this family enrolls. And you will notice their coverage is not automatic, even under the hon. Minister of Health's system within The Department of Health. This family goes down on June 2 and it wends its way through a maze of bureaucrats to enrol in the plan.

Then, on June 3, 1966, let us assume that disaster strikes this unfortunate family—the breadwinner is called into his boss's office and he is told he has been doing a good job and deserves a raise. The boss will say, "You deserve better than you are getting, I am putting you up to \$52 a week." Now, usually a raise is welcome to a working man but consider the situation that this fellow is in—we will call him "Charlie." His gross income has gone up to \$2,704 a year and his tax deductions are only \$2,700, thus he now has taxable income, and thus he now is expected to pay part of his health care premiums.

It is not clear yet, Mr. Speaker, from what the hon. Minister of Health has seen fit to divulge, whether Charlie must now seek out a private carrier, buy a plan from the private carrier, pay his own premiums and seek a rebate from the government, or whether alternatively Charlie will still obtain his health insurance coverage from The Department of Health, and be required to pay an as-yet-unannounced portion of the cost of his coverage. In either case, he is in difficulty. His taxable income is only \$4 but this is enough to deprive him of free medicare. And I suspect that however small a proportion of his

subsidized premium Charlie is now required to pay, it will be more than \$4. Thus, his raise really means that it has put him out of pocket. It has also led him directly into another round of negotiation with the bureaucrats, either of the public service or of the private insurance industry. His status has changed, so the whole administrative machinery must go to work and create a new health-care programme for him. From now on he is paying premiums.

Let us have another look at this situation. Charlie's troubles are not yet over. On June 4, let us say, his wife goes to hospital and adds a third child to Charlie's family. What does the new baby mean? Another \$300 in income tax deductible. Charlie's tax exemptions have gone up to \$3,000 from \$2,700. Once again, he has no taxable income; once again his health-care programme changes. He is back under the hon. Minister of Health's wing with no premiums to pay. Charlie, hon. members will note, has been in and out of a medicare plan three times in three days. Hon. members may think this is a frivolous example, but I suggest that this whole patchwork of approaches that the government is taking is going to cause consternation and worry and confusion throughout this province.

We believe in, and we are firmly committed to, the principle that if government is to move at all in the medical-care field, and move it must, then it must act in such a way as to provide equal service for all citizens. Government-sponsored medical care must be universal. And what do we see when we apply the plan outlined in Bill 136 to Charlie and the hundreds and thousands of other citizens of Ontario who will be in comparative positions? We see that if their incomes are below a certain amount, then they are receiving charity at the discretion of the state, they are separated through no fault of their own from the mainstream of our society, and I presume they will be singled out to carry a special card, a card which will identify them as having a certain low income, a card which is really saying "poor."

Not only does this bill create an administrative nightmare, not only does it create an incredible hodgepodge of public and private and half-public and half-private ways and means of coping with medical bills, but it also is a means barrier between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 of our citizens. All the people who will receive subsidies for health-care premiums and all the people who will be enrolled through The Department of Health are stigmatized by the government. I think that is an unpleasant approach at the best of times, but when, as in the present case, it

walks hand in hand with built-in administrative inefficiencies and intolerable high costs, then it is an unforgiveable imposition on the people of Ontario, an imposition which has no logic behind it, no humanity and no common sense, an imposition which could only have arisen from the kind of internal wrangling within Conservative ranks which must have been taking place within the last few months.

Mr. Speaker, we are debating the principle of the hon. Minister's bill, so let me turn now to the matter of principle. I want to make it perfectly clear that we are opposed to Bill 136 not exclusively because it is such an absurdly unworkable piece of legislation, and not only because it saddles the people of Ontario with excessive costs and excessive bureaucratic red tape. We are opposed to Bill 136 because it denies every principle of social justice and every principle of economic progress that is the objective of the thoughtful citizen in a modern society. We are opposed to Bill 136 because it does not provide universal medical-care coverage for our citizens.

The hon. members opposite have defended their bill's voluntary features by announcing that they are opposed, on a high and ancient principle, to compulsion; they seem to emphasize that word steadily. But where do they actually stand? They take pride in their hospital services plan or I assume they do—a plan created by the present government, a plan which is compulsory in all but name, a plan which covers 99 per cent of the people of the province as the hon. Minister has pridefully informed us.

We are firmly committed to a universality in the Medicare plan for Ontario and we are disturbed, even shocked, at the government's hypocritical inconsistency in introducing a health services bill into this House which will not reach as many citizens of this province as are covered by our hospital plan. We are opposed to Bill 136 because it is a minimum-effort bill.

It is almost incomprehensible that the government would have the nerve to bring in a dead-end bill like this one in the face of all the evidence on every front. It is as though the government had turned its back on the experience of virtually every other advanced nation of the world; turned its back on a host of nations which have neither our wealth nor our medical resources, but which have produced and are operating comprehensive medicare plans. It is as though it had turned its back on the findings of the Hall commission; turned its back on

one of the most thorough, best documented and researched studies ever undertaken in Canada; turned its back, too, on human suffering and on the economic cost such suffering entails.

Bill 136 is administratively inadequate, but even if it were rewritten to eliminate the bureaucratic never-never land it embodies now, it would still be inadequate. It would be inadequate because it does not go anywhere. It does not lead to dental and optical care for children. It does not embody any preventive medicine. It speaks vaguely on the annual checkups, which the medical profession tells us are so important. It ignores well-baby care. It is silent on such matters as mental health, home nursing, chiropractic care and other therapeutic measures that are all part of a health services spectrum.

It ignores the whole field of prescription drugs. It makes no provision for the elimination of the inadequacies of medical and health services available in different areas of the province. It is silent on the subject of medical- and health-care research. It makes no allowance for the rapidly changing pattern of health-care services. It makes no allowance for the incredibly, rapidly changing technology of health care. It says nothing about the kind of paramedical personnel who can do so much to support the inevitably limited resources of fully professional health-care workers.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this bill effectively blocks the possibility that we will one day have universal and comprehensive medical care for Canadians, available from coast to coast. And I want to clarify this point and go into it more fully.

The Hall commission looked forward to the day when Canadians would be assured of at least a minimum amount of health-care protection, no matter where they happened to live in this country, no matter how or when they chanced to move from one province to another. There is no doubt in my mind that the Hall commission correctly anticipated federal financial participation in such coast-to-coast medicare. Where does Bill 136 leave that dream? This bill encourages the private insurance industry to operate a multitude of different health-care plans, plans that will offer certain services, to certain groups, at a certain price; other services to other groups at other prices; plans that will give the citizens of Ontario such a welter of alternative health-care plans, it will never be possible for order to be made from a government-sponsored chaos. It will never be possible to find the uniform base which is

essential if we are to have an equalization of services and benefits from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Ontario should be providing leadership to the rest of Canada in the field of social progress. We have the resources to do so, but this government practised and still practises followship and not leadership in the matter, as they did in the Canada Pension Plan. On the evidence, their behaviour in the health-care field is going to be even worse.

Bill 136 will effectively block the possibility of any sort of meaningful national health-care plan. Bill 136 is therefore not only an outrage, perpetrated on the people of Ontario, it is an outrage that is perpetrated on the whole Canadian nation. If all the deficiencies of this bill could be excused on the grounds of economy, then the government would have an argument. Not a good argument, but an argument, nonetheless. The truth of the matter is that the health services plan embodied in Bill 136, is just about as expensive as it could be.

If the hon. gentlemen had sat down and drafted this bill with the clear purpose of providing as little health-care protection as possible, for as large an expenditure of funds as possible, minimum medicare at maximum cost, I do not think they could have come up with a higher cost programme. In Bill 136, they have done a truly masterful job of wasting public money and of encouraging private citizens to waste their own money. How have they done this? I have already mentioned the waste in administrative costs, the fact that the cost of health insurance from private carriers is more than five times as great as the cost of public health insurance. This wastage alone, I estimate, will amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$40 million to \$50 million a year and this money could stay in the pockets of the citizens of this province.

Alternatively—and frankly my party finds this alternative attractive—the saving on administrative costs in a public, universal and comprehensive plan, would be sufficient to provide dental and optical care for every child in Ontario up to 18 years of age. You ask the average citizen of Ontario what his opinion is between these choices and I think you would get a very clear answer. Ask him whether he wants to see 25 cents on his health dollar going for sales commissions, head office overhead and other retention factors, or would he rather see that 25 cents spent on getting his children good teeth and good eyes. Put that question to the average citizen and you will see how far out of step

with public opinion and progressive legislation Bill 136 is.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I am proposing to introduce will call for the establishment of universal and comprehensive, publicly operated Medicare for all the citizens of Ontario. No doubt the government, in defending Bill 136, will attempt to undermine the logic of our position. I think that this debate will not be cluttered up with efforts from the other side of this House to attack the principle of universal comprehensive Medicare, but in order to avoid this possibility, I think I should say something about our own plan, the plan embodied in our amendment.

We believe that it is unnecessary to set up a whole new administrative framework for public Medicare. We believe that automatic enrolment in the Medicare plan of all persons now covered by hospital insurance would be simple, economical and very much in the public interest. We believe that the handling of payments—and we would pay doctors, I want to emphasize this, on a fee-for-service basis—would be facilitated by having the pool of highly skilled personnel that are now working for the prepaid carriers and the private plans. We know that Ontario could have universal Medicare right now, for an expenditure in the neighbourhood of approximately \$200 million. We know that this sum will provide not only complete physicians' services for all the people of Ontario, but dental services for children, optical services for children and people in receipt of public assistance.

I have tried to think why this government has brought in the kind of plan that they have. I have wondered if the government has done it because it felt that we could not afford a universal coverage and it decided therefore, that it would not go ahead in this. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if you will read this most comprehensive study made by Chief Justice Hall, he clearly states that we can afford to pay for a comprehensive universal programme all across Canada, not just in Ontario. He points out—and I am repeating myself in this, just to emphasize it—he points out that the private insurance companies are a more costly way for the average citizen to receive health coverage, that the private insurance companies are interested in the one area in which they are giving service, such as physicians' service—and it is not on a broad base, looking at the need for more personnel, seeing that it is related to hospitals and the need for prevention, and so on.

In the past I have respected the hon. Minister of Health for his forward-looking

approach—I am afraid I do not any longer. When we look at the new barriers that have been broken in Saskatchewan and we see the kind of approach that has been taken by the hon. Minister, I try to think of other reasons. He kept talking about compulsion and this seems to be preying on his mind—that any other scheme would be compulsory. Surely, in this 20th century he recognizes that education is the right of every person. Surely he does not feel that the people of Ontario grumble about having to pay taxes for their education; but for some reason as the Minister of Health and as a doctor, he down-grades health below education. Otherwise, he would feel that we all should have a right to universal comprehensive coverage. He would not be arguing about compulsion; he is far too intelligent a man, in my opinion, to—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): That is flattery!

Mr. Thompson: Well, the hon. Minister's argument just does not hold water. He raises this bogey about compulsion and he is suggesting that it would be wrong to have a government department looking after the health needs. I suspect that he brings up the bogeys about doctor-patient relationship and says that this will be undermined—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Try me out.

Mr. Thompson: I suggest that if he does bring it up again, all he has to do is look at studies in Britain and Norway and Sweden, to show that it has not deteriorated. He can raise all the bogeys he wants about that, but let him look at objective studies with respect to it. Surely the doctor knows—and I refer to the hon. Minister as a doctor; I am forgetting his Scottish background—that the manner in which a bill is paid and the signature on it does not have any particular therapeutic effect with respect to the patient, and that is what we are talking about—to be able to have a collective system by which we take responsibility for each individual so that he can get proper health coverage.

Does the hon. Minister believe in the principle of workmen's compensation whereby we know the individual working man cannot afford to pay for injuries which will take place and therefore collectively we all get together to help him? Why does he not apply that in connection with this medical-insurance approach?

The other point that worries me is this, because it shows to me that the hon. Minister may have a sort of Marie Antoinette

approach; he has this nervousness apparently, with respect to a government-run insurance programme, but that does not matter to 1,000,000 people who are in a lower income group.

The hon. Minister does not see any inefficiencies or inadequacies that are going to take place with them getting health services, so if he really believes that a government-run medical programme is bad, a great difficulty for doctor-patient relationship and all the other aspects and bogeys that he brings up, then surely he is not going to inject an approach in setting up a department, a government-run approach for 1,000,000 of the citizens. If he does not believe it, and he believes it provides good service, then why is it not extended to all the citizens of the province?

I suggest to anyone in this House from the other side who gets up and starts talking about compulsion, that if he has a government-run programme that it really gives inadequate service and those other things, that he just recognizes that with his bills. He is inflicting that—if he thinks it is bad—on 1,000,000 of the people. If he thinks that it is bad, it shows again a kind of class consciousness which he has, that he really does not give a rap, provided that they are at a lower income—so do not let us hear that argument!

An hon. member: How is it being inflicted?

Mr. Thompson: What about the situation of universality? The hon. Minister says this opportunity is going to be given to all the citizens of Ontario and yet we look at this situation: We have seen his plan in operation; we have seen it in Alberta. What is the latest report? In Alberta, 15 per cent of the people have not applied for the coverage and they are the 15 per cent of the people who most need it, apparently. Surely, that should make him shake a little before he starts introducing this thing. But has it? Not at all, and yet right in his speech of introduction, he refers to the aspect of universality while in Alberta, where they have a similar plan, 15 per cent of the people who do most need to be in, are not in.

What about the "grey" area? The people who are just over the deductible group? I want to speak very strongly on this because to me, one of the reasons that I am in public life and one of the objectives which I have in Ontario, and I speak personally about this, is to have universal comprehensive coverage. I have stood for this since I first ran; it was in my first pamphlet I had when I first ran in

Dovercourt, and I fought for this and I fought for personal reasons as well. I speak because I come from a family which would be considered to be in this "grey" area, a family which I like to think has a certain dignity of wanting to pay its own way, for wanting to look after itself. I saw my father having to pay out money steadily for health services for treatment for my mother because he was over a bracket, until finally he could not. I think there are many of us in that situation throughout this province.

We are aware that a universal programme has been done in many other countries; we are aware that Saskatchewan has shown that this can be done in one of the provinces of Canada.

One may say, for example, that the doctors would leave. Well, we heard all the cries in connection with Saskatchewan; the simple point is that it is working in Saskatchewan and has not been changed by any government. The simple point is that in Britain, for all the hon. Minister's great abhorrence of it, he will not see changes in that system, either. As a Conservative, I would think he would take some pride that the Conservative government in Britain had written a White Paper in connection with comprehensive coverage; and as a Conservative, I think, he should take some pride in his hospital insurance commission and the fact that there is free hospital service, even though I know that he fought it down to the last ditch when it was being introduced—not him personally, but some of those with an antiquated philosophy who were in that government when this thing was being introduced.

Why is he fighting this? Why is he coming up with this kind of half-baked approach? Economic grounds; it is costing us more; it is a most elaborate thing. He, with his Scottish background, I think would be the most concerned about this waste of money. Surely as a man of humanity, he does not want to have people channelled and processed one way to get help, while some others go another way. On philosophical grounds, he is not against a government-sponsored scheme, because I do not think that he would suggest that we give a bad kind of scheme to 1,000,000 people. So that as a politician and a humanitarian he believes that they would get the best of care—those 1,000,000 people who will be getting service through a government-sponsored scheme.

What is the reason? For the life of me, I cannot think of why he has not followed the Hall commission. I debated last week with the chairman of the Hagey commission—a

very fine and dedicated man. My only point to him was that he had got himself involved in horse-and- buggy terms of reference when he took on that commission. There has been an enlightened, thorough study made by the Hall commission, and the Hall commission has denounced, in every way it can, the programme that the hon. Minister is suggesting. It has denounced this approach of grading people, this approach based on taxable income. It has argued for universality and a comprehensive approach; it has urged the hon. Minister to take a broad look at the whole health field, not only at the physicians' services but also the research or the need for new schools for doctors.

One of the thoughts that came to my mind was that he will say, "Well, we haven't got enough staff, we haven't got enough doctors so if we had it on the universal basis we would not be able to service it." I imagine some hon. members of the government will say that and I would ask why have they not enough doctors if they do not think they have enough, because they are the people responsible for getting doctors? I noticed in the paper, during the weekend, that there are people dying because there are not enough doctors. We had the situation last year where we read of people dying because they could not get into hospitals. I suggest that we remedy this, for the government is responsible and it is clear that the government is responsible for having to provide services around this province.

We will put the heat on the government to see that it gets going on this, if it is responsible, the way we are putting the heat on about hospital beds. I would suggest if we had not had a hospital insurance commission looking after the needs of hospitals, that possibly we would have a greater shortage of hospital beds; there would be no one person who would be responsible to whom we in this Legislature could point a finger and say, "Get going on it." Similarly with a shortage of doctors. If there is a shortage of doctors, I say the hon. Minister is to blame for that, he and his government. But I suggest even though there may be a shortage of doctors and he puts on a crash programme now with the medical schools, you still have more doctors per capita than they have in Norway or Sweden or England, and they have a comprehensive universal programme. And the Hall commission says, "Do not be carried away by that kind of weary talk from people who say, 'Look, let's wait longer on this thing till we get more.'" The Hall commission said, "You can start in Canada, you can start today." Well, we can certainly

start in Ontario. So that must not be the reason why the government has not implemented a universal coverage.

Is it because the government thinks that people are covered? I notice that it has claimed previously that people have insurance coverage and I think a figure was quoted that about 73 per cent of the population of Ontario has coverage. Yet surely it would have asked the further question: What kind of coverage have they got? Just taking PSI—and that is one of the better policies—PSI pays only 23.5 per cent of the average total health care; and in doctors' bills PSI pays 58.7 per cent of the doctors' bills, so that to suggest that people have got coverage, that 73 per cent have it—what kind of coverage have they?

I say I cannot understand in this province, when the government has had the opportunity to bring in a health charter, when it has had a most comprehensive study done by the Hall commission to give the facts, to tell it that it can afford it, to tell it that it should go ahead—I find it deplorable that this government, in this year of the 20th century, in this wealthy province is bringing in this half-baked approach, muddled, confused, administratively costly and offering it to the people of Ontario. For this reason, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that," and the following be substituted:

this bill be referred to the standing committee on education, health and welfare at which representatives of farmers, trade unions, the business community, the medical profession, and the public should be invited; with instructions to make recommendations to the government and the House in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal commission on health services, chaired by the Honourable Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, in order that the bill should provide a health charter for the citizens of Ontario and without limiting the generality of the foregoing the bill shall include and be based upon the following principles:

(a) A comprehensive government-operated universal health care programme.

(b) The patient shall have the right to be treated by a doctor of his choice.

(c) Doctors shall be paid on a fee-for-services basis and shall be free to practise within or without the plan.

(d) There shall be no means test.

(e) Mental illness shall be treated on the same basis as other illnesses.

(f) Dental and optical services for children up to 18 years of age shall be included.

(g) Other ancillary medical and health care services such as home nursing or orthopaedic appliances, chiropractic services, etc., shall be phased into the programme as independent health services, in order that the programme shall be fully comprehensive by 1971.

(h) The bill in its final form shall be of such a nature that the programme can be readily integrated into a national health-care programme for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Thompson moves, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that" and the following be substituted:

this bill be referred to the standing committee on education, health and welfare at which representatives of farmers, trade unions, the business community, the medical profession, and the public should be invited; with instructions to make recommendations to the government and the House in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal commission on health services, chaired by the Honourable Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, in order that the bill should provide a health charter for the citizens of Ontario and without limiting the generality of the foregoing the bill shall include and be based upon the following principles:

(a) A comprehensive government-operated universal health care programme.

(b) The patient shall have the right to be treated by a doctor of his choice.

(c) Doctors shall be paid on a fee-for-services basis and shall be free to practise within or without the plan.

(d) There shall be no means test.

(e) Mental illness shall be treated on the same basis as other illnesses.

(f) Dental and optical services for children up to 18 years of age shall be included.

(g) Other ancillary medical and health care services such as home nursing or orthopaedic appliances, chiropractic services, etc., shall be phased into the programme as independent health services, in order that the programme shall be fully comprehensive by 1971.

(h) The bill in its final form shall be of such a nature that the programme can be readily integrated into a national health-care programme for all Canadians.

The debate now will proceed upon the amendment just read.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Health introduced this bill, on first reading he made a comment which I would like to read to the House. It is to be found on page 2758 of *Hansard*. He said:

Mr. Speaker, I fully anticipate that there will be argument that everyone should be compelled to come under our standard plan, and that this is the only equitable and workable way in which complete and adequate medical services coverage can be attained.

This really boils down to a difference in basic philosophies. Some believe that government should regiment the people, deciding what is best for them and imposing that decision upon them by compulsion. Others, and we subscribe to this, believe the same objective can be attained without compulsion.

We believe we have proven this in our experience with hospital care insurance—

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me begin right at that point. I find it a little difficult that a Scotsman, with a Scotsman's normal intellectual integrity in terms of facing the fact, would say on one hand, "we subscribe to this, we believe the same objective can be attained without compulsion," and then in the very next breath say, "we believe we have proven this in our experience with hospital care insurance."

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health must know—I do not know where he has been if he does not know—that over 60 per cent of the people in hospital insurance in the province of Ontario are under it compulsorily. They are the people who are in employee groups of over 15, whose employer must enrol them in the plan. He has no alternative. This is the base which establishes the hospital insurance plan as a viable economic unit. It is idle for the hon. Minister of Health to talk about non-compulsion in a plan, when 60 per cent of the people in that plan are compelled to be in it under the law. Their employer must enrol them. And that in itself, Mr. Speaker, reveals on just what a phoney kind of philosophical concept the hon. Minister is trying to base this bill, and then set up the battle with the Opposition.

The hon. Minister says there is a difference in basic philosophy. I agree there is a difference in basic philosophy. If the hon. Minister had been consistent in his philosophy, both within this bill and within the

acts of this government down through the years, I would have some respect for his stand on a basic difference in philosophy. But the fact of the matter is that the philosophy on which he is basing this bill is a mish-mash philosophy, in fact, and what he is trying to present to the public is a myth, an outworn myth, an old Tory concept, in terms of meeting the needs of the people in this day. Indeed it was underlined by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) very shortly after the bill was introduced. The hon. Prime Minister was speaking to the North York Progressive-Conservative association at their annual meeting and in the *Globe and Mail* of May 13, he is quoted as saying: "We believe as a party in individual responsibility."

Well, may I say, Mr. Speaker, he has no monopoly on that. The New Democratic Party believes in individual responsibility, but we also have come to the conclusion, because we live in the 20th century—and on this bill I have come to the conclusion the government does not live in the 20th century—that experience has proved conclusively that on some things the individual cannot cope with the cost, and therefore society generally throughout the western world has recognized that a collective solution to meet these individual needs is the superior one. Indeed, the Hall commission came to the same conclusion. But the hon. Prime Minister proceeded: "We must be prepared to come to the aid of those who need it."

There is the good old 19th century paternalism: We should come to the aid of those who are not fortunate enough to have shared in the benefits that we have achieved, by whatever means we have achieved them. But we must not force these things on those who do not need them. The dignity of the individual must be considered. Here is the hon. Prime Minister accurately reflecting the philosophy of a government, which says that the dignity of the individual must be considered. What he is thinking about is the dignity of somebody at the upper end of the income bracket, who is now buying his health insurance, and upon whom it would be an imposition and a violation of his individual rights, if he should have to believe he was his brother's keeper and become part of an overall plan. But he forgets the dignity of the 1,800,000 people in this province who are going to have to come to this government with their TD-1 forms in their hands, as a means test, to be separated out from the rest of the population, to be treated as second-class citizens who have to be helped to meet these basic needs. And if they do not do it

themselves, what was the hon. Minister's comment, as another indication of this good Tory basic philosophy? He was quoted in the papers and the press conference after he had introduced this bill as saying, True there will be some people who will not buy the insurance, even when we have assisted them and indicated that we will assist them to buy it, but these are the people who have "a slackness of character."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I must protest that I have never at any time in discussing this bill, used those words.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if the hon. Minister did not use them, he was quoted in the newspapers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have never spoken in such derogatory fashion about any of the citizens of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister was quoted in the press as referring to people as having slackness of character, the people who did not have what was required to look after their own needs.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already stated to the hon. member that I did not use those words. I think in respect to a member's word, he should withdraw this statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Minister has stated that he did not use those words. In the House, the member for York South has to accept his word.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will certainly accept it. But I will take a look at my files. This debate will go on for some time and perhaps we will have the hon. Minister take a look at what was reported in the press on his behalf.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the basic philosophy that underlines this bill—and both the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister have been quite clear and explicit in stating it to the public—is out of tune with the times. It is not part and parcel of the 20th century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the House back to an incident that was etched forever on my memory at a meeting of the standing committee on health that was held here at Queen's Park, back about the year 1957. The committee at that time was considering the introduction of hospital insurance. The government had been giving consideration to whether or not it would be a private plan or a public plan and I think it would be accurate to say that in the first instance, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Frost,

was disposed to favour a private plan. But the more we examined the facts and the realities of private coverage, the more it was evident that the Prime Minister of the day became dubious. For example, the standing committee on health was informed that of the four major carriers that were providing hospital coverage at that time, the best one had a record of paying back on the premium dollar, 61 cents in claims. The next best record was one that was paying 56 cents in claims. The third best record was one that was paying 47 cents back in claims. The fourth one was paying 39 cents, on the premium dollar, back in claims.

In other words, very close to a half, on an average, of the premium dollar, was being frittered away in administrative costs, on high overhead, and was not being spent for what the citizen of the province of Ontario had originally bought the policy, namely, to cover his health needs. And the more the Prime Minister of the day looked at the situation, the more he came to the conclusion that, with the high costs of hospitals as they are now, to establish a private coverage with this built-in overhead, would be more costly than the public purse should have to sustain—certainly that the people of the province of Ontario, in an overall plan, should have to sustain.

Now I come to that incident, which I recall so distinctly. A couple of young, somewhat brash, certainly very aggressive spokesmen on behalf of the insurance underwriters' association, in a very informal give and take in the committee, turned to Prime Minister Frost on one occasion and said to him: "You cover those who cannot pay for their own policies and we will look after the rest"; and Prime Minister Frost looked at him and, with mild embarrassment and a slight squirming, he said: "Well, that sounds like a good deal for you. We will underwrite the high risks. We will cover those in the lower income brackets, and you will go ahead and cover all those who will provide a sure profit for the insurance companies." And to his everlasting credit, Mr. Speaker, he did not buy that kind of a deal.

Now, to this government's everlasting discredit, this is precisely the kind of deal that this government has bought. I want to analyze it, to show to what extent this is the case. The government has divided the people of the province of Ontario into three groups. The first group, who come with their means test, indicating that they have so little income that they pay no income tax at all, numbering one million people in the province of Ontario,

are going to have their premiums paid by the state in total. If I may just interject as an aside, we have had many back-benchers on the government side argue that there were no pockets of poverty in this province and it is interesting within the same session, when statements like that have been made, to have a government bring in a bill that reveals that a cool one million people in this province have incomes that are such that they pay no tax at all. There is a pretty sizeable pocket of poverty, scattered across the whole province; the government acknowledges it and they are going to pay for them.

There is a second group—800,000 people—whose taxable income is something less than \$1,000, and the government here is going to pay an escalated or a graded subsidy that ranges from nothing up to, presumably, the total premium.

Now, we are still left, as the hon. leader of the Opposition stated, speculating after years of study on the part of this government as to exactly what the premiums are going to be—I can think of nothing that is a more solid condemnation of this government floundering in its approach to health insurance than that they should finally bring in a bill after all these years of study and not yet be able to present to the public, and particularly to us who have to debate this bill, some indication as to what the premiums are going to be. But if one takes the table that the hon. Minister of Health included in his speech, when he introduced this bill into the House, one will find that it grades up. Up to \$100 there are subsidies paid, so that all that is left to be paid by the individual is \$14. If he has a taxable income of \$200, he has to pay \$29; if there is a taxable income of \$300, he has to pay \$44 premium; if there is a taxable income of \$400, he has to pay \$59 premium, and interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, the table was cut off—nothing more was included. There is a footnote at the bottom which says:

So on up the scale until taxable income of \$500 is reached for a single person and \$1,000 is reached for a married couple. Support for a family will extend to a taxable income of \$1,200 approximately, annually.

So let us go up the table, let us follow it up. Hon. members will see that the difference, for example, in the amount of premium that has to be paid for the individual is \$15 for each \$100 increase in taxable income. It rose from \$14 to \$29, between \$100 and \$200 taxable income; it rose from \$29 to \$44, between \$200 and \$300 taxable income; it

rose from \$44 to \$59, between \$300 and \$400 taxable income—\$15 upward with each bracket of \$100 taxable income. So let us follow it up the scale; let us do as they suggested and “so on up the scale.”

At \$500, the premium being paid would be \$74; at \$600 the premium being paid would be \$89; at \$700 the premium being paid would be \$104; at \$800 the premium being paid would be \$119—and just pause for a moment, Mr. Speaker, \$800 taxable income for the average family—father, mother and two children—means an income of \$3,500, because their exemption will be \$2,700 on \$800 taxable income taken from the \$3,500. So at \$3,500 they would pay \$119; with \$900 taxable income, they would pay \$134; with \$1,000, \$149; with \$1,100 taxable income on a family, it would be left to pay \$164; with \$1,200 taxable income, it would be up in the range of \$179.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the premium that this government is going to fix as a maximum is a premium that was indicated in the Hagey commission report—approximately \$175.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): What is wrong with that?

Mr. MacDonald: All I am saying is, if there is nothing wrong with it why is the government trying to hide it? Why, after six years of study does the government bring in the bill and not indicate the premium? One has to go through a devious calculation to discover exactly what it is going to be.

Well, there it is.

Now, as the hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out, Mr. Speaker, if your premiums are going to be in the range of \$175, which is some \$13 or \$14 more than the premium in the province of Alberta, and you are going to leave it on a voluntary basis, it follows, as night follows day, that we in the province of Ontario will have somewhat the same experience as they had in the province of Alberta, namely, that a good many people in these lower income brackets, who are still left with this size of a premium to be paid, whether or not—and I now use the term—they have “slackness” of character, or whether they just say, “At the end of the week when I have paid for the groceries and the rent and I bought little Johnny a pair of trousers and little Susie a new pair of shoes, and I have not got enough to pay for the premium, I will gamble.” Because all life is a gamble when you are living on that kind of income. They do not buy it, and when they are hit with illness they are uncovered, of course.

Therefore, the whole plan does not fulfill the objective that a medical insurance plan should seek to fulfill, namely, coverage of everybody.

The net effect of this kind of a situation will be that a significant number of people who are left on a voluntary basis, simply will not have the financial means to do it and we in the province of Ontario will share, to some degree, the kind of experience they have had in Alberta where 15 per cent of the people—and most of them in the lower income groups, it has been acknowledged in Alberta—remain today uncovered.

However, Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me even more, is when I begin to analyze—with the limited amount of information that this government has deigned to give the Opposition as we seek to debate this important bill—exactly what the cost is going to be to provide coverage for this bottom 25 per cent in our income scale in the province of Ontario.

The hon. Minister, in introducing the bill, indicated that the cost will be some \$70 million out of the public Treasury to cover the 1,800,000 people. Now, as I was reflecting on this a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I was suddenly intrigued by a little bit of calculation that I became engaged in. Seventy million dollars for 1,800,000 people, is a per capita cost of \$38.88, not taking into account the fact that 800,000 of that 1,800,000 are going to be contributing premiums—partial premiums. Now, it is impossible to predict at this point, how much they will be contributing. I have tried to figure if one could intelligently guess what amount of money would be contributed in partial premiums along with this \$70 million of public moneys to cover this bottom 1,800,000 people.

Let me give you an example: Suppose that they were paying half the premium across the board on those who are in the zero-to-\$1,000 taxable income, then that would mean that there would be an additional \$13 million in partial premiums from this group. But it does mean this, Mr. Speaker, that the per capita cost for covering the bottom 25 per cent out of the public Treasury, plus the partial premiums that come in, will be somewhere between \$45 and \$50. I wonder if the House for one moment realizes the enormity of that figure. The Hall commission—and I want to come back to these national averages a little bit later—the Hall commission estimated in its report that the national per capita, for establishing a complete medical insurance plan in this country in the year 1966, would be \$24.91; and here is a government bringing in a plan which says that for

the bottom one-quarter, the cost is going to be almost precisely double that amount—somewhere in the range of \$45 to \$50 per capita.

Now, in the first place, I am a little astounded as to why it is to be that high. I will concede that if you are covering people who are on allowances, on pensions, like disability pensions and old age pensions, or if you are covering low-income groups—because studies have indicated that there is a greater incidence of ill health in lower income groups—that this will be your high-risk group. But I am very curious as to why even in the high-risk group, you are going to come up with a figure which is twice the national average laid down by the Hall commission.

However, Mr. Speaker, let us for a moment accept the fact that this is a valid figure to cover the high-risk 25 per cent, the lower income scale, then this simply means, Mr. Speaker, that the per capita cost for the rest is going to be relatively low. The per capita cost for the rest of the people in the province of Ontario might well be in the range of \$18 to \$20, if one bears in mind the Hall commission national average of \$24.91.

So what in effect, Mr. Speaker, this government has done is that they have taken the high-risk group out and they are going to cover it partially or wholly out of the public Treasury which means that all of the people of Ontario are going to have to share in that cost. And then, too, the rest of the province of Ontario, who are going to have to seek their coverage from the private carriers, the insurance companies or the doctor-sponsored plans, are going to have to pay not a relatively low cost rate in the range of \$18 or \$20; they are going to have to pay more than they have to pay at the present time, because the fact of the matter is that if we are going to end up, as it looks as though we are ending up, with a maximum premium of \$175, this is higher than is now charged, for example, on the Blue Cross blue plan, on a group basis.

So the people of the province of Ontario who fall into the 75 per cent who are going to have to look after themselves, are going to pay doubly through the nose: they are going to have to share the cost from the public purse for this high-risk coverage on the bottom 25 per cent, and they themselves are going to have to put in a larger contribution to the premium that they purchase for their own coverage, \$175, for something less than the kind of coverage that PSI offers at the present time.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is that we are

going to have a high-cost low-value coverage. That is what this bill offers: a high-cost low-value coverage. We are going to pay more and we are going to get less. This is something that I think the people of the province of Ontario have to take a good solid look at. I would suggest, incidentally, that some of those on the government backbenches who I know have some doubts with regard to this kind of policy, should take a solid look at. Why should you pay more to get less? Why at this stage in the game we should be presented with a high-cost low-value coverage I do not know.

Let us take a look at the cost and why it is going to be a high cost, in addition to the reasons I have already spelled out. It is going to be costly, Mr. Speaker, for three reasons: 1. Because we are going to have a multiplicity of policies. There will be dozens of policies offered in this province of Ontario.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Cheaper by the dozen!

Mr. MacDonald: It will not be cheaper by the dozen. My hon. friend to the right here interjects, "Cheaper by the dozen." It will not be, that is the point. If it were cheaper by the dozen it might be fine, but it is going to be more expensive. The government is going to bring in a bill which will obligate every carrier—with some exceptions; I note they now have permission to give exceptions—to give standard coverage, either standard coverage paid from the first dollar or standard coverage on the deductible and co-insurance plan, that darling of the insurance industry that it has been trying to promote for years.

In other words, each company is going to be competing, not to provide complete health coverage, they are going to be competing with the plan which will lure people into buying what they are offering and what they are offering will be less than complete coverage at what looks like a fancy price, a low price. They will discover after they have bought it that the very thing that they need coverage for is not going to be there.

Alternatively, if it is going to be a standard plan like the one that the government is putting its seal of approval on, this deductible and co-insurance plan, let us examine for a moment the cost for an average family again. Suppose they were to sign up in this deductible and co-insurance plan. They have to pay the first \$50 deductible if they are a family. Beyond that the policy will cover 80 per cent, but they have to cover 20 per cent. Suppose, for example, this average family of

father, mother and two children, should happen to have during the course of the year \$200 in doctor bills, which is not impossible, not out of the ordinary at all. This would mean they would have to pay the first \$50, and they would have to pay 20 per cent or one-fifth of the remaining \$150, or an additional \$50, so that their total is going to be \$100. So here, on an incomplete coverage, they are going to have a total bill of \$100.

An hon. member: Eighty dollars!

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is right. One fifth of \$150 is \$30 and \$30 on the original deductible of \$50 is \$80. They are going to have to pay \$80 even though they had coverage.

It is going to be costly for a second reason, Mr. Speaker, and that is that there is just no doubt in the wide world that the overhead cost for private insurance companies is in the range of 25 to 28 cents, what is referred to euphemistically in the trade as the retention amount.

The hon. leader of the Opposition was referring to it. It is somewhat less than it was in the case of hospital insurance where we had payments out by the top four companies of only 61, 56, 47 and 39 cents. Here the average is approximately 72 cents. So 28 cents is going to be used for overhead and administrative costs and profits.

The fact of the matter is that on the plans that have been operating for some years, and therefore on which we have some incontrovertible evidence, it has been found that under a public plan coverage can be provided for everybody with an administrative cost which is not in excess of five per cent.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have found our hospital insurance in the province of Ontario is in that range, and I suggest if we were to establish the right kind of medical insurance in the province of Ontario, and combine it with hospital insurance, that the administrative costs could be reduced to distinctly below the five per cent figure. But we are going to have these high costs.

It is going to be costly for another reason, Mr. Speaker. Even though the medical association has indicated some unhappiness with the present government bill because it at least opens the door to the kind of public coverage which it regards as anathema—the establishment of this division within The Department of Health to cover that bottom 1,000,000 or 1,800,000 people partially or wholly—the medical profession has, generally speaking, indicated considerable support for this. Why would it not support this bill, Mr.

Speaker! Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this, already the highest paid profession in the province of Ontario, in Canada, will get immediately an increase to its incomes of something in the range of \$20 million overnight.

The reason for that is this: This bill stipulates that the doctors will be paid on 100 per cent of the OMA's schedule of fees. At the present time the doctors are being paid only 85 per cent if they are enrolled in PSI. I happen to have here the 1963 annual report of Physician Services Incorporated and I find on here that the expenditures from PSI in 1963 for physician services and for extended health benefit services were \$52,214,385. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the doctors received on a payment of 85 per cent of the fee schedule, something in excess of \$52 million. When this bill goes through, automatically they will get something over \$61 million, because they will be paid 100 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees, an increase in excess of \$9 million for doing exactly the same work.

Second, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Ontario there are something approximating 250,000 people who have enrolled with The Department of Public Welfare and have been placed on the health welfare plan, a plan which has been worked out between The Department of Public Welfare and the Ontario medical association, whereby these people who are indigents, or near-indigents, are covered for, I believe, \$1.25 a month or something like \$15 a year, and this is prorated among the doctors. I have had a little difficulty in getting an exact figure for the amount that is paid each year. I have been told that the amount that was paid in some years past is in excess of \$3 million. When I checked in the Department of Public Welfare estimates for this year, I believe the figure there is in the range of \$2 million, which is going to be put into the pot for doctors, to cover this 250,000 people who are on this welfare plan.

But under this proposal, this bill that the government has just brought in—as was the case in the Hagey commission report—automatically these people will be enrolled and their premiums will be paid and the doctors will be getting a full schedule of fees, so that instead of receiving \$2 million or \$3 million, the Hagey commission report indicates that they will receive \$12.8 million or \$12.9 million—in round figures, some \$13 million. In other words, there will be an increase in the doctors' incomes of something approximating \$10 million there, as well as an increase of something in excess of \$9 million

for the full payment of schedules within the PSI structure. From these two sources alone, Mr. Speaker, the medical profession will immediately be in receipt of some \$20 million or more income, and this is the profession which today is the highest paid profession in this country, the highest paid profession in the province of Ontario.

Indeed, the latest figures, which I have here from the 1964 taxation statistics, published by The Department of National Revenue, indicates that in Ontario in that year, 5,456 medical doctors and surgeons received total net incomes—this is net income and the gross will be about one-third higher than this—of \$106,173,000, for an average of \$19,460. So that next year you can add to the doctors' gross income another \$20 million directly out of the public Treasury, for a full payment of schedules on the PSI and on the welfare plan. That is why the plan is so costly. That is why, for example, the hon. Minister of Health has to come in here and tell us that for covering this bottom 25 per cent, it is going to cost the public Treasury some \$70 million. That is why the figure is so extraordinarily high. It has got this kind of featherbedding in it, for what is already the highest paid profession.

Now, I have no objection to the doctors being the highest paid profession. I have said it before and I say it again, that if there is any profession that is going to be the highest paid one, I know of no profession that deserves it more than the doctors, in terms of the time they put in, and in terms of their service to humanity. But I think that within any democratic society, if a profession is already the highest paid profession, that one has to look a second time at the proposition, that when a government brings in a bill, they should bring in a bill that immediately hands over another \$20 million out of the public Treasury, to those already high salaries.

When a government intervenes in the fashion that this government has finally intervened, I think the only justification for their intervention is that they should do so to make certain that everybody in the province of Ontario is going to be covered and that secondly, there will be no fat in the system. There will be none of these excessive costs that can be ironed out—the kind of thing for example, that Prime Minister Frost back in 1957 took a look at, when he considered private coverage and said "I will have nothing of that at all. We have got to give it at the lowest possible figure." And obviously this can be done only under a public plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by way of another approach to the weaknesses and questions that should be asked in this government plan, I would like to turn to an editorial that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* a few days ago, after the government introduced its bill. The plea from the *Globe and Mail* editorial writers was to the Opposition. They said it was an opportunity for a constructive debate and they asked that the Opposition should rise to this, rather than take refuge in doctrinaire approaches to medical-care insurance. For example, let me read this and a few of the questions which I would like to have the House take a look at along with me for a moment.

The medical insurance legislation proposed by the Ontario government offers much fertile ground for exploration and challenge by the Opposition parties. Are the benefits sufficient for a healthful start in this field?

A very good question. It does not give on the standard plans as complete coverage as it does at the present time under PSI blue plans. So it is a very good question. It rules out pregnancies under certain conditions that are spelled out in the Act, if enrolment has not taken place early enough. It rules out eye refraction; so it is a very good question as to whether or not this plan is providing a healthful start on the kind of benefits that the people of the province of Ontario want.

"Have reasonable priorities been observed?"

Well, I do not know exactly what the *Globe and Mail* means by "priorities," but if they are talking about the fact that in building a complete health coverage it is generally conceded that the first priority was hospital coverage and the second one is medical coverage, what should be beyond that?

And here, incidentally, I would say that our Liberals, with the kind of limited study that they put into this kind of plan, have gone off at a tangent that I personally would not support. Not that I do not want complete coverage for everybody on dental and optical immediately, but if you are going to be responsible in facing up to the costs and the staging of the implementation of this kind of programme, I would suggest that the third priority—indeed it is so close to being the second, that I think it should be integrated with the second—is the coverage of drugs.

In fact, a very strong case can be made for the fact that if one does not have coverage of drugs, in a family with limited financial means, that is idle to have coverage for the doctor's bills, because if a person goes to the doctor and his problem gets diagnosed

and he is given a prescription and he has not the money to buy the prescription, what good has it all done him?

And, therefore, a case for drug coverage—at least in certain urgent areas, if not for the whole of the people of the province of Ontario—should be an integrated part of medical coverage and I personally would say without any hesitancy that this is the next priority. Beyond that, of course, there is dentistry and beyond that there is optical; priorities might be a matter of argument. Indeed, once we get this groundwork laid in hospital and medical and drugs, I think we should move as quickly as the facilities enable us. I say as quickly as the facilities enable us, because in the instance of dentistry, we simply have not got the facilities to provide the kind of complete coverage that was envisioned in the Hall commission report.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The hon. member likes this approach then, does he?

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Mr. White: The hon. member likes this approach, phasing these benefits in?

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I like phasing it, but I do not like dragging my feet and phasing it the wrong way; and the government is doing both.

An hon. member: That is what you think.

Another hon. member: Next question?

Mr. MacDonald: Next question, right!

"Will the cost be excessive for the poor who are not quite poor enough to be entitled to assistance?" The answer to that question is in many instances beyond any shadow of doubt: Yes, it will be too great for them.

"Can a case be made for an extension of graded premiums?" Of course it can be; of greater subsidies and extension of premiums, because I repeat, as I said earlier, that we have the experience of the province of Alberta, which indicates clearly that these lower income groups are going to be precisely the groups who, left to buy health insurance voluntarily, are not going to have the means to buy it, even though the government says it is going to assist to some degree. Next question:

Should some part of the premium burden be borne out of the general revenue as in the case of Saskatchewan and British Columbia, or with hospital insurance in Ontario?

Well, I will come to that a little later, because I think that there is merit in some of the burden being carried by a basic premium and the rest of it being borne out of the general revenue with specific taxes that are designed to raise the need.

Now, continuing with the *Globe and Mail* questions:

How does the government propose to make sure that all citizens will be aware of the opportunities for coverage available for them? Advertising these, even on a mass scale, will not reach some of those who need protection most. Will welfare and health workers be alerted to convey the message?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know; it depends on the vigour with which this government is going to try to get the message across to the people of the province of Ontario, but one of the added high administrative costs in it is undoubtedly going to be caused by the fact that they are going to do a sizeable amount of advertising to be able to get those who should be aware of it to come voluntarily into the plan. This will be an added administrative cost in the kind of plan that we are talking about.

What is to be done about the low-income worker, who would be entitled to a government subsidy but is already a member of a group plan to which his employer contributed? Will he be required to forfeit assistance either from the government or his employer? What does the government propose to do about such persons? And they could be many, who do not pay for coverage and then suffer illness or injury, for those who have no money to buy medical attention.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many questions in the untidy, piecemeal, fragmented kind of approach that the *Globe and Mail* has very rightly raised and we have had no answer from this government as to how they are going to cope with it.

What about the persons who, for example—and there are lots of them in the province of Ontario, indeed there are thousands among the 35 per cent of the civil servants of this province—who are living on something less than \$1,000 taxable income? What are they going to be under the government plan, or are they going to come out and handle it on their own? This is the kind of thing that the government has given no answer on.

My only comment, finally, on this *Globe and Mail* editorial is that although it asks all these questions, on February 27, editorially

it took a look at the Hagey report and with a very commendable enlightened reaction stated that “in the context of these events the Hagey proposals are an anachronism—an anachronism designed to serve the insurance companies and the doctors more than the people of the province of Ontario.”

Now the government, two months later, brings in a plan which is patterned on the Hagey report with the exception of this slight move toward public coverage, which is going to be very, very costly and represents a handover to the medical profession and to the insurance companies by taking out the high-risk group—when the government brings in this kind of plan, why does the *Globe and Mail* throw in the towel and accept the plan and say: “We will start with this and we will try to improve it”?

Obviously the plan is so bad in the terms of the *Globe and Mail's* own premises, which it laid down two months ago, that I trust the *Globe and Mail* has now become persuaded that it appreciates the Opposition fighting this plan and fighting it tooth and nail because of its inadequacies. We only took our lead from the *Globe and Mail* and I hope the *Globe and Mail* is not like the Liberals who change their policy every couple of months or so on this issue.

Mr. White: That is the first true thing the hon. member has said.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me go back for one moment, Mr. Speaker, to the genesis of the plan.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member was doing well; remember the day he voted against the third reading of a bill when he voted for second reading?

Mr. MacDonald: Let me get back to the genesis. The hon. member should not get too excited because he may get more excited before I am finished.

An hon. member: Is that right?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The *Globe and Mail* is more progressive than George Hogan.

Mr. MacDonald: My considered view would be that at least it is in touch with reality sometimes, and not lost in the maze of its own philosophic concepts.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well for the House to recall the genesis of this plan, because there are a lot of people in the province of Ontario who think that this bill that has been brought before the House

is a bill that has been shaped by the Hagey report, and this simply is not the case. As I spelled out in this House and documented solidly some couple of months ago during the Budget debate, the genesis rests right with this government; it does not need to blame anybody else. It laid down the principles of this bill back in 1962, and then it sought an advisory committee to give it some ideas of the implementation of those principles. I have dubbed this "the Dymond advisory committee." When I was debating this and the hon. Minister of Health interjected and was unhappy with some of the things I was saying, I pointed out that the committee was a rather select one—that he had not invited everybody who was interested. I was just trying to see if I could not find his exact words because I am getting into trouble in trying to quote him this afternoon. I have found them in *Hansard* of March 10:

Mr. MacDonald: And furthermore, many of the people interested in Medicare were excluded from it [the hon. Minister's committee]. They were never invited.

And what was the hon. Minister's reply?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I invited them; the groups that I thought could do the most good.

And whom did he invite, Mr. Speaker? He invited 24 doctors and 11 representatives of the insurance companies; nobody else.

I have no objection to doctors being in the organization of a Medicare programme; indeed, when we worked out our Medicare programme we sought and we had the benefit of a meeting with the OMA executive to find out its views, although we knew that in basic principle there was quite a cleavage between us. I have no objection to doctors being there. Indeed, I have no objection, if one wants to have insurance company people in there to get some of the benefit of their experience in this field. But it is a preposterous suggestion that a Minister of Health who is presuming to shape the plan on behalf of the people of the province of Ontario, and not the vested interests in the field, should call together a group of people which he, in his own words, said "could do the most good"—and include only the medical profession and the insurance companies.

This government laid down the principles and then the hon. Minister brought in these people, who accepted those principles completely, and then he said to them, "You implement those principles, you give us the machinery." And the committee suggested

the machinery in a complete confidential report, which I read in good part into the record in *Hansard* of March 10, 1965.

I wonder when we are going to get to the day, Mr. Speaker—if I may just interrupt myself here for just a moment—of recognizing that Medicare is not just for the doctors. Medicare is not just for the insurance companies. Medicare is for the people—the people whose needs we are trying to fulfill and meet more fully, not those who have a vested interest in the field at the present time.

But they got the proposals from these people who dominated the existing setup—the status quo in true Tory fashion—and the government brought in its Bill 163 before the last provincial election. Then, by way of the inevitable procrastination that old parties deal in in trying to implement this urgent social need, they then set up the Hagey committee to study the matter.

While the hon. Prime Minister was going around the province and ticking off Medicare as being "done," nothing was being done about it. The Hagey commission was wasting another couple of years, because the fact of the matter is that when the Hagey commission brought in its report, when it was tabled in February, 1965, that report was very little more than a rehash of the narrow select committee that the hon. Minister established in 1962. There were a few variations, but in basic principle it was identically the same, it was just a little elaboration of the machinery.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was a waste of time, it was a waste of money, and the bill that we have now is a bill that this government had decided on back in 1962. Unfortunately, the tragedy of it, Mr. Speaker, is that times have moved on and that bill and that approach has become an anachronism—to quote the *Globe and Mail*. Indeed, I suspect that there are many in the back benches of the government today who recognize that this is the case but this government is stuck with it. That is point one.

Point two—which we cannot ignore and forget is this context as we examine the genesis of this bill, Mr. Speaker—is that in the critical period of 1962 when the mould was being set, so to speak, on what this government's policy was going to be with regard to medical insurance—belated in the day, after most of the countries in the western world—the government was given a major assist by the Liberal Party, which had three medical insurance policies within a 12-month period. It started out in favour of private insurance, it switched for a three-month period to public insurance, and it

switched and carried through until the last provincial election on a doctor-oriented plan that, presumably, it had worked out with the doctors. Yet in the midst of the election, one of the doctors who was on the executive of the OMA said that they had never discussed the matter at all.

Mr. Speaker, why do the Liberals need the Hall commission to remind them of what has been their policy since 1919? I was very interested to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition in his battle against this government on this issue. He was really punching the pillow and the feathers were flying in all directions. For example, he said, "I find it incomprehensible that the government has moved to bring in this kind of bill." Mr. Speaker, why should he, particularly, find it incomprehensible, when his own party was supporting this kind of a bill three years ago—in 1962?

Mr. Thompson: We like to have facts—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this is a fact and it cannot be denied. No idle interjection at this point can dismiss what I am saying.

Furthermore, when the hon. leader of the Opposition gets up and says that from the first time he ran in politics in 1959, he had it in his literature that he was in favour of a public Medicare programme, why did he sit in the back benches like a rubber stamp and not have the intestinal fortitude to fight within his own party, when his own party forsook that public policy? All he did was to hoodwink the people when he sought the votes. Indeed, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) was in the same category. I concede that these two hon. gentlemen are in favour of public Medicare; I am even persuaded that they have always been in favour of public Medicare, but they share the responsibility for their party's wavering because they did not have the intestinal fortitude to fight it when their last leader brought in the wrong policy. And tragically, Mr. Speaker, we are stuck with a bad kind of Medicare in the province of Ontario, because this government in 1962, decided on a policy at a time when the Liberal Party was assisting them on that decision and the Liberals cannot now just slough all that off and thrash away at the government.

Indeed, after all that we have heard, what we need from the Liberal Party on this issue is a little bit more evidence of conviction on the issue after they have played politics with it since 1919, both federally and provincially.

The hon. leader of the Opposition, in characteristic confusion, in which his amendment almost got lost, concluded his debate by saying that this government has brought in a half-baked approach—muddled and confused. I will agree, but I can think of nothing that is a more accurate description of what Liberal policy has been on this issue down through the years, and that is the reason why the province is stuck with this kind of a Medicare policy.

An hon. member: Everybody is out of step—

Mr. MacDonald: No, we are not out of step. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, not that I want to do anything other than to get this government to change its mind and bring in the right kind of Medicare. I now turn to an alternative in which I will indicate just how right we have been all along.

I have no objection to this government proceeding with a medical insurance bill, if it were the right kind of medical insurance. After waiting for some 46 years for the Liberals at Ottawa to do something, I can quite understand the government being exasperated, impatient and wanting to meet the needs of the people, if it were really going to meet the needs of the people.

Let us take a look at the alternative, Mr. Speaker. We can have in the province of Ontario at the present time, universal coverage.

We can have that coverage through a basic premium, plus contributions from the Treasury that will be met through taxes and I want to indicate one way in which this can be met. Otherwise, we would have no objection to the kind of policy, the kind of medicare that the government is establishing in basic principle. We would agree, for example, that the doctor should have the right to choose his patients and the patient should have the right to choose his doctor.

We will agree on the proposition that we should operate on a fee-for-service basis which has become traditional on the North American continent; we will agree, for example, that medical decisions should be made by the doctors—anybody else who is not a doctor who issues a medical decision would need to have his head read. But we also say that if you are going to have this kind of a plan it should be under the administrative direction of a health insurance commission on which everybody who is involved would have representation—including the doctors—the kind of concept, though more broadly applied—that we have at the present

time under the Ontario hospital services commission.

Those are the basic principles. Now, when you come to costs, Mr. Speaker, just let me remind the House—because here I am proud, as a member of the Opposition, to get up in this House and to repeat in essence what I put on the record in December of 1962 and what has now been vindicated completely from the authoritative and authentic studies of the Hall commission report.

On December 5 or 6, 1962, when we announced the kind of Medicare programme that the New Democratic Party had been fighting for—and, indeed, when they were elected they put it into effect; they did not talk about it and change their policies, like the Liberals—we pointed out that you could establish in the province of Ontario, complete coverage in 1962, for approximately \$165 million. And we came to this figure, Mr. Speaker, by following the same cost calculating procedures that the Thompson committee—the author of that book that the hon. leader of the Opposition has on his desk but which he has not completely absorbed yet—the kind of cost calculations that were used in the province of Saskatchewan to find out what overall coverage would cost. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we went one step further; you can double-check these costs by taking a look at the amount of money that is now being spent in the province of Ontario, because, let us face it, Mr. Speaker, what you and I spend for Medicare, ultimately comes out in The Department of National Revenue statistics as doctors' income. So if you want to find out how much is being spent on medical services in the province of Ontario at the present time, take a look at doctors' income.

Mr. Sopha: Gross income!

Mr. MacDonald: Gross income, right—and back in 1962, the doctors' net income was in the range of about \$90 million. The gross income—since about one-quarter of it, by rule of thumb, I find accepted in the profession, for expenses—would take it up in the range of about \$125 million. In other words, you could establish in the province of Ontario, a plan for \$165 million on a per capita cost of \$26.25, and of that figure, Mr. Speaker, \$125 million of it would not be new money—\$125 million would be a redirection of existing expenditures that you and I are spending directly in doctor bills, or indirectly through some sort of a plan. Into that there would have to be new money to the extent of, perhaps, \$40 million, to provide complete coverage. But the whole of the people of the province of Ontario would be in—universal

coverage, with complete medical services not plans that had deductibles or fine print in the contract.

Now, when we calculated that figure back in 1962, it immediately was attacked by government benches and particularly by the hon. Minister of Health in speeches all across the province of Ontario, saying that our figures were a gross underestimate of what it would have to be. Our retort was that this was a calculation that might not be completely accurate, but to the extent that it was not accurate we were convinced that it was an overestimate, not an underestimate, and the Hall commission report, I suggest to you, has confirmed that this is the case.

The Hall commission report indicates that the per capita cost nationally to establish full medical insurance in this country in 1961 would have been \$21.01; in 1966 it will be \$24.91. In other words, next year it will be \$24.91. By 1971 it will be \$28.72.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the per capita cost that we calculated in 1962 was so much of an overestimate that I suggest to this House that it is still valid in the year 1965. Because the per capita cost in Ontario of \$26.25 is sufficiently above the national average of the Hall report, \$24.91, I suggest to you it is still valid. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we could still establish in the province of Ontario full medical coverage for everybody, for \$165 million, and at least \$125 million of that, perhaps more, would be a redirection of existing expenditure, not new money. You would have at the most, something like \$40 million in new money to provide complete coverage for everybody—not the \$70 million that the hon. Minister of Health is talking about, out of the public Treasury, to cover only the high-risk group at the bottom, the bottom 25 per cent.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): The hon. member should come and keep my books if that is the way he figures.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, instead of that idle kind of interruption, I would suggest the hon. Minister of Mines just take a look at what I have said and I invite him to indicate to me either personally or in writing where I am wrong in my calculation.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I will do that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the hon. Minister should do that.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): He will not be able to find anything wrong.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. members are not in Saskatchewan now.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, just a minute now. Let us just pause for a moment. This idle, unknowledgeable interruption on the part of the hon. Minister of Mines—I thought he would have learned by now that perhaps not talking so freely will keep him from getting into trouble.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that out in Saskatchewan when the Thompson commission made a study of what the costs would be—on precisely the same basis as we have done for Ontario and have been vindicated as correct by the Hall commission report—experience proved that even in the first year it was high. In the first year of operation in the province of Saskatchewan they were something less than one dollar below what the estimated per capita cost would be, so the hon. Minister should not interrupt on something that apparently does not come within his purview; he knows nothing about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can provide complete coverage in the province of Ontario for \$165 million, I want to suggest to this House once again how this could be met. And I want to spell it out to the House because it indicates just how more equitably one could share the complete burdens financially of health insurance and cover everybody, instead of this half-baked fragmented kind of approach the government is making in bringing in Bill No. 136.

Our proposal is that the \$165 million for medical insurance should be covered by revenue being raised from each of the following three sources: One-third of it would come from a basic premium, and that basic premium would be set low enough that any person or family that was earning, that was not unemployed, was not living on a pension, would be in a position to pay it. In other words, 30 cents a week for a single person, \$15.60 a year, or 60 cents a week for a family, \$31.20 a year. And that, Mr. Speaker, would raise approximately one-third, indeed in the range of \$57 million. Second, any further contribution that was made by the individual or by the family would be in accordance with his ability to pay, and that would be reflected by his income tax, he would pay a six per cent surcharge on the income tax he is now paying.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Would the hon. member not call that a means test?

Mr. MacDonald: This is not a means test. It is a basic premium for which you get a complete coverage, it will be the same for everybody. Thirty or 60 cents a week; \$31.20 for a family. Anything further paid would be a six per cent surcharge on his income tax and it would go up with his income; it would be progressive, it would be in accordance with his ability to pay. That would raise approximately one-third in the range of \$56 million to \$58 million, in 1962.

The third source of revenue we proposed was that there should be a three per cent corporation tax. On something that is as fundamental to the economy and to the society of the whole of the province of Ontario as health insurance, I suggest that in any equitable distribution of the burden, the great and growing amount of the wealth of the province of Ontario that is to be found in corporate income should share in the cost and a three per cent corporation tax in 1962 would have brought approximately \$50 million.

Now, there is the way in which the government could raise the revenue.

And I want now, Mr. Speaker, to turn and indicate to the House in the concluding portion of my remarks, what the contrast would be in that kind of a plan—I am not wedded to the exact details of the financing of it—as compared to what the government is proposing to offer us at the present time. For those who were unemployed or living on a pension or an allowance, under both plans—the government's plan and our plan—their premiums would be met by the government—

Mr. Reilly: This would be different from Saskatchewan then?

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, in Saskatchewan persons who are unemployed and living on an allowance, are covered.

Mr. Reilly: Do they not pay a premium?

Mr. MacDonald: No, if they are unemployed or living on an allowance. If they are unemployed and are getting relief, their premium will be paid by the agency that is making the relief payment, to keep them covered so that those persons will have protection.

Mr. Reilly: For those people on pension and those with no income?

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Second, Mr. Speaker, for those whose incomes are so small that they pay no income

tax, the government proposes to provide coverage, but on a means-test basis. Now, under the NDP plan, if a person was earning but paying no income tax, he would pay the basic minimum premium of 30 cents a week single or 60 cents a week for a family and then he would be entitled to full coverage with no means test, no further payment. All citizens with an earned income could be treated on the same basis. Those on low incomes would not be left with the impression that they were getting something for nothing. I am interested in this government, for example, after years of saying that no one wants to kid the people into claiming that they were getting something for nothing, now, in effect, brings in a programme which is going to kid people into believing that they are going to get something for nothing.

Here, perhaps, is where there is a healthy manifestation of our different philosophies. We would agree that a person who is in the low-income bracket should be charged a low amount and that is why our basic premium is as low as 30 cents per person per week or 60 cents per family per week. We contend that any person who is earning, no matter how small his income, is going to be able to meet that and when he meets it he can hold his head high and say, "I have met my share of the burden of the cost of Medicare and I am entitled to full coverage, I am not on a means-test basis, I am not going to be categorized by a government into a sort of second-class citizen, I am not going to have to come with my TD-1 form as my means-test indication to the government as I seek a subsidy because I happen to be on a lower income." You get rid of all of the iniquitous aspects of the various means-test approaches. But beyond this no-income-tax group, the following table contrasts the Medicare costs for an average family of four, father and mother and two children under the NDP and the government plans.

A person earning \$3,000, Mr. Speaker, under the NDP plan would pay a basic premium of \$31.20. His income tax is \$33, the six per cent surcharge on that is \$1.98, which, along with the \$31.20, means his total payment will be \$33.18. Under this government's programme he would have to pay \$44.

At \$3,500, under the NDP plan, they would have a basic premium of \$31.20. Since their income tax is \$88, the six per cent surcharge will be \$5.28, so that their total premium would be \$36.48.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): What is he going to pay through corporation taxes—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member should not interrupt for a moment; I will deal with that question.

Mr. McKeough: That doesn't matter!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: The government is going to charge \$119 for the person who is in the \$3,500 bracket and has an \$800 taxable income.

At \$4,000 the NDP plan would be \$31.20 for the basic premium, an income tax of \$152, a six per cent surcharge on that is \$9.12, so that his total premium is \$40.26. Under this government's plan, it is likely going to be \$175. At \$5,000—I will not read the whole table now, from this point forward—at \$5,000 under the NDP plan, it will be \$49.26. The government's charge will be \$175.

At \$7,000, the NDP plan will be \$71.76. This government's will be \$175. At \$9,000, the NDP plan will be \$98.88. This government's will be \$175. At \$11,000, the NDP plan will be \$130.80. This government's charge will be \$175. At \$13,000—and just let me detail this calculation to show how it comes: At \$13,000, a family would pay a basic premium of \$31.20, their income tax would be \$2,275. A six per cent surcharge on that is \$136.50, which along with the basic premium means \$167.70, for his total Medicare premium.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in this kind of a plan, which would require less new money than the government proposes to put in out of the public Treasury to meet only the bottom 25 per cent, we could provide coverage for everybody in the province of Ontario, and at a cost so that everybody who is earning less than \$13,000 would pay less than this government is going to fix as approximately a maximum premium in its programme. For better coverage. And for anybody who wants to dispute the figures, I will sit down and detail them.

Now, there is one final point, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to deal with and that is that, as I indicated earlier, one of the major deficiencies in the government's programme which I think can be met immediately, without any more procrastination, without any more study, is a move towards the coverage of at least the most urgent need for drugs.

Now, if I may go back to the costing of the New Democratic plan, I said that when we figured our costs in 1962, that it was \$165 million to cover everybody in the province of Ontario. I indicated because of the studies

of the Hall commission report and the average cost there, that that \$165 million would still cover everybody in the province of Ontario. But the interesting thing is that these three sources of revenue that I have just spelled out—a basic premium of 30 cents for an individual or 60 cents a family per week; a three-per-cent corporation tax, and a six-per-cent surcharge on personal income—raised \$161 million in 1962. This year, in 1965, they would raise approximately \$200 million—exactly the same taxes. In other words, the kind of experience that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) has had is that by keeping his tax level the same in a buoyant economy, his revenues go up each year. In short, we could cover a complete medical-insurance plan for everybody in the province of Ontario, and still have \$35 million left over, or some portion thereof, to move toward the coverage of drugs.

Much as I am interested in the proposition the hon. leader of the Opposition has thrown in, in his rather grab-bag approach to coverage of children's dentistry and opticians and things of this nature, my proposal is that we should move toward the coverage of drugs, insofar as that \$35 million would cover it, and I suggest that we should start with three groups whose need is urgent. The first group is people who are on pensions or allowances, usually older people or sick people, and who therefore have a great need for drugs. Second, as long as the doctor indicates it is required, the people who have been discharged from hospitals should be able to get drugs. Third, those who are in chronic need of drugs, people who are afflicted with arthritis and ailments of this nature for which there is a chronic need for drugs, should be supplied.

I think we can cover at least those three in a staging programme in drugs, and do it within the framework of the costs that we have spelled out here. We are not talking idly about general plans. I am presenting to this government and I am presenting to the people of the province of Ontario, an alternative plan whose financing has been vindicated by the Hall commission report in terms of the estimated costs. If one wants a variation in terms of raising the revenue, anybody will be willing to entertain it, because our proposal is illustrative, but we would like it to be equitable in terms of capacity to pay. With that kind of a plan, with less dipping into the public Treasury, with less expenditure of money, we could cover everybody in the province of Ontario, instead of having this atrociously expensive

proposition that this government is putting before the House, of covering the bottom quarter of high risks by dipping into the public Treasury to the extent of \$70 million a year. Then after it has taken the high risks out, it leaves the relatively low risks to the private treasury and the rest of us who will have to buy our own insurance will have to pay through the nose, with higher premiums to the insurance companies, and indeed, through the doctor-sponsored plans, too.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this bill is bad in principle. To a considerable extent it will be a roadblock on the way of establishing the right kind of medical insurance in this country and therefore anybody who analyzes it rationally, bearing in mind the needs of the people of the province of Ontario, has no alternative but to oppose it on second reading.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the principle of this bill, I was going to start out with a few laudatory remarks about the bill, but I think I have to leave them for a minute, having listened in the last 15 or 20 minutes to what the hon. member for York South has said. As he was speaking, a couple of lines from Gilbert and Sullivan came to my mind. I cannot remember where they are from, or just how they go exactly, but they go something like: "This looks like cream, but really it is just a lot of skim milk." That, I would submit, is just about what those figures are, that the hon. member just read to this House. He says he will sit down and prove these to anyone.

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with the facts instead of generalities.

Mr. Wells: Let me give the hon. member the facts then. Let me give him the facts, just in regard to this one specific thing—the per capita cost here in the province of Ontario.

Both the hon. member for York South and the hon. leader of the Opposition have made a lot about figures in the Hall commission report. They talk about this per capita cost being \$21.01 in 1961, and in 1966, \$24.91. In other words, the cost of medical services per capita in Canada, would be that.

The hon. member for York South has based his whole argument and his whole table of premiums on what he says is a per capita cost of \$26.25. What are the true facts?

Physicians' Services Incorporated is a representative non-profit carrier in this province. It offers a plan very similar to our standard plan. It insures people of all classes in all groups over this province, and has well over 1,000,000 people in its plans. What, Mr. Speaker, was its per capita costs for medical services last year? They were \$32.48. A far cry from \$26.25. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we take the population of Ontario at about 6,500,000, instead of costing \$165 million for a plan, we get \$214 million.

It should be remembered that this per capita cost for PSI was on payment of doctors' fees at 90 per cent of the OMA schedule, whereas under our bill doctors will be paid at 100 per cent of the schedule. A much more realistic figure is somewhere around \$35 per capita for medical services in this province—just doctors' services—and this comes to \$227.5 million. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a far cry from the \$165 million that we have been told about.

If that premise and that base is wrong, the whole table of premiums and amounts to be paid by the people of this province is wrong. I submit that the hon. member for York South has grossly underestimated what the cost of health services in this province really would be.

Mr. White: He cooked the books.

Mr. MacDonald: Take a look at the aggregate.

Mr. Wells: Having dealt with that point, I would like to make some general statements.

Another hon. member of the New Democratic Party, I think, a short while ago said that this would be a month called "a May of madness," and I think that history so far has shown that this really has been a May of magnificence. We have had more progressive legislation introduced in this month than in a long time in this House. We started with commuter services; we have had the colleges of applied arts and technology—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member should stick to the principle of the bill before the House.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in my enthusiasm for this bill I am merely trying to show that this is one of a group of bills that stamp this government with the true term "Progressive-Conservative."

Mr. MacDonald: It needs some—

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Wells: I can assure the hon. members of this House—although I am certainly not speaking for the executive branch of government, but—

An hon. member: The hon. member is speaking for the cause.

Mr. Wells:—from my knowledge, the bill before us today was not conceived back in 1962, it was conceived right now in 1965 and is in tune with the times and the year in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. MacDonald: There were a few changes—

Mr. Wells: Now, what really are the principles of this bill, the bill we are debating today? The principles are quite simple: This bill makes available a standard contract for medical services insurance. We all recognize that there are other facets of the health field that will and perhaps must be covered in the future, but, for the time being, this bill is a bill for medical services insurance. That offered by physicians. This bill sets out a standard contract and makes this contract available to every person in this province regardless of their age, their state or condition of health, and it makes this contract non-cancellable. In other words, everyone can obtain a good health insurance contract. This is to be done on a voluntary basis.

The second principle of the bill is that provision is made to make insurance available for those who cannot pay for it, with government assistance.

I think that these principles of this bill will meet the needs of the people of this province and are, in fact, what the people of this province want in this year 1965. That is why this bill has been brought before us, because we believe this is what the people want and further, Mr. Speaker, we believe that this bill really is following what the Hall commission has outlined.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Oh, come now. What a ridiculous statement.

Mr. Wells: And I will enlarge on that in a few minutes. The hon. leader of the Opposition read a few quotations from various groups in this province. I would like to say that in my talks with most people around this province, I have found that they are satisfied with this bill.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Has the hon. member talked to most people?

Mr. Wells: And most people—the opinions of a lot of people we find reflected by the newspapers in this province. I would like to read into the record, bits from some editorial comment in some of the newspapers of this province, because I think that they more than anything have really captured what the real feeling of the people is toward this legislation.

An hon. member: Likely all Tory papers.

Mr. Wells: The *Ottawa Journal* on May 13, said that:

Even though Health Minister Dymond has emphasized that this is only one step in the developing health programme of the provincial government, it is a momentous step. The government of Ontario has been careful to recognize from the start that a successful medical insurance programme should have the co-operation of the medical profession. It has taken care to achieve this without subordinating the general public interests to narrow professional advantage.

The *Woodstock Sentinel Review*, on May 14, said:

It is rather surprising that leaders of both Opposition parties in the Ontario Legislature have been so outspoken on their attack on the medical-care insurance programme which has been introduced by the government. It is the right and the duty of the Opposition to point out what it calls "the bill's inadequacies" just as it is the duty of the government to explain why some things are not included now. But do not let anything interfere with the passage of progressive legislation just because, in its initial stages, it may not appear to go as far as some would wish. As a pilot project, the current project seems like a good beginning.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps some of the out-of-province comment has been the most interesting and I would just like to quote two of these, one from the *Montreal Gazette*, which says:

The plan is being attacked on the grounds that it is not universal and compulsory, but in several ways Ontario appears to be proceeding wisely. Some of the critics of the Ontario plan have called it timid, perhaps the plan might better be called prudent. There is much to be said for doing first things first, step by step.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, the most interesting editorial is from that most often quoted place and one to which some look for all their guidance on medical health insurance, and

that is in Saskatchewan. This very interesting editorial appeared in the *Regina Leader Post* on May 14, and I would like to read this:

The Ontario plan goes somewhat further than the Saskatchewan scheme in recognizing lack of ability to pay as an obstacle to obtaining medical attention. In Saskatchewan every family and every individual was compelled to pay a medical premium irrespective of the state of their finances. Until the legislation was amended at the last session, delinquents could be jailed for non-payment of the premiums.

Mr. Reilly: Shame, shame!

Mr. Wells: And I might add, Mr. Speaker, six or seven people actually were sent to jail for nonpayment of premiums.

Several hon. members: Shame, shame!

Mr. Reilly: A Liberal government changed that.

Mr. Thompson: What about 1900 in Alberta?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Wells: To continue with the quotation, Mr. Speaker:

Since the municipalities are responsible for medical bills of indigents not covered by the medical-care plan, in their self-defence they have been paying the premiums for the known indigents. Under the Ontario plan the municipalities of that province [meaning Ontario] are to be spared such concern. The day will come in Saskatchewan when the pressure of public opinion will force acceptance by the province of responsibility for medical and hospitalization for indigents.

To the people of Saskatchewan, the estimated \$70 million first-year cost of the Ontario plan appears to be somewhat staggering. Ontario's population is approximately seven times Saskatchewan's. With medical care costing approximately \$25 million in Saskatchewan this year, the total cost of a similar plan in Ontario would be around \$175 million.

Of course, as I have already said, they too have underestimated what it would really cost in this plan.

I think I should mention, Mr. Speaker—and perhaps this again is something many are unaware of—the cost of medical services in the province of Ontario is 40 per cent greater than in the province of Saskatchewan; 40 per cent greater, and this is an actual

figure that can be substantiated, the per capita cost here.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why?

Mr. White: Higher standard of living, higher levels of income.

Mr. Wells: This is because of the facilities and services available, the specialties of doctors available, the different services available in this province; the cost of medical care is 40 per cent greater.

Mr. McKeough: All the good doctors are leaving!

Mr. Wells: To continue:

Or looking at it from the opposite direction, a plan similar to Ontario's would cost approximately \$10 million in Saskatchewan. Undeniably, there are financial advantages offered by the Ontario plan along with a more positive guarantee of "free medical care for persons in the low-income group."

The lack of uniformity among medical care plans being inaugurated by the province is not to be deplored, rather this is a development to be welcomed and encouraged. From the diversity of programmes will emerge through trial and error and experience, a specific form of medical care which appears to be best suited to Canadian conditions.

Saskatchewan will watch the Ontario experiment, as it is watching those of other provinces for indications of ways and means of improving our plan. Saskatchewan may have been the first to adopt medical care on a provincial basis, but strange to relate, none of the other provinces has copied our scheme.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, I think, is a very interesting comment on our plan from a newspaper situated right in the middle of the Saskatchewan situation, and a newspaper which lived through all the travail and wars that went on through the very difficult inauguration of that programme in Saskatchewan.

Now, what I would like to talk about, Mr. Speaker, are the statements by those who say that this is not really in the spirit of the Hall commission. Now, the Hall commission said that Canada should have a compulsory government-run national health programme. They did not tell us how we should have this; they said this would be a problem for the provinces and the federal government to get together and plan this out—"We think

you should have this; now you get together and decide how it should be done." They did tell us, however, that it probably would not be feasible in Canada until 1971, and the plan we are talking about now is coming into being June 1, 1966. And really, Mr. Speaker, in fact, Ontario has taken progressive steps in the field of health care, and these we all well know.

Now, the point is that this bill we now have had introduced before us is another one of these steps, but all the steps are related, one to the other, and I think the Hall commission recommended this, because they talked a lot about medical training and medical education and, of course, the hon. Prime Minister introduced a massive programme to give a shot in the arm to the training of doctors, dentists, paramedical personnel, hospital facilities, teaching hospital facilities, and so forth, last October. This, Mr. Speaker, is an important step in this whole programme because we must have the personnel to carry out a plan. This plan we now have—this bill—is a further step in a continuing programme of furthering the health needs of this province, and I submit in that light it is in the spirit of what the Hall commission has suggested.

While talking about the Hall commission, I think that it is well, perhaps, to look at another point that it talks about, because so many of the arguments that are put forward by our hon. friends here, rest on figures and statistics that are found in the Hall commission report. I think that it is as well for us to know that a lot of these figures and statistics are open to question by very seriously minded people and accountants. They are open to question because they feel that some of the conclusions arrived at are not accurate.

I would like to read something about this retention figure. It has been bandied around here that the retention figure, if private plans are allowed to continue to operate in Canada, will be 25 per cent, 26 per cent or 27 per cent—or 25 cents on the dollar. This figure is arrived at because the Hall commission has said something about this, but how did they work this out, and what are the true facts? As I have stated, I told you what the per capita cost of Physicians' Services Incorporated was, and it has well over 1,000,000 or 1.5 million people insured in this province. Its administration costs, or retention figure, is six per cent. This is exactly what the Hall commission says would be an ideal figure for the government-run plan. We have many plans operating at this figure now, and yet the Hall commission in some way twisted

the facts slightly, to present another picture. I will read something on this:

These specific comments relate purely to some of the figures used in the Hall commission report in computing the cost of a government-implemented plan. By what would appear to be undue inflation of the cost attributed to the voluntary plan, the commission on page 745 has suggested that in 1971, such costs would be \$1,020 million, whereas if the same were true under the government plan, the cost for health services would be \$837 million, a total of \$183 million less.

The commission arrived at this figure by using the figure of \$797 million in 1971 as the actual cost for medical care at that time, and to this figure, \$797 million, it has added an average of 28 per cent, as the retention ratio—28 per cent for administrative costs—and this was computed, supposedly, by the research staff.

In the case of the government's plan, however, the commission has taken this same \$797 million and used a five-per-cent retention ratio, or cost figure, so that it has the \$797 million, and in one case has added 28 per cent and in another case, five per cent. That is, in the first case it arrived at, the figure is \$1,020 million, and in the second case, \$837 million. Then it stated:

The decision which Canadians have to make is whether they wish to pay \$1,020 million for physicians' services in 1971 for a programme administered by the insurance industry, or \$837 million for a programme administered by government agencies.

In taking a look at these figures—because many of the non-profit plans such as PSI and their counterparts across the country operate at very close to the five per cent retention figure. Many carriers were very concerned with these figures. They took a close look at them and came to the conclusion that their performance refutes this statement, because they could show that they were operating very close to the retention ratio recommended by the Hall commission.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): What is the difference in coverage?

Mr. Wells: The difference in coverage? PSI and the non-profit plans offer a coverage equal pretty well to any government coverage. Through the non-profit plan, they felt that costs would perhaps be even lower than through a government carrier. In the case of the commercial insurance carriers, I feel

that the Hall commission has used modifying factors which have increased the retention ratio above what it would actually be.

In speaking about some of the figures in the report generally, I would like to tell hon. members—there is a table on page 734. This table shows a figure of \$159 per year per family and states that this is based upon costs in Alberta. Actually, the prevailing cost in Alberta at the time this study was done, in 1961, was \$125 per family, and that \$159 was the maximum premium. Again, the amount was paid only by those in the high-risk category who were in the pooling arrangement.

This whole changing of figures throughout the report tends to create distortions in the relative costs in the two systems, and because of this fact, I think that we cannot accept completely as valid, those figures which are quoted from the Hall commission report. I think that when one reads through the sections of the Hall commission report, he will find that there is a complete non-understanding of the principle of group coverage, as we know it in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a minute about this maximum premium that has been mentioned. The impression has been given that this premium, no matter what it will be—say \$175, as Hagey has mentioned—will be the premium that everyone will pay who is not in the assisted category. Let us take a look at this and see just exactly what the picture is in Ontario today.

Some of my hon. friends' arguments would perhaps be valid if we were talking about a climate in which no one had any insurance and we were going to introduce into this province a completely new principle of medical health insurance, when, in fact, we have a situation where medical health insurance has been here a long time, has been pioneered by non-profit and insurance companies, has been born and has grown to maturity and served the people of this province well. What is actually being suggested by the Opposition is a disruption of this whole system that has served a great number of our people very well.

How many has it served? The total coverage of people insured in this province was about 4.6 million in 1962, and in 1963, 4,996,000—nearly 5,000,000 people. From this 1963 figure one can take away those who have only surgical insurance, those who have only medical insurance, those who have in-hospital insurance, and those who have the PSI brown plan—in other words all those plans that my hon. friends might refer to as having

inadequate coverage. This comes to about 700,000. We find in 1963 we had about 4,297,000 people in this province with existing medical health insurance plans.

The percentage increase in adequate coverage in Ontario from 1962 to 1963 was 16.5 per cent. If we apply this rate of increase—and I have no reason to believe that perhaps it is not a legitimate thing to do—we find that by the end of 1965, we would have 5,800,000 people covered in this province with adequate health insurance. Now, what we are trying to do here is calculate this sort of nebulous thing, the insurance gap. In trying to do this, we take at the end of 1965 the projected population of Ontario, 6,800,000 people. Deduct from it the people who I estimated will be adequately covered, 5,832,000, those who have government and special coverage, 500,000, and you get a total covered population of 6,332,000; and we find that the insurance gap is 468,000.

Mr. S. Lewis: Did you have 16.5 per cent increase every year, steadily over—

Mr. Wells: No, we have 16.5 through in the last year and—

Mr. S. Lewis: In one year—and on that the government is—

Mr. Wells: —this is a trend that comes along. Well, what my hon. friend is saying—this is exactly the same kind of thing that the Hall commission did, perhaps—but I am suggesting that these figures—

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. member discredited the Hall commission.

Mr. Wells: —show a trend. And I say that in the year 1965 we will have covered by the voluntary system well over 5,000,000 people, in fact more like 5.5 million people in this province.

Now, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that you find that the insurance gap is really a half a million people and yet we are presenting a programme that makes provision for assistance, or partial assistance, to 1,800,000 people, so really there are many in this group who already have insurance. And there are many in this group who will not want to switch their insurance, because they have adequate insurance and because they are not paying too much.

Now, I say they are not paying too much. Why do I say this? Because, Mr. Speaker, I find that from some statistics that I got in 1959, 1,497 firms were surveyed and they

were asked if they were providing group medical and surgical coverage—this group coverage we are talking about—and 1,227 firms replied in the affirmative, 82 per cent said “Yes, we are providing this.” Of the 1,227 that replied, over 1,000—1,075—said that they were contributing to the cost of medical and surgical coverage. And all but 76 firms paid anywhere from 50 per cent to 100 per cent. Three hundred and sixteen firms paid 100 per cent of the premium.

Now, what this really means, you see, Mr. Speaker, is that at the present time in Ontario we have a lot of people working for firms who have group coverage. While the ultimate premium is probably—take the PSI premium—around \$159 per family, their firms are paying 50 per cent or more and all they really see going from their take-home pay is somewhere between \$75 and \$80. And to the average man on the street in the great mass that are covered now, this is what they are paying for their insurance. We agree that this is not what they are really paying but this is what they think they are paying and at this time it is being suggested that we scrap all this and we institute all these new taxes and disrupt this whole great mass of money from the private sector to the public sector in order to provide coverage for those who cannot pay for it themselves.

Now, I submit that this just does not seem right to me. I think we have arrived at a plan that presents the best of both worlds, if one wants. We are keeping and providing through the institution of the standard contract which will be available to anyone, adequate medical insurance coverage. We are not disrupting a great mass of people who right now feel that they are only paying about \$75 to \$80 a year premium. We are not disrupting them, we are not causing a massive disruption in our provincial economy and yet we are providing everyone with the opportunity to assist the needy, Mr. Speaker, not with a means test but with a simple needs test, a simple needs test: “Take your T-1 form, take a simple application form, fill it out, send it in and you have a standard insurance contract, giving you adequate coverage and looking after your needs.”

I might point out that the T-1 form basis—while this has not been worked out, I hope it will be worked out this way—if you take the taxable income figure on the T-1 form, Mr. Speaker, you are allowing not only the family deductions, but you are allowing deductions for labour union fees and deductions for medical expenses that might have been allowed the year before and so forth. I am suggesting this might be one way of doing

it and I hope that perhaps it is the way that it will be done.

Now, I would like, in concluding this, as I assume we probably do not want to go on too long this evening, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take an example of just how this disruption of existing plans could work, and this may not be too easy-going for some of our friends in the NDP. But the hon. member for York South outlined his plan to us.

Let us take the example of the General Motors Corporation in Oshawa. This firm employs 23,500 employees. General Motors has a PSI blue plan, complete coverage. The rates for this group are \$156 a year. But General Motors pays 100 per cent of the cost. It is a fringe benefit, nothing comes out of the take-home pay of the workers at General Motors. Using the yearly figure of \$156, which is completely paid by the company with no contribution from the employee—if we use this as a basis and took the “MacDonald plan” as introduced, we take \$31.20 as the premium. This is what he said—\$31.20 per year. That is what he said and that is what the NDP booklet passed around at the last election, said. Now if you use \$5,000 as the average income—and this is probably low for the workers at General Motors—this would mean that we would deduct the \$31.20 from the \$156 that General Motors pays. This would mean that the minute this plan came into effect, General Motors would be saving \$106.74 per family per year. In other words, the “MacDonald plan” would be saving General Motors \$2.5 million.

That is a rather odd sort of thing. As I have said, on this, the hon. member for York South has indicated that they would impose a six per cent levy on personal income tax. Now, once again on the basis of \$5,000 income this means that the six per cent tax would amount to another \$18.06, and this the company, of course, would not pay. Therefore the employee at General Motors, instead of paying nothing, would now be paying an extra \$18.06.

Now, in addition to this, it has been suggested—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is going to shock the hon. Minister of Mines. That has really got him confused.

Mr. Wells: In addition to this, the hon. member for York South has indicated that they would impose a three per cent increase on corporation tax. Certainly it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that at this time, nothing could be more detrimental than this type of taxation. The whole basis of the growth of this

province is on industrial expansion. Our industrial base and our taxing base must expand and we cannot stifle it by adding another three per cent to the corporation tax.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer will tell you that we have not had to have any tax increases this year, because of the economic expansion of this province. We get more money with existing taxes, without any increase in the tax rates, and this is the kind of thing we are expecting in the future. And a step like an increase of three per cent on the corporation tax, I say, would be a retrograde step and would be to the detriment of the people of this province.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Nothing confuses them more than facts.

Mr. Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, in these few rambling remarks I have tried to counter a few of the arguments which have been put forward. I will say “put forward” perhaps forcefully by the hon. member for York South, but very timidly by the hon. leader of the Opposition, because I think he has got the message. I think the message has filtered through, as it has filtered through to me from my hon. Liberal friends is that they really like what we are doing, and they support this.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want him to take that remark back or—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member kindly sit down.

Mr. Trotter: I am asking him to take that back.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: If the member has a point of order, please state it!

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I am asking him to take that back. That is utterly false. He is misleading this House. I detest this kind of thing. I want him to take it back.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, if my rather excited hon. friend from Parkdale would like me to bring down the five or ten Liberal friends I have who have told me this, I will sit them in the gallery here and let him meet them all.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I would suggest that the member adhere to the principle of the bill if he can, in his concluding remarks.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, one point has been mentioned, that in this plan the people will not be represented. I would draw all hon. members' attention to clause three of the bill, which states that the public will be in the majority on the medical services insurance council, which will give the general direction and advisory authority to the hon. Minister on this bill. The public, in conjunction with the doctors and the carriers will have a chance to make this plan work.

I think that the principle of this bill is sound. It is right for these times. It is a prudent measure. It in no way hampers anything that the federal government may do. In effect, it lays plans that could be enlarged if needed. It is a progressive measure and I think that this House should pass it unanimously.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, it is now five o'clock. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, could I say that on Friday I announced there would be a night sitting tomorrow night. If some of the hon. members were not here, they might not have known that.

The House adjourned at 5 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 26, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	3241
Recess, 6 o'clock	3269

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1965

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests in the east gallery, students from Parliament Oak public school, Niagara-on-the-Lake, and Willowdale junior high school, Willowdale. In the west gallery, Crystal Beach public school, Crystal Beach.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, a famous Tory leader of 100 years ago, Benjamin Disraeli, once said that the world is for the few and for the very few. I hear from the Tory government the words: "Hear, hear." The bill that we have before us today shows that in the course of 100 years the Tories have learned nothing; despite all the knowledge, despite their growth of wealth, we find that the Tories, as they have inherited what they have in England, have learned nothing.

Mr. Speaker: I must inform the member that he must discuss the principle of the bill only, and not get on to some other dissertation that has to do with partisanship.

Mr. Trotter: I again point out that it is a principle, a Tory principle that was announced by Disraeli. I want to point out to this House that, once again, this government, under the principle of this bill, perhaps think they are defending the rights of a minority, because the few are the wealthy.

This has been a bill more for the benefit of insurance companies and the Ontario medical association than it has been for the people of the province of Ontario. So that noxious Tory principle is still in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that the world is for the few and for the very few. It is time that we in this province woke up in other things, as well as in health care, that there are more people than just this very few.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), when he introduced this bill, told us that he had worked for six years on the bill. Well, he has laboured a lot and brought forth very little. Despite his six years of labour, so he tells us, the hon. Minister still comes out and says that we still need to know a good deal about the adequacy of insurance contracts now in force. Or, still flying away in his ignorance, again he says: "We have scant knowledge of how much care is provided for those who have no insurance and cannot pay for their health care."

Mr. Speaker, in Europe since approximately 1880, health insurance has been in existence in various provinces and various countries throughout the world. Minute studies have been made by people in our own country of what is needed and what is required; we even have the much-debated Hall report which has come before us, and still the hon. Minister does not know. I think the truth of it is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister really does not want to know, nor does the government want to know. When this present Minister of Health went before the Hall commission, he gave a dissertation on how important the private plans were. He set forth a lot of facts about the private insurance plans in Canada and Ontario, and then he summed up his remarks by saying this:

Not only does the foregoing—

that is the facts on private plans:

—reflect the tremendous increase in the demand for voluntary health insurance, it might well be considered to indicate that people have confidence in private enterprise in the existing insurance plans.

Mr. Speaker, what choice do the people have when there is no government plan? Obviously

they have to turn to a private plan, either the non-profit plan, or those run by the insurance companies.

I wonder if the government, when it seems so anxious to support the principle of private enterprise in health insurance, is aware of all the loopholes in the numerous insurance policies that exist? For example, not so long ago there was a case where the man was injured. He was insured. He was in a wheel-chair and he was wheeled around the block, but the policy read that he must be confined to his home. So because he was wheeled around the block in a wheelchair, the plan was cancelled. This is one of the many loopholes.

Or again, you buy a policy to protect yourself for accident insurance, and if you are on a motor cycle and injured, you expect to collect. But you have to read the small print of these so-called free enterprise policies to find that in so many of them, motor cycles are not covered.

So you can go on down the line. The private insurance companies have relatively little interest in health insurance as it is, to say nothing of the loopholes that they have put in their policies over the years.

We might ask why do the insurance companies through their lobby—and believe me it is the most powerful lobby in the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada today—why do they insist upon seeking to have the government father such a bill as we have here today? I think it is obvious—it has been mentioned before—for two reasons.

First of all, the insurance companies use these policies—the health insurance policies—as a loss leader. Even though they might not make a profit on them, they want to make sure that nobody else does. In doing this, they are denying the people of the province of Ontario, and the people of Canada, of proper health insurance, and, of course, they are also anxious to keep government out of the insurance business.

Again, one of the major principles that should be in an insurance bill, is that there should be no profit in health insurance. I know the last speaker for the government had the gall to say that Mr. Justice Emmett Hall had twisted the facts on the retention factor. In other words, only the insurance company keeps 28 per cent of the premium dollar. Well, the facts speak well and loud, both in Alberta, and certainly through the investigations of Mr. Justice Hall.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): He did not say that facts had been twisted.

Mr. Trotter: He certainly did. He accused him of twisting the facts. The people who are doing the twisting are the Tory government, here in the province of Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trotter: Why should the people of the province of Ontario be burdened with giving a pay-off to the insurance companies of 28 per cent of their insurance dollar? There is no justification, either in fairness to the people or in honesty, in handling public funds. It is squandering public funds to pay that 28 per cent to the insurance companies. I say that the government is doing a tremendous disservice to the people of this province when they defend this minority, this group of insurance companies, in order that they may make 28 per cent out of the people of the province of Ontario who can least afford to pay it.

In the plan they have brought in, and despite those people the government is going to assist—those in the lower brackets—the insurance companies are going to get some price in the area of \$15 million to \$25 million extra to start with. I believe that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) said \$20 million.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: Well, it is somewhere in that range.

I am sorry; the doctors are getting \$20 million. The government itself has not told us how much the premium will be so we do not know exactly, but we do know that it is a bonanza of millions of dollars. As this plan expands, as the population expands, it means that the insurance companies are going to get a bigger cut of the pie; money, at 28 per cent, that could be used to buy drugs, that could be used to buy dental services for children—to buy many things. The people who need it least in the province of Ontario are the insurance companies.

All one has to do is look at the big chunks of real estate in the main centres of our large cities to know that they are not suffering one little bit.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we here in the Liberal Party are speaking up for those people who are suffering, and that is the little man who is going to pay his bills and who is making a very small wage. These are the people that we are here to serve and these are the people that the government should be serving, not helping those who already have.

So, Mr. Speaker, although you may object to my phrasing, "the world is for the few, and for the very few," again I point out that they are sticking to their old, hoary, worn, hundred-year-old principle. When the government covers the poor risks—takes them out of the plan—again they help the insurance companies; because any plan should be balanced. It is obvious that the older people are going to join any plan because they are going to need it the most, but any plan should balance the risk across the board and across all our people. In this essential principle, the government again ignores what should be most obvious. What in essence has happened is that the people of the province of Ontario have become pawns in a game of power politics, a game of power politics that is for the benefit of the insurance companies.

Let us take a look at the doctors. Heaven only knows, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House have said that we do not wish to interfere with the practice of medicine in the province of Ontario. We have preached on a fee-for-service basis; we have talked about every man entitled to his own life, his own toothbrush and his own doctor. We have no intention of interfering with that principle, but I cannot understand the narrow mindedness of the Ontario medical association in dealing with this problem of medical coverage.

It has obviously worked in so many countries. Only two years ago the Ontario medical association took a survey among its own members, and I often wonder what the survey said because the OMA has not dared to publish the results. I will venture the suggestion that a very large proportion of the doctors themselves were agreeable to a medical insurance plan, because the average general practitioner knows that so many people like the small wage earner—whether he pays taxes or not—is faced with a real problem when his children, he or his wife are struck with illness and must try to cope with the cost of drugs and the cost of dental bills.

All these things add up. Suppose a man is earning \$4,000 a year and he has two or three children, it is ridiculous to say that he can pay \$175 for medical bills, his hospital premiums, his dental bills, his drug bills. We in this province are ignoring a basic principle in this bill—that is, the government is ignoring it—and it is this: Our greatest single resource is our people and it is a public responsibility to see to it that our people receive good health; and if they do not have it, they get it as quickly and as cheaply as possible. In an affluent society such as ours—

and we are affluent compared to the rest of the world—it is a disgrace that the province of Ontario comes along and says \$175 premium, while a much poorer province like Saskatchewan can say \$24. Now, why?

Let us be pragmatic about it. Obviously they are making it work and I think we should take a look at what is going on in the rest of Canada. Let us get our head out of the sand, because it is inevitable, in an age of great social reform, that it will roar in like a sea eventually. Yet we have the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. Minister of Health, like little boys with their pails and shovels building sand fortresses trying to stop an inevitable tide that will sweep their sand fortresses away. In the meantime the government is wasting the money of the people of this province, and what is even worse, causing untold financial hardship upon thousands of people in the province of Ontario.

We in this province have a tremendous opportunity because we are standing at the crossroads of a great social reform. We have the means in this province to carry out that reform. We have the will and the wish of most of the people; but not the government.

If the government of the province said that they would bring in a universal comprehensive programme, it could be done and we could become literally what we like to call ourselves, the banner province. If Ontario could carry off such a plan, it would be an example not only to the rest of Canada but it would certainly be an example to the world.

This to me is a tragic situation, that we come out with the half-baked bill that we have before this House.

The legislation, again I say, is the result of a well lobbied bill. Certainly the Ontario medical association had a built-in lobby in the present hon. Minister of Health. He has by his utterances over the years shown his opposition to almost any kind of a government-supported programme and no medical insurance programme is going to succeed, Mr. Speaker, in giving the people what they need unless it is supported by government and heavily subsidized by government.

The best plans available today are probably those put out by PSI. Not so long ago, about three years ago, they opened the plan to everybody who needed it regardless of their age. The obvious happened—and this is the difference between voluntary and compulsory—those who needed medical insurance joined, those who did not, the younger people, stayed out. Just look at what happened to PSI when they undertook what was a real good social

reform. It shows even the non-profit organizations cannot carry it off successfully without government help.

If we look at PSI over the past two or three years it becomes apparent that private non-profit plans are in serious trouble. PSI made their health plan public and carried on a public enrolment period and offered health insurance without a medical not too long ago. What was the result? All the poor rich signed up, the chronically ill and the aged; and as a result of this PSI's final report for 1964 states:

It has been a year of important decisions, especially regarding the subscription rates, because during the first six months of 1964 there had been \$1,800,000 more paid out for medical care than received from subscription income.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members here must be aware that the rates obviously had to go up. I think they are around \$204 for family protection now. They are going to continue to rise as long as you have a system where the sick can join if they want to, and the others can join. It has happened, for example, in British Columbia. British Columbia pioneered hospitalization. They said: "You can join if you like." And what happens? The old and the sick joined, and the healthy stayed out of it. So they had to change the plan. Of course, along came the federal government and all that was wiped out. But they began hospitalization there and showed it did not work. I do not see how you can expect a plan to work when that balance is utterly and completely destroyed.

Let the sick come, naturally; let the healthy stay out. The risk must be spread. It must be comprehensive, or all you are going to do is run into a financial disaster. Even the way in which you administer this bill, trying to determine who you are going to subsidize, is a fantastic web that will eventually choke the plan, because a man's income varies from year to year. What right have we to examine income tax returns? Alberta goes on the honour system—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Who said we did?

Mr. Trotter: Alberta is having a great deal of difficulty. How are you going to tell? You have no right to, and Alberta has not. Alberta estimates that one per cent cheats, but they depend on the honour system.

Why cannot you have a proper health system, instead of this ridiculous administrative monstrosity that you have forced upon us?

I think, too, that it is regrettable, as I have said before, that the doctors have taken the position they have. I used to think, Mr. Speaker, that they were the most conservative of all the professions—and, let us face it, all professions are very cautious to protect their interest; the doctors are, the lawyers are. I consider the lawyers the most conservative, yet when they have been faced with legal care I have not been impressed with the fact that they have brought forth a good scheme because they realize, as in health and in law, that this business of equality is a lot of nonsense; it is humbug, unless you have the money. There is no doubt in my mind, from what experience I have seen in health or law, that if you have the money you get far better services. I know the doctors like to deny this, and I know there are many doctors who go out of their way, just like many lawyers, to take cases and defend them if it happens to be a case which interests them, or something a bit different. I have seen it happen. I know there are many outstanding doctors. Yet prominent doctors have criticized their own profession—for example, Sir William Osler, who is probably, next to Sir Frederick Banting, the greatest medical man that this country has ever produced. I know the hon. Minister of Health would be aware of the great work of Sir William Osler. Here is a quote from him. No politician said this, but this is what Sir William Osler said: "When a doctor starts talking about principles, you know he is nearly always talking about money."

That comes from one of the men perhaps even greater than Sir Frederick Banting; I do not know. But this is a problem that has hurt the public image of the medical profession, which is a shame. It is true that the average person trusts his own doctor, but of the profession as a whole the public has a distrust. It is unfortunate—it is a calamity, really—that in the province of Ontario at this stage in our history the doctors have allowed the most conservative and most narrow of their men now heading the Ontario medical association to virtually dictate policy. I think they have done a disservice to Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to dwell a bit more on this retention factor of the insurance companies, because it is not obvious that a company that has heavy operating costs, that is paying commissions, that is competing for business and that has expense accounts, is going to spend far more money than a non-profit plan?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Is that true of all industries? Should we socialize all industry?

Mr. Trotter: My hon. friend from London, a good insurance town, is maybe a bit concerned about it. But all you have to do is read the Hall report. An example is in hospital insurance, where there is a tremendous amount of research done. The same principle applies to medical insurance. The Blue Cross—

Mr. White: Does the hon. member want to nationalize all types of insurance?

Mr. Trotter: —for hospital insurance returned 95 cents of every premium dollar to the public, while some insurance companies—the worst—returned 41 per cent of the insurance dollar. No wonder we have government hospitalization; no wonder that once government hospitalization came in 99 per cent of the people of Ontario are now in it. Obviously, they are getting their dollar's worth. This is all that we on this side of the House are asking—that the people of the province get a dollar's worth out of any government or any insurance scheme that comes in.

Again, I say that the government, in introducing the bill in the way it is, is squandering the public money to a disgusting extent when they allow private insurance companies to mulct the people of the province of Ontario of 28 cents on every premium dollar.

The present bill before us brings in the means test. We are making second-class citizens of a large proportion of our citizens. The Hall report emphasized that we should subsidize an insurance scheme, not individuals. In subsidizing the scheme, you avoid this business of the means test. So, again, they have ignored all the studies that have gone on for a period of time. When you look at the Hall report, you cannot say it was loaded with radicals or Liberals, when we see Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, Conservative; certainly Senator McCutcheon cannot be called a radical, yet these are the men that have brought out this report.

I remember once reading about Senator McCutcheon, where he was asked how he succeeded in business and he said it was organization, and in looking at the lower right-hand corner of a balance sheet to make sure it was in black.

So a good business man helps come forward with the Hall report. It made economic sense.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He had nothing to do with its preparation.

Mr. Trotter: Nor has he protested about it. He has never protested about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Trotter: So when you get down to creating this type of scheme, where it creates second-class citizens, where we have this administrative monstrosity of trying to decide who is paying taxes, they throw one more thing into this bill, and that is co-insurance. Why this government wants to push co-insurance when, even in Alberta, they have shown that those people who have had an opportunity—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): What does the hon. member mean, even in Alberta?

Mr. Trotter: Six times the people have preferred the comprehensive scheme to the co-insurance scheme. Three are many studies to show that it is the rich people that use the medical services more than the poor. In fact, the sickness survey made in Canada in the early 1950s, and a survey made not so long ago in the United States, showed that the poor were twice as ill as the rich, and yet those who were better off used medical service twice as much as those who were less well off. In other words, everything was reversed, so that if the hon. Minister and his experts ever took the time to look into these things, they would find that co-insurance is something that will not serve the general public here in the province of Ontario.

The cost is going to fall on the average wage earner, because today, people on welfare are taken care of. The very rich really need not worry, but it is that large segment, literally the backbone of the people in the province of Ontario, and in the Dominion of Canada, that are not protected by this type of insurance bill. These are the people that I feel, through their taxes, are going to have to subsidize the lower 25 per cent and yet get nothing for themselves. As usual, the fellow who is paying his way is left entirely on his own, and this is the shocking weakness in this bill.

This bill, in essence, is a political compromise. It is, more or less, giving a great deal of money to a favoured few—millions to the doctors and the insurance companies, and a few paltry alms more or less thrown to the people who are regarded as peasants. This is, in essence, what the bill is, and this is why it is unjust and unfair.

This bill does not set up an administration that can expand. It is narrow in its outlook, and it does not allow for what inevitably is going to be needed—rehabilitative services and more services for prevention in the field of health services. These things are ignored, and again I emphasize what a tragedy it is

for the people of this province, and for the cause of health services in general, that the government has not come to grips with the problem we are faced with in the province of Ontario.

I would like, in summing up, Mr. Speaker, to point out the four weaknesses that I would say are in this bill. It puts real control in the hands of the insurance companies and the doctors, which, when considered that this is really a public operation, is unfair to the people of the province of Ontario.

2. The way we have set up our payments, we are going to squander the public money.

3. The administrative cost—where we have been shown in the Hall report that in some areas you can operate a plan at five cents on the dollar, we now are going to take over a plan that is going to cost 28 cents on the dollar. It is improvident and unfair.

Finally, there is no equality and this is the main thing, because more than just dealing with principle, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with people, and we are not treating our people equally.

I remember—and this came home to me about three years ago—when I was on a drug committee and we were going through the facilities for treating public patients at the Toronto general hospital. The great argument at that time was the question of drugs, whether to use generic drugs or brand drugs. Most people in the medical profession consider the generic of poorer quality, and it is best to have the brand drugs. I can remember being a 12-year-old over in the public section, waiting to get some treatment—I think I had tonsilitis. Unfortunately, I do not like getting in line, and I do not like charity, the same as anybody else. But at that time, things were at that point. Maybe having a bit of Scottish shrewdness, I hit on a deal with the doctor who examined me and said, "I want to pay for it. Will you take \$25?"

Well, he operated on me for \$25, so I was not a charity patient. But most of those people in that long line were charity patients, and I was never back there until I was on that drug committee, and we were going through the dispensary, very close to where the patients were sitting. I remember the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) making inquiries of one of the men getting the drugs together, and he pointed out the different drugs they get and said, these are the generic. I remember the smile on his face and the rather cynical shrug of the shoulders. He said, "We give those to those people out there."

In other words, the people out there who cannot afford to pay, get the cheap stuff. This is what the situation is today, and to me, that incident brings home the need to treat our people in this province as the individual human beings that they are. It is not a question of how much money have they got, or who can pay their bills, but are they getting good health.

And do not let any hon. member in this House, Mr. Speaker, go away believing that there is equality in this province, because there is not. This is why I think it is a tragedy that at a time we have the opportunity to do something, I am disappointed in the hon. Minister of Health. He has been Minister of Health at a time in the history of this province when he could really do something. But instead of that, he has become a political paraplegic, and cannot stand on his legs. They are waving firmly in the breeze at all times on these great principles of health.

The hon. Minister made a great speech way back in 1959 about all he was going to do. If you read that speech today, it seems he has pretty well forgotten about it. He is strictly an apologist for the Tory government. But we on this side of the House are not going to rest until we see the people of this province get the medical and health treatment they deserve; that it is universal, comprehensive treatment, regardless of their state of health and regardless of their means. I hope that hon. members of this House will support the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, this bill has been represented rather differently by its Tory supporters as a step in the right direction. Apparently they themselves do not regard it as an adequate solution to the problem of financing medical care. It has been suggested in other quarters that it is in the nature of half a loaf; that everybody should be prepared to accept it as a step in the right direction on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I am often convinced by that type of argument. I am prepared to settle for something that I think is a step in the right direction, even though it may not go as far as I would like to see it go, and I have done that many times in this House.

I would point out, however, that it is impossible for anyone to do that in this case. This bill is not a step in the right direction, it is a step in the wrong direction. It will close the door to future progress.

It is not half a loaf of bread in place of a whole loaf—which is the most, I suppose, that one could ever hope for from Tories—it is a dried-up crust that the hon. Minister rescued from some unused cupboard in The Department of Health. It offers nothing to the people of the province of Ontario except futility. It represents a tremendous bonanza—as my hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald) pointed out yesterday—for the medical profession and insurance companies, but for the vast majority of the people of Ontario it offers nothing at all.

We do not support that sort of proposition and we will certainly not vote for this bill; we will vote for the amendment.

We will, however, continue to press the government to face the clear facts of the situation. It is possible to withdraw this bill and bring in one that adequately meets the need and is in line with modern thinking as to medical care insurance.

If that should fail—and I hope it will not—we will have many suggestions, I can assure hon. members, to try to make at least half a loaf out of this crust of bread that is now before us. I am not sure that it is possible to do that, but if we are reduced to that necessity we will do our best. We will try first of all to persuade the government to accept a proper bill, and if that fails we will do our best to try to make this into a partially adequate bill, which it is not at present.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I am an optimistic soul. I realize that the hon. Minister of Health is normally impervious to logic and common sense, and he may continue to be so in this case. With his dour Scottish nature he may dig his heels in, and the more wrong he is shown to be the further he may dig his heels in. I do not know, but it is possible.

On the other hand, I am a great believer in the educational process. I was encouraged in that belief this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to my friend, the hon. member for Parkdale who preceded me in this debate. I think all of us were impressed by his eloquent plea for a complete, comprehensive public medical care insurance programme. There is no doubt as to his conviction on the matter and I think that his speech today shows the value of education. Because only a few years ago, in 1960 to be precise, he proposed in this House a resolution that, “the government establish a province-wide system of comprehensive, prepaid health insurance, including medical and drug expenses.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seemed to us in this group that that resolution was a little vague.

So just to make sure that there could be no misunderstanding, my hon. leader moved, seconded by myself, that we make one small amendment in the resolution, namely, to insert the words “government operated.”

Well, that really provoked a storm from the benches to my right. The upshot of it was, without getting into the whole story again, Mr. Speaker, that after blasting us from stem to gudgeon for suggesting a public, comprehensive health insurance programme, they then voted in favour of adjournment of the debate so that the whole thing could be swept under the table and forgotten, and indeed, they voted to have their own resolution shelved by that vote.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, in the space of five years the educational process has worked quite significantly with my hon. friend from Parkdale.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Stop bickering! Let us stand together on principle, shall we?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I am even happy to welcome the hon. member for Sudbury into the ranks of the converted. Those two have finally seen the light on this matter. I look forward to the day when I can also rejoice at the conversion of the hon. Minister of Health. Unfortunately, it would appear that that day may still be some distance removed; but when one considers the progress that our hon. friends on the Liberal benches have made in this matter in the last five years, I think we can hold out hope for the hon. Minister of Health as well.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health did not vouchsafe to this House a speech in moving second reading of the bill. He did, however, make a rather extended statement when he moved first reading. I would suggest that in his statement on first reading he stretched the rules of the House more than a little. He went, I would say, beyond what the rule book describes as “a short explanation of the purport of the bill.”

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): The hon. member is breaking a rule right now!

Mr. Bryden: Not that I know of.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that one would have been prepared to tolerate a rather extended statement by the hon. Minister on first reading of so important a bill as this. The

only trouble is that there was no explanation given in his statement at all, as others in this debate have already pointed out. He did not explain the purport of the bill. He did not take advantage of the opportunity, as I think we would have all been prepared to concede he might have done whether the rules permitted it or not, to give the factual basis, the results of the research on which his bill was drawn. There was none of that.

On all the critical points, he said that although he had been studying this matter for some years he still had not found the answer. He was bringing forward the bill, he said, without knowing exactly what the factual basis for it was. In particular, he did not even have the courtesy to give to the House—and he still has not given to the House, even though we are now debating the principle of the bill—the scale of subsidy that will be involved for the group whose taxable income is between zero and \$1,000. He gave us a table that he said was illustrative of how the subsidization of premiums will work. It was just illustrative. Surely, he could now, he should by now, he ought to be able to by now, to give us the precise facts on this.

Has he not even studied the matter? It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, that he cut the table off at a taxable income of \$400, he did not extend it beyond that point. I think it is obvious why he did not, even if the table was just tentative. Once he got up around \$900 or \$1,000, we would have discovered that the amount that the individual will have to pay under this bill, if this table is even close to right, is about \$170 a year.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A piece of deception.

Mr. Bryden: He was quite happy when he was talking about people with taxable incomes of between nothing and \$70, who will have to pay only \$10 with the government paying the rest. But he was not prepared to put in cold print the fact that a person with, shall we say, between \$900 and \$1,000 in taxable income, will have to pay something like \$165 to \$175 in medical insurance premiums.

Now, I am suggesting to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker—and I will have more to say about this on other occasions—that he should reconsider this whole proposition. A person with a taxable income of \$1,000 a year or \$900 a year simply cannot afford to pay \$165, \$170 or \$175 a year for medical insurance; particularly for the incomplete medical insurance offered in this bill. He cannot afford to do it.

The hon. Minister, if he is going to stick by this bill, should at least reconsider the

whole basis of subsidization. He should think in terms of subsidization up to, I would say, a taxable income of \$3,000 a year.

Take a person's taxable income as \$1,000 a year. Now, just who would that be? A family of a husband and wife and two children would have a taxable income of \$1,000 if they were earning a miserable \$3,700 a year. Now, a family in that situation simply cannot afford medical care insurance at the sort of prices the hon. Minister has in mind. Those people will be excluded completely from medical care insurance by the sheer fact that they will not be able to afford it.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell particularly on the information the hon. Minister did not give us. Frankly, it would fill volumes. But I would like to spend a little time on some of the things he did say.

He did not give any information to speak of at all. It was not the type of speech that was appropriate on first reading. It was, indeed, factious and tendentious from beginning to end. It was the sort of speech that should have been made on second reading.

I regret the tendency that the Ministers of the Crown seem to have developed, of not making speeches introducing their bills on second reading, they make their whole speech, mostly out of order, on first reading. I think that they should follow the rules and get into the debate along with the rest of us, and make their statements at the proper time.

At any rate, this was an argumentative type of statement, not based on sound arguments, that could appropriately have been made on second reading and was completely out of order on first reading. It is significant, however, Mr. Speaker, in that it indicates the line of Tory propaganda, not the arguments. There is no argument here at all, only propaganda. It is the line the Tories followed during the last election campaign, when they had another inadequate bill halfway through the House, one that even they discarded. It is the same line they are now following, and it is a line that is not designed to throw light on the subject, but deliberately to confuse the issue, and to divert attention from the issues that are really at stake.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth exploding some of the mythology that the hon. Minister tried to put forward in his introductory statement while we have the opportunity. Therefore, I am going to refer to some of the main points he made in that introductory statement.

He said, first of all, that the greatest single

step with regard to health care was taken by the government of this province on January 1, 1959, when the Ontario hospital care insurance programme came into operation. He said: "This programme was founded on certain principles which have proved sound, workable and successful, principles from which we have never departed." That is a quote from the hon. Minister.

He then went on to say, as he tried to indicate when that other ill-fated bill was before the House a few years ago, that this new bill on medical care insurance is based on the same principles as the hospital care insurance programme. That was the burden of a good part of his introductory statement: He is following exactly the same principles as were followed in the hospital care insurance programme. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that an hon. Minister of the Crown would make a statement that is so clearly wrong. This bill that is now before us is not, in any sense of the word, based on the principles of the hospital care insurance programme.

Let us just take the principles of the hospital programme. The hon. Minister said, by a very quick twist of the tongue, that the hospital programme was based on the principle of voluntary coverage, just as this bill he now has before us is so based. He knows as well as I do that that is not true, and I am surprised that he made such a statement in the House.

The hospital insurance programme involved compulsory coverage for more than half of the population. The recent reports of the hospital services commission do not segregate the compulsorily covered groups, so it is impossible to say at this stage how many of the people now covered by the hospital plan are in the compulsory groups. But looking at the figures, it would appear that at least 60 per cent are in the compulsory groups.

The hon. Minister glossed over that point, trippingly shall we say, when he said, speaking of the hospital plan:

Coverage is non-compulsory except for employee groups and this was done to ensure continuity of protection for those who over the years had had hospital care insurance in their wage and salary contracts.

The hon. Minister knows perfectly well that that was not why it was done at all. If that was the reason, then why does he not do the same thing in the medical bill? There are even more now covered by medical insurance in their wage and salary contracts than were covered by hospital insurance in those days.

The reason there was compulsory coverage for about 60 per cent of the population in the hospital insurance plan was in order to diversify risks, and to provide a base which would prevent adverse selection and thus make the plan unworkable. That is why it was done.

We in this group—I was not in the House at the time—but this party objected to it being made compulsory for some people and not for others. There is no question that the reason it was made compulsory for a large percentage of the population was in order to diversify risks and make a workable plan.

So let us end this nonsense that the hospital plan is a voluntary plan. It is no such thing. It was a compulsory plan from the beginning for a majority of the population, a large enough group to make it workable.

The hon. Minister also said that this bill is similar to the hospital insurance plan, in that it is a public plan available to everyone. Well, I will agree with him in his description of the hospital plan—it is and was a public plan operated by a public commission, and protection is available to everyone. It is compulsory for 60 per cent of the people and available on a voluntary basis for the remaining 40 per cent, most of whom have now seen the value of the plan and have enrolled in it.

But what is proposed in this bill is not available to anybody except the very poor—the 1,800,000 in this province who are so poor that they do not pay any income tax at all or have a taxable income of not more than \$1,000. It is not available to anyone else. If the hon. Minister really believes in the principles of the hospital insurance plan, why does he not follow those principles? Why does he not make his plan available to anyone who wants to take it? Why does he not consider providing a solid base to diversify risks, so that coverage can be provided cheaply, rather than in a very expensive form, as is now proposed here? Why does he not open this up?

I venture to suggest that if he did, in fact, follow the principles of the hospital insurance legislation, there would, within five or ten years, be practically one hundred per cent coverage, just as there is practically one hundred per cent coverage under the hospital plan. But that is not true under this bill, because unless one is in a deprived group, with so little income that he pays little or no income tax, he cannot get under the public aspect of the plan at all. What is particularly regrettable, we cannot bring in people with lower morbidity rates than those in the lower

income groups, so as to reduce the costs of the plan.

Related to this phony argument that the hon. Minister presented in his introductory statement, is a further one that he set forth on page five of the mimeographed version of his statement, in which he said, and I am now quoting:

We have provided in this bill that medical services insurance will be:

1. Available to all, regardless of age, state of past or present health or financial status.

Now that statement is completely false, Mr. Speaker. He has not ensured that medical insurance services will be available to all at all. He has ensured that it will be available to the very poor, one million who pay no income tax and 800,000—not all of the 800,000 but a certain number—who pay very little income tax.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Anybody can buy it.

Mr. Bryden: As my hon. friend from Eglinton says, anybody can buy it. But just as I said in relation to the hon. Minister's previous bill, Cadillacs are available to everybody in this province; anybody can buy them. I am sure that the Addison dealership over on Bay Street or wherever it is would be tickled to death to provide you with a Cadillac if you gave it \$7,000 or \$10,000, or whatever the amount may be.

Under the hon. Minister's bill, medical services insurance will be available to everyone in exactly the same way as Cadillacs are available to everyone, except for the very poor. It will be available to the very poor, and even though the hon. Minister has chosen the most costly method possible for achieving that purpose, I am glad he has achieved that, at least. In his earlier legislation, the hon. Minister had not even achieved that much, but once we get beyond the people in dire poverty, it is simply not available to the majority of the people, because it will cost too much. They will continue to be priced out of the market. Unless they are in employee groups, where the employer pays all or part of the cost, they will continue to have no coverage. And yet, Mr. Speaker, they will contribute, through their taxes, to provide coverage for other people.

I think the taxation system should be used, as an instrument for redistribution of wealth, but I do not think it should be used to make certain people pay for benefits for other people that they cannot afford to buy for themselves. If the hon. Minister said

that we should all chip in and help to provide coverage for everyone, I would be for it. But that means coverage for everyone, not just for a few privileged groups at the bottom and the top of the income scale.

The hon. Minister then went on to say a little later in the same statement that Ontario is the province with the highest ratio of voluntary medical insurance in Canada. He said "some 76.5 per cent are already covered, and a further 7.3 per cent have special coverage, so that some 83.8 per cent of the people of Ontario are covered at the present time."

The hon. Minister did not do any research to arrive at those figures; he just produced, *holus bolus*, without any criticism at all, the figures presented by the Canadian health insurance association. That is the type of figure it has been palming off on the public for years, and it is a most misleading figure. I think that the hon. Minister should do what he admitted in his statement he has not done—that is, study the adequacy of the coverage that this 76.5 to 83.8 per cent is getting. Because without some analysis of that, the figures are completely meaningless.

Other people have undertaken some analysis of these claims, and I think it is worth referring to, at least, some studies that have been made on this subject. I would certainly not go into all of them, because there are many, and it would take a long time to deal with them all. But I will deal with some of them. For example, I would like to refer to some portions of the brief that the Ontario federation of labour presented to the Hagey commission a year ago January. They took the claim of the health insurance association that a large percentage—the figure was not exactly the same as here—of the people are now covered under private plans, and went into some detail as to what that meant. I want to read a portion from the brief they presented to the Hagey commission. Apparently the hon. Minister did not read that brief, because he does not show that he has been affected by it at all. But this is what the federation discovered by an analysis of these claims:

The following case histories were selected by the Canadian health insurance association in its submission to the Royal commission on health services—

that is the Hall commission:

—in 1962. Therefore they can safely be assumed to reflect the insurance industry in its best light.

I think that it is a fair assumption that the cases that the Canadian health insurance

association itself selected were representative of the kind of coverage it was providing.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: What are you reading from?

Mr. MacDonald: The OFL brief to the Hagey commission.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Is he reading something from the brief?

Mr. Bryden: I read a paragraph from the brief, and now I am making some comments of my own. I always want to make sure that the hon. Prime Minister is enlightened, so I will be happy to stop at any time.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I can only say I am very interested, and that is why I really want to know what he is saying.

Mr. Bryden: I will read it very slowly, then, because it is interesting.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to assume, as the federation did, that the cases that the health insurance association itself selected do not reflect unfavourably on the insurance industry. Here are some of them, as summarized by the federation of labour:

In claim number four of company "A", the patient was left to cover \$198 out of a bill of \$599.80, or almost one third of the total.

In claim number six, of the same company, the subscriber was required to pay \$2,664 out of a total bill of \$8,950, or almost 30 per cent of the total.

And if I may interject, Mr. Speaker, enough to break most people.

Mr. Reilly: That is co-insurance, though.

Mr. Bryden: These were the policies these people were selling. They were taken as representative by the companies themselves.

Another instance in company "C", example one, is an illness of long duration. The insured had to pay \$2,483 out of a total of \$10,621, or slightly in excess of 23 per cent of the total bill.

Claim number two required that the insured pay out \$1,517 of a bill for \$5,832, or 26 per cent.

A tabulation of all the cases cited by the association reveals the extent to which a subscriber up to this moment may be financially liable. Of the 45 examples provided by the association, in only four cases did the carrier cover the total cost

incurred. In 21 cases, the insured was left to pay more than 20 per cent of the total cost and in another eight cases between 10 and 20 per cent of the cost.

They give further details, but I think that illustrates my point, Mr. Chairman. The significant figure is not the one the hon. Minister persistently cites, namely, the number of people or the percentage of people who might have some sort of coverage.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Do you not think anybody should pay anything?

Mr. Bryden: The significant fact, I believe, in a health insurance plan under which people should—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Nobody should pay anything.

Mr. Bryden: I do not believe that a man should have to pay—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. Bryden: I do not believe a man should have to pay \$2,600 for medical bills after he has paid a high premium, presumably to give him protection. I would think, if the hon. Prime Minister would stop and think about it, he would consider that it would be a good idea to provide, as we do in our hospital plan, that after a person pays a certain premium—and we can discuss on other occasions the nature of the premium—his bills should be covered in toto, and not—

Mr. MacDonald: The same principle—

Mr. Bryden: I would object violently to the hospital plan, if a man with a long illness who incurred a hospital bill of \$10,000 was then presented with a personal bill of \$2,500. I am happy, even though I believe there are some defects in our current hospital plan, that at least that vicious principle is not included in it. But this is what is involved in the 76.5 to 83.8 per cent that the hon. Minister refers to as being covered. I may say that there is probably a substantial amount of double counting in those figures, too, but I will not go into it. I have studied the reports issued by the association, and there is no indication that any effort has been made to eliminate double counting. How much it is impossible to say; one would have to study the actual records to find out. Undoubtedly there is some. But what is even more important is that all the hon. Minister means is that a certain percentage of the people get some coverage. I think it would be wise to take a

look at what the Hall commission had to say about this.

At the time it made its study, it noted that, taking the whole country: "10,675,000 Canadians had some form of medical insurance or prepayment coverage"—the sort of figures the health insurance association loves to cite.

"But," said the Hall commission a few pages later, "of these the coverage held by nearly three million is totally inadequate."

It made an analysis in Table 18-2, on page 731 of volume 1 of the report, of the amount of protection that these so-called "covered" people got. It found this in the overall picture, although we talk about the large percentage of the people who are covered by some sort of medical insurance contract, the Hall commission's estimate was that the claims actually paid, which is surely a more meaningful figure, represented only a little more than 40 per cent of the liabilities for medical expenses incurred by the people of Canada. And that was probably an underestimate. I will admit that this figure is a couple of years out-of-date now; it is also a Canadian average, it does not apply specifically to Ontario. I will admit that, but we have been given no figures along this line—the really significant point—by the hon. Minister. The best we can do is to work on the basis of the partial figures that have been worked out by other people investigating the field. These other figures indicate that the claim the hon. Minister has made, and that he loves to repeat, about the percentage who have some sort of medical insurance coverage is grossly misleading, to say the least; it does not represent the true picture at all.

Mr. Speaker, we come to the pièce de résistance of the hon. Minister's statement, the good old moss-backed Toryism of our friend, the hon. Minister of Health, the diversion, the attempt to create a duststorm so as to confuse the issue and conceal from as many people as possible what the real issue is.

An hon. member: But not from you.

Mr. Bryden: He says in his most resounding period on page 10 of his mimeographed statement:

Some believe that governments should regiment the people, deciding what is best for them and imposing the decision upon them by compulsion. Others, and we subscribe to this [that means the government] believe the same objective can be obtained without compulsion.

This is the old worn out Tory red herring—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We want some disposable income left.

Mr. Bryden: This is the old red herring that smells to high heaven that has been dragged back and forth across the path so many times it is a mystery that they have the gall to drag it across once again. I may say that it was the same old red herring that for 15 years was dragged across the path with regard to hospital insurance. Now we get it again.

Is the hon. Minister suggesting that, to take one example, Chief Justice Emmett Hall, of the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan, believes that governments should regiment the people? Does he seriously believe that? Does he believe that any of the people who served on the Royal commission on health services, appointed by the Diefenbaker administration in Ottawa, really believe in regimenting the people? I do not think the hon. Minister of Health believes such a thing at all. If he does, he is even further beyond hope than I had thought.

Does he believe it is regimentation to have compulsory school attendance laws?

Mr. White: That is a foolish analogy.

Mr. Bryden: This is a very sound analogy. We say that education is a basic matter, and I say that health is a basic matter. I can agree that there is a basis for argument as to whether education and health are analogous; obviously, they are not completely analogous. I say that they are sufficiently analogous that the same sort of principle should apply in this field.

Mr. White: The hon. member wants to force everybody into the mould shaped by his own biases.

Mr. Bryden: But, you see, if we try to argue the case, which I think is at least arguable, that there is a clear analogy between health and education in their basic importance to the community—

Mr. White: Is the hon. member going to force everybody to go to church?

Mr. Bryden: You see, we get the old Tory red herring that some people believe in regimentation; that we are trying to regiment everybody. Every time we try to drag these fellows one step more into the 20th century they scream "regimentation!" Of course, they have been doing it for a long time and I suppose they will continue to do it. There is nothing that hurts a Tory more than a new idea. They have been resisting this new idea for as long as I can remember—

Mr. White: This session disproves that idea.

Mr. Bryden: But I have observed in the past that in time they can learn to bear their hurt. They did finally go along with—

Mr. White: There's more to come.

Mr. Bryden: Even Strachan went along with the idea of public education ultimately. They went along with the idea of public hospital insurance, but they are still kicking and screaming against the logical extension of that principle. They claim that anybody who argues this principle wants to regiment the people; they are not willing to consider it on its merits. No, they have to attack the people making the argument. Well, let it be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that they are now attacking such people as Chief Justice Emmett Hall.

I may say, and it is public knowledge, that prior to his appointment to the bench, Chief Justice Hall, when he was a practising lawyer, was a well-known and prominent Conservative, one of the leading Conservatives in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Very good judgment.

Mr. Bryden: He is an extremely good judge, and he was, according to my amateur assessment, an extremely good lawyer before he was appointed to the bench.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Good judgment, I said.

Mr. Bryden: He was certainly regarded as one of the best in the province of Saskatchewan. He is a man of intelligence and common sense. Naturally, now that he is on the bench he has no association with party politics, but I think we can still say that he is a man of conservative temperament, using a small "c" on that word. I think that would be a fair description of him; I suspect it is one that he himself would agree with. He was appointed, as we all know, by a Conservative government at Ottawa to head a commission to investigate this whole matter. Unfortunately, the government of Ontario never did bother to investigate the matter. If they had, they might have been persuaded by the logic of the facts, just as Chief Justice Hall and his associates were, because once they got into the facts and began to study what the true situation was, they changed their own minds. They said that they have done that. They found that they could not support the sort of nonsense that the hon. Minister has put forward in this bill on the basis of any comprehensive and impartial analysis of the facts.

I think it is worth putting into the record just what the commission did say on this point. I will try to avoid reading more than is necessary, but I think there are some points that should be made. Remember that this is a commission appointed by a Tory government, and most of them are Tories. I know that hurts the hon. Prime Minister quite a lot—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It does not hurt me a bit—

Mr. Bryden: You have been deserted by the only—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is one of the hon. member's red herrings, that is all. It is a red herring if he calls this a Tory report.

Mr. Bryden: I can sympathize with him; he is being deserted by more and more people. He is standing in splendid isolation advocating an out-of-date idea that even Tories cannot support when they study the matter. Here is what the commission had to say on page 742 of volume 1 of its report:

The commissioners were basically sympathetic to the views of those who believe full-scale government action to be unnecessary in the health services field. Like most Canadians, we suspect, we are opposed to change simply for the sake of change.

There is a good Tory statement to begin with.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Does the hon. member not agree with it?

Mr. Bryden: I do not agree with the first sentence but I agree with the second. I am opposed to change simply for the sake of change. I disagree with the original assessment that full-scale government action is unnecessary, but they frankly admitted that that was the predilection with which the commission started. Then they went on to say:

Accordingly, we examined hopefully—
Hopefully!

—the central feature in the health insurance association and Canadian medical association proposals—

They do not mention the proposal made by the hon. Minister of Health of this province, but he was in the same company:

—we examined hopefully the central feature in these proposals . . . that the great majority of Canadians could, and would, become insured through their own means, and that the government would

need to assist only a relatively small number.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House if it has heard statements like that anywhere else, besides in the briefs presented to the Hall commission. This is the line the government has been palming off—I think with declining conviction—for as long as it has discussed this matter. It is the old line of the Canadian medical association and the Canadian health insurance association. But returning to the Hall report:

The health insurance association, for example, states that the borderline for determining who will need subsidy should be drawn where the income tax legislation draws it now. That is, anyone now paying income tax is deemed able to pay his full premiums, and only those who do not pay income tax fall in the "medically indigent" category and therefore require subsidy.

This, with one modification, is exactly the principle of the bill that is now before us and, as the Hall commission said:

Unfortunately the problem is not that simple. The main reason, as we have said, is that the Canadian people are concerned, not with paying for physicians' services alone, but with meeting the cost of the full range of services necessary for comprehensive health care. That is, in ascertaining ability to pay without subsidy, we must consider not only the premium for medical and surgical care as proposed in the two submissions mentioned above, but also hospital care insurance already being paid, for example, \$78 per family per year in Ontario [And the hon. Minister wants to tack another \$170 on top of that] and as well as for dental care, optical services and nursing. After more than 35 years of endeavour on the part of the voluntary plans and commercial insurance companies, only slightly more than one-half the population of Canada has any degree of voluntary insurance protection, and this for medical services alone.

The commission goes on to discuss private plans which I have already mentioned.

I hardly expect that anything I say would convince the hon. Minister of Health, but I am hopeful that he might one day open this report and read it, and let the facts speak to him.

I am going to read a little more from the report, on page 743, where the commission says:

Our reasoning is as follows:

1. That the method of subsidy should

be one that subsidizes the insurance fund, rather than one that subsidizes individuals.

Precisely what my hon. leader was proposing in the plan he offered to this House two or three years ago, and repeated in shorter form yesterday.

2. That reliance on the method of voluntary insurance would be unnecessarily slow and inevitably incomplete.

3. That the number of individuals who would require subsidy to meet total health services costs is so large that no government could impose the means test procedure on so many citizens, or would be justified in establishing a system requiring so much unnecessary administration.

This is another point that the hon. Minister has not faced up to. He does not propose in this bill to subsidize nearly all the people who will require subsidization under his way of doing things.

3. Continued: The health services will make enough demand on our resources. We must not waste them.

4. That, so far as the issue of compulsion is concerned—

Now I would ask the hon. Minister to listen carefully to this:

—we believe that as long as decisions of this kind are made by democratically elected Legislatures, as long as they provide only basic essentials—for example, standard ward hospital care—and assure citizens free choice of physician and hospital and free choice of additional items against which they may insure through private arrangements, then we have confidence that our democratic ideals will not only be protected, but, in fact, more fully realized. It is of great significance for a democratic society such as ours that The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act was passed by a unanimous vote of the House of Commons representing all political parties.

5. That the health insurance fund in each province should be administered by one agency in order to achieve full integration and effective planning of all health services, and thus to obtain the most efficient administration of all sectors of the proposed health services programme. We have recommended that the existing hospital insurance programme be administered by the same agency in each province as administers all personal health services. This necessarily means rejection of any proposal that one phase of health services,

namely, payment of physicians' services, be administered by a separate agency.

Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to envisage a more effective condemnation of the bill that the hon. Minister has put before us than that passage I have just read from the report of this distinguished commission. I want to quote just one more portion from this report, and that is on page 745:

—the decision which Canadians have to make, assuming that they accept the claim of the health insurance industry that it can provide universal coverage, is whether they wish to pay \$1,020 million for physicians' services in 1971 for a programme administered by the insurance agencies, or \$837 million for a programme administered by government agencies.

Apart from anything else, Mr. Speaker, I think that hits the nail right on the head. The figures used here were in terms of Canada, but my hon. leader gave similar figures in relation to Ontario. The question asked by the Hall commission, as its parting shot, was, in effect: Do we want to subsidize the insurance industry to the tune of nearly \$200 million a year as far as the whole of Canada is concerned? Do we want to hand out—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is absolute nonsense.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister suggests that the only people in Canada who really studied the matter ended up with absolute nonsense. Well, it is unfortunate that he has closed his mind to mature consideration, and merely wishes to protect his prejudices by describing as nonsense what is unquestionably an authoritative study, infinitely more comprehensive than anything his people have ever undertaken. This is the final point of the Hall commission and one I would like to repeat here:

How long are we going to go on subsidizing insurance companies, instead of providing health services for the people of the province?

Mr. MacDonald: A good question.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would now like to take the bill itself and some features of it. I will not attempt to deal with matters that can be considered in committee of the whole House, but apart from the very broad questions of principle that I have dealt with, I think, even within the four walls of the bill, some extremely bad principles are enunciated that the government might very

well consider before this bill gets to committee of the whole. For example—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member not to get into the precise details of any clauses of the bill in his remarks.

Mr. Bryden: I will try to avoid that. Sometimes it is difficult when one is discussing a principle to avoid a specific reference, but what I would like to deal with really are some of the main outlines of the bill.

The basic principle we have here is that the control over the cost that is going to have to be paid by the people of Ontario—through their taxes for subsidies paid under this bill, and through premiums when they buy from insurance companies—is really left wholly, or almost wholly, in the hands of the insurance companies and the medical profession. Apart from any other criticism I have made of the bill, this is essentially what the government is laying down, that these groups can write their own ticket. The bill says that payments for the standard contract will be—for the subsidized groups, and this will undoubtedly become the model for the voluntary plan—in accordance with 100 per cent of the fee schedule of the Ontario medical association.

I will not repeat what my hon. leader said about this yesterday, but this is handing an enormous melon to the medical profession. They have never contemplated that they would get 100 per cent of the fee schedule for people in the lowest income groups. In fact, they do not get 100 per cent in the plan that is now in effect in the province of Saskatchewan for the whole of the population. They get 85 per cent of the fee schedule there, and they are making more money than they ever made in their lives before. In fact, their average incomes, I think, went up about \$2,000 or \$3,000 after the plan came into effect on the basis of 85 per cent of the fee schedule.

Yet the hon. Minister comes along and says that he is going to give them 100 per cent.

What is even worse, Mr. Speaker, is the point I am at this stage mainly interested in. The bill will let the doctors determine what they will be paid, and we on the public side will have to accept whatever the doctors arrive at.

They set their fee schedule, we have to pay it out of taxpayers' money in the case of the subsidized group.

There are some limitations on this, but mighty few. As a matter of fact, the bill now provides that payments will be according to the fee schedule in effect at the time the bill

comes into effect, an open invitation to the medical profession to jack up its fee schedule between the time the bill is passed and the time it comes into effect. Then they will be restricted for two years, but beyond that, they will be able to set their fees at anything they like, and we will have to pay.

The hon. Minister, in his introductory statement, referred to difficulties that had been encountered in France, Belgium, Italy and Britain. I believe the difficulties have been more or less solved in negotiations with the doctors. I think we should all recognize that whenever negotiations are involved there may be difficulties. But there will not be any difficulties under the hon. Minister's bill. The doctors are not going to complain when they can simply say whatever they want; they can write their own ticket; they can requisition the public Treasury for whatever they want.

They are not going to complain about that. In fact, I would think there would be no industrial disputes in this country and The Department of Labour could wind up its conciliation services if employees were authorized to say what their wages would be without any reference to anybody else.

Yet this is precisely what the government proposes here—let the doctors say exactly what they are going to get. There will be no difficulties, but I would suggest to the government that they ought to think of that again.

The government is going to set up a council—I have forgotten the precise name, but it does not matter—which is going to be responsible for—

Mr. Reilly: Medical services insurance council.

Mr. Bryden: Medical services insurance council, my friend, the hon. member for Eglinton says. It is going to advise on maximum premiums, open enrolment periods, form and content of standard contracts, and so on—in fact, everything of significance under the legislation is going to go before this group. How is it to be set up? The bill provides that there will be nine members. Five, it says, in very general terms, will be representatives of the public; there is no suggestion as to how those public representatives are to be named, or what their credentials will be, they are just described as public representatives. But we have it very clearly set forth that two of the members will be named by the medical association, and two of them by the insurance companies. So four of the nine will be straight advocates and lobbyists of the medical profession—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Did you not say that five of the nine will be appointed from the general public?

Mr. Bryden: I just said it. I said it was stated very vaguely—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Four of the nine will represent the medical profession.

Mr. Bryden: I indicated, first of all, how the five will be appointed. I would like to come back to that, if the hon. Prime Minister will allow me the privilege of doing so.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am sorry. I listen patiently, but occasionally I just have to interject, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize. Occasionally I have to interject, but I recognize that you must put the emphasis where you want your argument to go. But when I sit here and listen, I sometimes see the other side. So I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member; I am enjoying his speech, but I just noticed that instead of saying five of nine represent the citizens he said four of nine represented the medical profession and the insurance companies.

Mr. Bryden: I do not want to quibble with the hon. Prime Minister. I think if the record is checked he will notice that I said first that five will be designated as public representatives, and I assure him that I want to say a little more about those five. But I wanted, first of all, if he will bear with me for one moment, to say again that four of them—and this surely is beyond dispute—will be appointed by the medical profession—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The minority.

Mr. Bryden: Four of the nine. My arithmetic is almost as good as the hon. Prime Minister's, but I will accept his statement that four of nine is a minority—but just barely a minority. Four of the nine will be appointed by the medical profession and the insurance industry. And, of course, Mr. Speaker—and I am sure that the hon. Prime Minister with his great knowledge of arithmetic will follow me on this point—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, if I may just set the record straight. The reason I belabour this point a little bit is that the hon. leader of the Opposition, in his speech yesterday, missed this point completely and said that the majority of that group would be representing the medical profession and the insurance industry; these men he uses for research had not done it very well, and he was wrong.

Mr. Bryden: I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition will take responsibility for his own statements. I have no doubt that if that is what he said, he would be prepared to correct it.

However, I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that all of us know enough arithmetic to know that if those four can capture just one more, they have got a majority, and I would emphasize again that there is no basis, nothing in the bill, that suggests how the additional people are to be appointed. They are to be whomever the hon. Minister of Health, I take it, or the Cabinet, considers to be representative of the public.

Well, from my observations to date of people whom they consider to be representative of the public, I would not even figure that the public would have more than one or two out of the nine. They might ask the O.F. of L. to submit a panel of names. They might ask the Ontario federation of agriculture to submit a panel of names. That would give us a couple of public representatives, Mr. Speaker.

Then, I suspect, the others would be retired doctors, or nurses, or people like that, or perhaps actuaries, or representatives of the Canadian manufacturers association.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Would you like to appoint them? I suppose this is what you would like?

Mr. Bryden: No, I would not like to appoint them at all, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: You would have to take the responsibility then.

Mr. Bryden: I expect my colleagues will, in the not-too-distant future, be over there in the position where they will be able to appoint them. I would not personally be anxious to participate in the appointment.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: But I think that the bill should set forth, just as precisely as it does for the medical and insurance companies, who these public people are to be, and where they are to come from. Why do we not say that the Ontario federation of labour will name two, the Ontario federation of agriculture will name two and the consumers' association of Canada will name one? Something like that. Let us see exactly where they are going to come from. The qualifications have been set forth very clearly for the other people. I have no confidence at all, Mr. Speaker, that even the administration of this bill will be—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Will the Progressive-Conservative association appoint any?

Mr. Bryden: I suspect that a substantial number of them will have been passed by the Progressive-Conservative association.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): A substantial number of the population is Progressive-Conservative, of course.

Mr. Bryden: There will, however, undoubtedly be one New Democratic Party member to make it look good.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): That is about all you can find.

Mr. Bryden: I have found quite a few in my constituency.

Mr. Reilly: One has to get away from Woodbine to find out—

Mr. Bryden: There are also quite a few up in your constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to summarize some of the major points which we find objectionable in the bill and which are so completely objectionable as to make the bill totally unacceptable. I will not deal with all of them, but I would like to summarize one or two.

Primarily, Mr. Speaker, it is a social security plan for insurance companies and the medical profession. For the overwhelming majority of the people, it will mean inadequate insurance protection at high premiums, and an excessively high charge on their tax dollar to provide protection for subsidized groups. The government plans to accept full responsibility for a million people, plus part of an additional 800,000 who are so poor that they pay little or no income tax. It is well known that the sickness rate among the poor is much higher than for other people. Thus, the government is relieving the insurance companies of the high-risk group so that they can declare open season on the rest of the population.

This segregation of the poor will mean that the cost of providing them with protection will be higher than if the risks were averaged across the whole community. Thus, the taxpayer will have to pay far more than is necessary to protect this group. Moreover, the high cost of protecting the poor will undoubtedly become the yardstick for setting the rates to be charged by insurance companies to the rest of the people. The taxpayer will not only have to pay higher taxes than necessary to protect the poor; he will

also have to pay unnecessarily high premiums if he wants insurance protection for himself. What is equally bad is that he will get inadequate protection.

The proposed standard insurance contract, which we can deal with in greater detail in committee, is riddled with exceptions and loopholes, and there will continue to be all the fol-de-rol of enrolment periods and waiting periods. This, I think, is one of the great tragedies of this half-baked plan the hon. Minister is putting before us. We still have to go through all this nonsense of enrolment periods and waiting periods, all of which would be eliminated in a universal plan.

We should not, however, conclude that the insurance companies will be the main beneficiaries of the proposed legislation. We should look at the melon—I will not go into it in detail, because my hon. leader did it yesterday—that is being handed on a platter to the doctors. The government is planning to pay 100 per cent of the Ontario medical association schedule of fees for medical services provided to the poor. As my hon. leader said yesterday, this probably means we are handing the doctors about \$20 million free, gratis and for nothing—the group that is already the highest-paid in the community. I do not begrudge the medical profession the high rates of remuneration they receive; I think that they earn such scales of remuneration by both hard work and by a high standard of qualifications and responsibility. I do not begrudge them their high incomes, Mr. Speaker. But let us bear in mind that they are already the highest-paid group in the community. Why should we be collecting taxes from people with 20 per cent, 25 per cent, 30 per cent of the income that doctors are getting to give them a great big melon that they do not need? I am surprised if they are so greedy that they want it.

This is probably the most objectionable feature in this bill. It cannot be considered in any sense a medicare bill, a bill to provide for medical care insurance; it does not do any such thing. It provides for certain subsidization of certain groups, but mainly subsidization of doctors and insurance companies. But what is particularly objectionable is the redistribution of income that is going to take place under it, from the poor and the average income people, to some of the wealthiest groups in the community.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, we oppose the bill absolutely. We will vote against it at every opportunity that presents itself. However, we will, as we always do, if by some great stroke of misfortune it should be approved in principle in this House, try

to clean out some of the most objectionable features contained in it, and do our best to assist the government to make at least a half-loaf measure out of this pitiful crust it is now offering.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, when one has been privileged to sit in this Legislature, as I have, for a comparatively short time, it is very interesting to note the flip-flop that takes place with some of our friends in the Opposition. I am sorry my hon. friend from Parkdale is not in his seat at the moment. But as short a time ago as April 25, 1963, he told the House this:

One of the main principles of the Liberal plan for administration is that we must work in co-operation with the doctors. I know the socialists think this is a big joke, but we mean it, sir, and most seriously, because we have seen examples of the way the CCF in Saskatchewan messed up the plan. We do not want to see this happen here in Ontario or Canada.

An hon. member: Who said that?

Mr. Harris: Our hon. friend from Parkdale. Just a little farther on—I will not read all this—he makes a big issue out of having a PSI scheme. Then, in his closing remarks:

Then, Mr. Speaker, should we fail to get the co-operation of PSI, we admit that we will sponsor one of our own carriers. In other words, we will have a government-sponsored carrier. This is not our first choice, this is our second choice.

I thought that was worthy of being repeated at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bryden: It shows the power of education. They have learned.

Mr. Harris: I have a word or two for the hon. member when I get a little farther down.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage in the debate, repetition of fact, figures and varying philosophies is becoming very apparent. In all this welter of words that have emanated from my hon. friends in the Opposition, very little time has been spent in pointing out the benefits that will accrue to the 1,800,000 of our people who are going to benefit from this legislation.

I am concerned about the welfare of my constituents, and the passage of this bill will bring relief to a very large percentage of them. I would rather move slowly and bring in a prudent health care plan in stages and make sure the people who are most

urgently in need of physician services are going to be looked after first; I submit that is what this bill does for us.

For several reasons I want to take a few minutes of the time of the House this afternoon. First, from the public point of view, I have had the privilege of serving on the board of one of Toronto's larger hospitals for almost 15 years now. From the private family point of view, as a result of a rather serious car accident, I had a better-than-average insight into the practical workings of our hospitals.

As I have said before, certainly from the political point of view—I represent a riding where the average male wage earner makes approximately only about \$4,200 a year—I am concerned as to how this bill is going to affect my constituents. During the past 15 years, medical science has made enormous strides. People who once suffered from diseases that completely baffled medical science can now have their condition diagnosed, and through drugs and therapy can lead more normal, useful, and often very full, lives.

During this time the Conservative government in Ontario has consistently moved forward. It has assisted in the building of hospitals, it has assisted in making grants available for research. It introduced the Ontario hospital insurance plan in 1959 and now we are going to introduce a medical service insurance plan.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that our hon. Prime Minister made last October 29 are of tremendous significance at this time. This is all part of this overall package. I am just going to highlight one or two of those things that he said at that time, because they bear on this bill and they are worth repeating.

First, a new medical school at McMaster University; a new school of dentistry at the University of Western Ontario; a medical school at the University of Toronto expanded to provide for the admission of an additional 75 first-year medical students; and a general upgrading of all the facilities throughout. A new health science building is being provided at Queen's University and the first-year medical class increased in numbers up to 75.

Now the cost of this particular programme is approximately \$50 million. As well as that, the government is setting up a programme of special grants to assist hospitals associated with our medical schools and our dental schools. And this programme will cost an additional \$64 million.

So in total, there is an expenditure of \$114

million that ties right in with what we are doing.

Just to explore this a little farther, much has been said about nurses in this House, and I just want to add a word in that regard. The grants by the Ontario government for construction of nurses' residences will be increased from \$2,000 to \$3,200 per bed. In addition, the province intends to construct three regional nursing schools, each to accommodate 100 students. Encouragement will also be given to hospitals to push forward programmes for training registered nursing assistants, and I know as chairman of a school of nursing how vital this need is.

The para-health services, we have a tremendous need in this area and it is so essential to the good health care. At this time these things are being studied. They include physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, laboratory, technicians and others. Planning to meet these needs has progressed and will be pressed forward as an integral part of the provision of adequate health care.

This is a comprehensive and carefully planned programme to meet the needs for the supply of trained personnel in the health field. Its financing is a vast undertaking, planning for which is in no sense the least important part. This is entirely a provincial programme, financed by the province. All of these projects are outlined in the Hall commission report and it is there recommended that they should be paid for on a 50/50 basis; so it is certainly to be hoped that the federal government will see fit to implement these programmes very soon, because such support would be of tremendous assistance to this province.

Mr. Speaker, the enumeration of the specifics proves this government's concern for the welfare of all of our people in this field of health. As I said a moment ago, apart from the particular bill, the allocation of \$114 million that I have just outlined for the needs of medical education is something that we must bear in mind when we are discussing this project. So let us remember the things that have been done and are being done in this field. As the hon. Minister of Health said when he introduced Bill 136 the other day, this Act is not an isolated piece of legislation but a further step in a health programme which is designed to make available medical coverage to all our people.

In this age that we are privileged to live in new remedies are available and more will be made available because of the research money that this government is providing.

What is now being considered in this bill is the assurance that the people of this province will have available to them physician services without the financial worry that a serious illness could bring. The real issue raised by this bill is that group of people who are now without medical insurance of any sort and also that group which has inadequate insurance coverage.

In this area, what could be more realistic than taking our approximate 1,000,000 non-income taxpayers and making sure that they have their medical bills paid for? It should be pointed out that approximately 50 per cent of our people over the age of 65 do not pay any income tax. So here in this area we are providing health coverage for those of our senior citizens who are most urgently in need.

Second, we take that group of approximately 850,000 people who have taxable incomes up to \$1,000 and we assist this group. Under this scheme, the person receiving the assistance is no more identifiable by his neighbour or friends than anyone in the province who pays income tax. We all know this total figure of 1,800,000 represents approximately 25 per cent of our people and by means of this bill we should more than close the 16 per cent gap which most experts agree now exists with our uninsured people.

At this time I would like to commend Joan Hollobon of the *Globe and Mail* for her very excellent series of articles over the past six months which have dealt with this subject. It is interesting to note that in one of her references to British Columbia she said, and I quote:

The means test troubles few. An average of 83.7 per cent of all income groups said they had no objection.

Bearing in mind this report of Miss Hollobon's and with the simple procedure that we are adopting here of applying an income test which falls far short of a means test, I find that objections in this area are no longer valid.

In several of our provinces where free enterprise has been left to flourish completely without any government intervention, as has been said on the other side both this afternoon and yesterday, in some instances the lower-income groups who need insurance most are not buying it. I say with all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, if we find in our bill that some of these low-income people who need this insurance are not buying it, I am sure that this government will find ways and means to make sure that they are covered with the minimum of delay.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): When are you going to find that out if you cannot see it now?

Mr. Harris: I have faith in this executive council that sits on my left here that if this does not work out in the first instance, they will certainly amend it to make it work out.

Mr. Singer: None so blind as those who will not see.

Mr. White: Continuous progress in this jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: None so deaf as those who will not listen.

Mr. Harris: A few years ago, I was involved in a rather serious motor-car accident. I have paid doctor's bills in this regard something in excess of \$6,000, and the Ontario hospital services commission paid, on my behalf, something over \$8,500—

Mr. Sopha: All of which you recovered, I trust.

Mr. Harris: Just a minute. I am not complaining in any way about this large expenditure that I made, because I had insurance which provided for this—

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member had a good lawyer. The hon. member recovered the money.

Mr. Harris: But the point I want to make—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Harris: —to the hon. member for Sudbury, is this. This experience pointed out to me very dramatically that the purchase of medical care cannot be compared to the purchase of any other service.

Mr. Sopha: Not paid out of his pocket!

Mr. Harris: The human element and the capabilities of the doctors are of prime importance. In this regard, in discussing a proposed operation that my daughter was going to have at this time, some of the finest neurologists in the country could not give me any assurance of what was going to happen. I might say the operation was successful. But I am pointing this out because we, as politicians, always have to remember that medical care is provided by medical people, not by politicians.

Mr. Trotter: We are not arguing about that. The money; where is it coming from?

Mr. Harris: All right. I am just making sure you have it straight. Our job is to do everything in our power as legislators, which this government is doing, to see to it that in order to have adequate medical care we make the facilities available to provide more doctors, to provide more nurses, to provide more hospitals—

Mr. Trotter: Why do you not, then?

Mr. White: Do not be ridiculous.

Mr. Harris: We are doing it. Provide more researchers, and more of all the facilities necessary for proper medical care. This, I submit, we are doing. I will repeat again this government's allocation of \$114 million for the needs of medical education. The additional amount of \$30 million for the needs of the nurses is evidence of our concern.

Mr. Trotter: A long time coming.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward, with anticipation, to the results of this federal-provincial conference that was scheduled to take place at the end of this month. I understand it has been postponed until June or July, and it is quite possible that this subject will be on this agenda. At that time I hope that consideration is given by Ottawa to make available to the province this 50 per cent figure that we have all heard so much about.

After reading and listening to some of my hon. colleagues opposite, one would almost get the idea from some of them that we are doing a great injustice when, in fact, this bill is a tremendous step forward. It will help to ensure the right to good health is available to all of our people, not just for those who are wealthy enough to be able to afford it.

I would like to say to my hon. colleagues who make up the executive council of this province that this is a good piece of legislation and I commend them for bringing it forward.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trotter: Preaching for the call?

Mr. Harris: Before concluding, I would like to make brief reference to some of the sections of this bill, as the hon. member for Woodbine has just done. But let us just see where the emphasis lies in some of these questions.

Regarding this medical service insurance council that so much has been said about here this afternoon, I want to commend the

government for making it clear that five members of this council will be representatives of the public. I have enough faith in them to be sure that they will appoint five people who are five just men. You have heard enough about the two from the insurance companies, the insurance carriers, and the two from the medical profession, but with this five to four majority in favour of the public, we can be assured of the best possible decision without any possibility of any excess pressure which has been talked about so much here this afternoon.

In section 7, we should note that this makes it absolutely clear that assistance is available for a person who is not able to continue payment of his or her premium because of the lack of income due to unemployment or illness or disability.

Again, section 12 should be emphasized so that everyone is aware that not only are they eligible for a standard contract, but, if the licensed carrier were to refuse to sell them a standard contract, the carrier would be guilty of an offence and, upon conviction, liable for a fine up to \$500.

In section 14, subsection 2, this makes it clear that any dependant is covered up to 21 years of age. I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Health that I am pleased to note this age limit is set at 21, but I would also like to recommend that under the Ontario hospital services commission he give consideration to raising the age of the dependant from 19 up to 21, and bring it in line with this Act. By doing this, many parents of older children will be relieved of the present burden this age limit of 19 imposes.

At this time, I would also ask the hon. Minister of Health to give consideration in both these areas to extending this coverage to all of our university students.

Under section 18, subsection 2, it should be emphasized that for a period of two years after the day the Act comes into force, the prescribed maximum prescription rate will remain constant. This is a most important section, and will certainly relieve the minds of many of our people who might be worried about increased premiums.

Again, in section 25, I would like to emphasize that everyone has the right to choose their own physician.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago, no one on this side of the House would say this is the last word in health care, but it does assure that no person will be denied attention when they are sick. And, most important, no person will suffer impoverishment as a result of illness. It is

just another step in this government's long and progressive programme which has, as its ultimate objective, complete health care of the highest order for all of our people. I commend the hon. Minister of Health for bringing this legislation forward.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, to accomplish the purpose that I have set for myself, if the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) will forgive me, I should like in the format of my remarks to provide a text, against the background of which to relate all that I have to say after the text. The text I should like to provide is a series of quotations, so that the discerning, who may take the opportunity or the liberty or give themselves the licence to read the remarks I make, will be able to see what I am trying to do. The first quotation that I should like to read into the record by way of preamble is this one. The quotation begins:

Frankly, we are concerned about the feeling that exists among many people in this province. They simply do not want everything taken away from them by the state.

That, sir, is the first citizen of the province, the Hon. John Parmenter Robarts. The second quotation that I should like to read is this one:

What the commission recommends is that in Canada this gap be closed, that as a nation we now take the necessary legislative, organizational and financial decisions to make all the fruits of the health sciences available to all our residents without hindrance of any kind. All our recommendations are directed toward this objective. There can be no greater challenge to a free society of free men.

Those words, I suppose, may be attributed to Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, for they are read from the Hall report on health services.

The next one, sir, is a quotation from a speech made just two weeks ago tonight. It begins:

The individual must be secured by the state, but the individual has some responsibility, too. If you turn over to the government the total economic responsibility of the individual, then you must prepare to give up the right to a lot of individual decisions. You cannot have it both ways.

That, again, is an excerpt from a speech made by the Hon. John Parmenter Robarts, first citizen of the province.

The final quotation, to provide the text—as I say, my hon. friend from Dufferin-Simcoe

will understand what I am doing—begins thusly:

We wish to speed up the date when all have access to health services and to have enabled them to make their contributions to Canada's welfare. Low incomes and poor health have been too closely associated for us to ignore the adverse effects on income distribution of chronic illness and disability. Expenditures on good health may well be as efficient a device for equalizing the distribution of income as any subsidy can possibly be.

That sir, again, is a quotation from the Royal commission on health services, chaired by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall.

By your leave, Mr. Speaker, that is the text against which I am going to approach this subject on the philosophical basis. I am delighted—nay, I am enthused—with the prospect of having the opportunity to address some remarks on the second reading of this bill toward a delineation—and a crystallization of the differences that separate a Tory in his philosophy from a Liberal—the philosophical predilection, the intellectual predilection that delineates a small “c” conservative from a small “l” liberal.

I have been impressed by a number of things in the debate thus far. If we sit here until mid-August, I hope that every hon. member of this House will take the opportunity to participate in this debate which, after all, deals with a subject fundamental to the well-being of our society. It relates to a precious asset, an invaluable asset, beyond which one would find it difficult to conjure up a greater one. It is fitting that each hon. member of the House get up in his place and take a suitable length of time to expostulate his views, his philosophical approach to this problem and to the remedying of the evil, the distress and the suffering that we are all—I accord all hon. members that—concerned about.

One of the things that impresses me about this bill is that there is no preamble to it, as there was in the case of the bill which introduced on March 21, 1957 the establishment of the Ontario hospital services commission and provided hospital care to all but one per cent of the citizens of this province. Here is the preamble to that Act:

Whereas it is in the public interest to establish a plan of hospital care insurance for the people of Ontario, universally available to all without regard to age, financial circumstances or condition of health, and whereas it is desirable to extend the powers of the hospital services commission of On-

tario in order that it may put such a plan into effect as soon as practicable—

As we say in the law—and I look at my friend, the hon. member for York Mills (Mr. Bales)—*mutatis mutandis*, those words could apply to this bill if it was universal and comprehensive in its coverage. One could borrow the words of the preamble of that statute and emblazon them on the front page of this bill, if this bill met the terms and the characteristics of the amendment that we have proposed.

I was impressed by the fact that the bill was not introduced by the hon. Prime Minister; he left its introduction and preliminary statement to a mere Minister.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Frost used to speak first, last and always.

Mr. Sopha: No, he is *primus inter pares*—first among equals—*primus inter pares*, the hon. Prime Minister. Unlike Leslie Frost, who introduced the hospital services care bill, and who spoke first on second reading of the bill, the first citizen of the province unfortunately is absent. If he believed this was a major step forward, then he himself would have got up and moved it to the House and made the preliminary statement.

I noticed that in regard to this bill—I cannot read the mind of the first citizen—but in regard to the bill, I noticed that if you observe him in this House and as he goes about the province in his public sphere, you know what the rest of the 78 are thinking and doing, because they all merely reflect and parrot what he says from time to time.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sopha: I noticed a certain willingness to banter in his attitude—

Mr. MacDonald: What about the hon. member for St. George? He is sometimes obstreperous.

Mr. Sopha: That may be so.

I was impressed—indeed, I was shocked and dismayed—to learn that 1,800,000 citizens in this province need to be subsidized—more than 25 per cent of the people who live in this province. I would not have dreamed, even in the wildest state of hallucination, that more than 25 per cent of our population live on the edge of poverty. That is to say, one out of four of the residents of this province—which other hon. members have described as the “affluent society,” which we proclaim to be the richest, the wealthiest, the most industrial province of the nation—one out

of the four apparently live in a state of suspended animation, where they are too poor to live properly and too rich to die.

If that be so, it is a pocket of poverty that you will not put in a vest pocket, in the war of the several governments on poverty. It might be interesting at this point to reflect on how the citizens of this province manage to pay for the Ontario hospital services coverage. Here are the figures; very current; from an absolutely reliable source, the commission itself: 4,866,723 are covered by reason of the regulation that industry or businesses having 15 or more are required to enrol.

Compulsory, that is the word, the shibboleth, the red herring that is trotted across to us. Is it an assault on human dignity to be required to have a driver's licence? Is it an assault on human dignity, is it a detraction from freedom, for an employer to be required to pay the total of the benefits into the workmen's compensation fund? Such artificiality that is used to defend this piece of legislation!

Then, 1,613,406 pay direct. There are 66,782 in the armed forces, for which the federal government pays. The indigent—324,308. That makes a total of 6,871,219 souls in the province. Then we are informed that about 65,000, less than one per cent, are not covered.

So, my reasoning from these figures is that apparently all but 324,308 people, through one means or another, are able to make their contribution toward the securing of the protection that hospital insurance gives, without having to go cap in hand to the public purse; without suffering the scrutiny of the bureaucracy; without being put in a position of a recipient of charity. And what greater assault on human dignity is there than that? All but 324,000 can make some form of payment.

Mr. Singer: Is that compulsion?

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend from Downsview asks is that compulsion? I never heard a constituent complain about compulsion of hospital care coverage. I have heard a good many of them thank a merciful providence that we have it, and that they were not faced with crippling financial distress by having to meet the burden of a hospital bill that piles up at the rate of \$22 to \$25 per day.

Then, where does this 1,800,000 figure come from? Or to put it another way, is this a gigantic bribe to 25 per cent of our population? Those people rely upon the concept of free enterprise, which, in many cases, is neither enterprise nor free. These people speak the maxims that were suitable to the late years of the 18th century, the philosophy

of Adam Smith, about individual initiative and all that sort of thing.

Mr. Bryden: He was one of the Liberals.

Mr. Sopha: Is there not some concept in their mind that there is an assault on human dignity if you thrust charity on a person? Or to put that another way, for purposes of clarity, does one not conjure up in his mind that there is a certain measure of pride in the individual, that he is making some contribution himself to his welfare? Or is the hon. Minister of Health, who brought up this figure, saying to us and to the people of Ontario, that 1,800,000 of our people are content to go to the public trough and ask for a subsidy? If that is the position he takes, then I say to the hon. Minister that I do not believe that rubbish for a moment.

The next thing that impressed me about this debate, was the attitude of our hon. friends in the NDP. When I was getting ready for the minor contribution that I will make to the second reading, I thought to myself, here is one place and a principle where we may stand together to make an assault on this government.

Mr. Bryden: If you will just stay with your present position, we will welcome you.

Mr. Sopha: I am telling the House what has always been my position in the realm of social welfare. I am talking about my social philosophy. It has never changed since the days that I went to university. But I am asking my hon. friends, is it not better for the well-being of the people of Ontario that we present a united front against this?

Mr. Bryden: We rejoice at your conversion.

Mr. Sopha: For us—and I speak on behalf of my party, though I have never consulted them about it—I say with assurance that we are content to go to the people of Ontario on this issue. We are content to make this an election issue.

Now we are able to reveal to the public from the public rostrums, the outlines, the skeleton of what the government proposes in the field of health care, instead of having to battle with the smokey, shadowy substance of the hon. Prime Minister of this province on the electronic medium, backed by millions of dollars in his political campaign treasury, and checking off against health care and saying “done” as he did in the election campaign of 1963.

As an aside—it was not really one of the things that impressed me—I noticed the ferocious scribbling of the hon. Minister of

Health throughout the debate. Every once in a while he takes up pen and he notes down something that is being said on this side of the House. I look forward to his participation in this debate, when he gives himself the opportunity to meet and attempt to defeat and to muster arguments against the things we are saying are wrong with this legislation.

I know in every sinew of my body, I know in my heart, that this legislation is wrong. This bill is shameful. It is a shameful delusion, wreaked upon the people of Ontario.

All afternoon I have been watching the comings and goings of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and now that I have reached this point I am delighted to see that he is in his seat. I want to say to the hon. Minister of Education that I hope that at some point in this debate, he will rise in his place.

Mr. Speaker: I would inform the member that he is always supposed to speak through the Chair to the House, and not to particular individuals on the other side of the House, or even on his own side of the House.

Yesterday, and the day before—or last week rather—we had occasion where members were speaking directly to the Minister and saying, “you said this,” and “you did that,” and making personal conversation to each of the individuals whom they were addressing. I would say that was wrong, and you should always address the House through the Chair, and thus to the House as a whole.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I would say that several times this afternoon I have used the phrase, “I say to the hon. Minister through you.” I am in the habit of doing that. I was not, I assure Your Honour, speaking directly to the hon. Minister of Education, without regard to Your Honour’s dignity as the chairman of the House. May I add, as an addendum, that I hope we will soon see the end of the pernicious device that has grown up in this House, of hon. members of this House referring to other hon. members by their first names. It is only in this session that it has grown, and I hope there is a surcease put to it. I believe in the dignity of Parliament too much to allow those things to come seeping in.

Through you, Your Honour, to the hon. Minister of Education, I challenge him to rise in his place, occupant as he is of perhaps the most important portfolio in the government, and explain to me—there may be others that

are interested—what is the difference between compulsion in the field of education and compulsion in the field of medical care?

Perhaps from a philosophical point of view, education is the care and training of the mind. Fundamentally, it is nothing more than that. It is a very complex field, but it boils down to that—care and training of the mind. Throughout our history as a province, we have exercised compulsion in the field of education. Parents have no choice but to train their children's minds, to care for their minds, and they must send their children to school. Indeed, if they do not they are in danger of going to jail. The statute so provides.

Medical care, medical health insurance, is care of the body in the same way as education is care of the mind.

Then, if we exercise compulsion on the one hand toward the mind, what philosophical argument is there against exercising compulsion in being concerned and accepting responsibility for the well-being of the body of our citizens and, indeed, their minds? Mental illness is taken care of on the same basis as any other illness.

So I hope the hon. Minister of Education, Your Honour, has understood the challenge that I hand to him. We are indeed fortunate, I say, and I do not want to wound any feelings, we are indeed fortunate in this province to have a Minister of Education who fights for education. But we do not have a Minister of Health who fights for health in the same way, I am sad to say.

I want to say, by way of interpolation to my next remark, that I have a profound admiration for the man who occupies the Cabinet portfolio as Minister of Health. As a man, as a person, he has great humanitarian instincts. He is easy to talk to, he is understanding. But having said that, I go on to say that it is perhaps unfortunate that the incumbent of that portfolio is a medical doctor. I learned at the knee of Professor R. McGregor Dawson that it is a fatal mistake in the choosing of Cabinet colleagues to take a man who is a professional in the field of the portfolio that he is to administer.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): We have a lawyer as Attorney General.

Mr. Sopha: We have to have.

An hon. member: Lawyers stick together!

Mr. Sopha: We have to have. But we do not have to have a doctor as Minister of Health; and in most cases in our system the

Minister of Health has not been a doctor; I cannot recall during my lifetime that the Minister of Health in the federal government has been a doctor.

The unfortunate part about it is—against this background of having the intelligent amateur of high administrative ability in a portfolio—the unfortunate thing is that a medical doctor comes to this department with intellectual predisposition. He cannot put himself outside the society in which he has grown up. His society is composed of the medical profession, his brethren in the profession; and as a medical doctor he would be inclined to be influenced by their desires and their wishes.

Several hon. members: Let us get back to the bill.

Mr. Sopha: I cannot imagine anything more closely connected to this bill than to treat of its genesis, how it came about to this form, doctor and insurance company oriented as it is.

Now to go back to the text I was attempting to develop and to elucidate: These people who talk about freedom, these people who talk about the voluntary nature of the scheme, these people who want to leave something, some decisions, to the individual—the words of the hon. Prime Minister—I say to them that if they are truly concerned about freedom, that I have learned from our history and from my observation that without security there can be no real freedom.

Small comfort to a man suffering the terminal stages of cancer of the pancreas, to say: "Well, at least I had the volition, I had the free will to join the plan or not." As well as it is small comfort to the individual who is without employment to say: "Well, at least I live in a free society." That does not put any food in his children's stomachs, that does not make him feel any better.

As Liberals, we believe that freedom can only be realized within the framework of economic security. When people have economic and physical well-being and security, then they can be truly free. They can be free within that environment.

An hon. member: What is the number of that bill?

Mr. Sopha: The whole history of this 20th century has been the intervention of the state on behalf of the individual, to secure to him that attitude of mind where he is relieved of the worry about pain and suffering and financial distress and economic dislocation.

That is the march of the time; and we live in times of great change, great change. He who sits back, or mounts the public platform and starts to talk about securing to the individual his freedom to make decisions, he who holds up on high as a shining banner and says, "We do not want to impose things upon the individual," he flies in the face of the history of this whole century. Those comments were suitable before the first day of January, 1900, but they are no longer suitable.

The truth is that in all fields of human endeavour we interfere with the individual, and we interfere with him in the name of the greatest good for the greatest number, in the name of public welfare, in almost every sector of his life.

In another aspect, he who is truly liberal, liberal in the sense that Emmett Hall is liberal, believes that the equitable distribution of the goods we produce among those who produce them is the proper philosophical approach, that is what social welfare is.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Do not get mad.

Mr. Sopha: I say to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions I am not getting mad at anyone. The whole philosophical concept of this century has been the march toward the more equitable distribution of the goods we produce among those who produce them. That is what Mr. Justice Hall said in the quotation that I read: He said this is another means of distributing the wealth of this country among all its citizens; to provide him with health care, to ensure indeed that every citizen has available to him the best that medical science can give. He put it in another way; he said there is a terrifying gap between the state of our medical knowledge in this country and the availability of that knowledge to the great mass of our citizens.

Now I have heard and I have listened to the debates; and I heard money being talked by every speaker. Every speaker emphasized the money aspect. But in humility I say to them, to those who are concerned about the money, the financial aspect of an appropriate and adequate system of medical care is not the most important aspect. Whether it costs \$150 or \$175 or \$200 or costs 5.4 per cent of the gross national product or six per cent; that is only a minor and ancillary matter. Listen to the words of Mr. Justice Hall on that score:

It became clear as we entered upon our hearings that two factors in particular were going to pose special difficulties. One was the haphazard approach of organizations

and government to the search for solution to the problem of providing a measure of health care for Canadians. The second was the overemphasis given to Medicare. This latter factor threatened to overshadow the broad purpose of the inquiry.

No one would suggest that the payment of medical bills is not an important item, but it is, after all, but one item in the full range of health services and in any objective approach it could not be permitted to dominate the whole field.

Now this remarkable document, the report of the Royal commission on health services—against which, I am a person who uses selective words, Your Honour, against this blue covered one, Tory blue, pales into insignificance of rubbish—this document, which is the background of our amendment, the basis on which we have phrased the amendment we present to the second reading of this bill; this document was four years in preparation, in its two volumes and several hundreds of pages.

The commission listened to 400 briefs; they commissioned 27 separate studies in the field of health care. Canadians have had the habit, in almost every sector of their lives that whenever a problem comes up, Canadians are unique in that they institute a Royal commission. So help me, I would not be surprised that if atom bombs were flying over Greenland that somebody in this country would propose a Royal commission to investigate.

An hon. member: The Liberals!

Mr. Sopha: They have had the habit, having imposed the Royal commission, of taking the Royal commission report and putting it on the shelf—the darkest, deepest, most dusty of the shelves—and there letting it lie until eternity. But I have a feeling—I do not only have the feeling, I know in my bones—that this Royal commission is not going to suffer that fate.

And that for three reasons: (1) Because it is a penetrating analysis into one of the most important sectors of our national life.

(2) Because the subject-matter of this Royal commission is in the political context—Medicare, medical health insurance, is now a political matter in this country. It is political in the sense that the majority of the people who take an interest in public affairs, which is the majority of the people in the country, have an opinion about it. Everyone has an opinion about Medicare. I made a private little survey. Everybody I speak to has something to say about it; it is a subject of thought

and reflection and consideration; because after all with humans nothing strikes more deeply than illness, illness and injury.

(3) Because the man who chaired the commission will fight for it. No sooner were the reports published than he was in this city and he was battling on behalf of his report. He took on an august organization like the Canadian tax foundation. He took them on, fair square, heels dug into the rug like mine are.

Mr. P. J. Yakubuski (Renfrew South): The hon. member's heels dug in!

Mr. Sopha: He is ready to fight for the implementation of this report, and it is an appropriate place to say that if the hon. Prime Minister and the members of his executive council believe in the principle of a national health scheme, if they fully believe in that, then all they need do, this is a simple move, is say to the federal government, we are ready to co-operate with you in a national scheme.

Mr. Reilly: Why do they not say it?

Mr. Sopha: If Ontario said that, if Ontario said that to the federal government, then within a very short space of time, it is my own view, Canada, Canadians from coast to coast, would be the beneficiaries of a national health care scheme.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What about Quebec?

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to digress, but I would expect as in the pension field, I would expect that Quebec would not go in.

Mr. Yakubuski: The hon. member would expect!

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to digress, but I would think that the temper in Quebec is such now that they would be reluctant to become a part of it.

Mr. Yakubuski: You would not be sure, though.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sopha: But remember this, apart from the attitude of Quebec, we in Ontario, we are the very fulcrum of this country.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What about the British Columbia scheme?

Mr. Sopha: We are the very centre of the scale. We in Ontario, after all, were the main stimulators toward confederation of this country; we started the idea of confederation in this country.

Mr. Yakubuski: No, not really.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: We in Ontario have a healthier attitude towards the power of the central government, I have said in this House before, than any other—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am afraid we are getting away from the principles of the bill or the amendment and I would ask the member speaking to try to confine himself to the principles contained within this bill. At the same time, I would ask some of the other members in the House who are making interjections to desist as it would enable the speaker to stick to the second reading better without these many interruptions.

Mr. Sopha: Fine, sir. The hon. Prime Minister asked me a question, and I thought it polite to answer him.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am enjoying the hon. member's speech very much, digressions or no.

Mr. Sopha: We in this party believe in a national scheme. We say in our amendment—in order to relate this to the business before the House—we say in the last paragraph of the amendment that the bill should be revised so that it might be easily integrated or readily integrated into a national scheme. We in Ontario have always been most generous—and this is a thing about which we can be proud—in our attitude to sharing the wealth of this province with the less fortunate areas of this Confederation. We can be justly proud of that without going into the details, although we hear complaints from time to time about the tremendous amount of income tax and corporation tax that is collected in this province by the federal government.

To be true to our history and our tradition, we in Ontario ought to be the prime motivator of a national scheme of health insurance for all Canadians.

Now, sir, having said that, I want to return for a moment to this report that I referred to in that very kind language a moment ago—the report of the Hagey commission. It really astounds me that you can have a number of doctors as part of the Hall commission, and a number of doctors as part of the Hagey commission, and the medical men can come to contradictory conclusions. With the same facts before them, with the same time for reflection, they can come to opposite results!

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Sounds like the lawyers!

Mr. Sopha: The medical men on the Hall commission unreservedly supported the principle of a government-operated scheme. The medical men on the Hagey commission are cut of a different stripe. They support the voluntary nature of a scheme, and a scheme that is carried by private carriers. It is interesting to note that the government did exactly the same thing as it did in The Hospital Services Commission Act. The Act was introduced as a trial balloon in 1956 but it was not passed; it was reintroduced in revised form in 1957, and it passed. This government introduced Bill 163, but it departed from the practice in hospital care insurance and it established a Royal commission in order to make suggestions about the revision of the bill. But the Royal commission that looked into the provisions of Bill 163, sir, had the cards stacked against it before it started. The dice were loaded before it embarked upon its inquiry. Listen to this, the remarks of the report:

The investigation was brought but the committee's recommendations and decisions deal primarily with "matters related to and consonant with" the basic principles, purposes and objectives of Bill 163 of the 1962-63 session of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario respecting medical services insurance.

Note those words—matters related to and consonant with, the purposes and objectives. In other words, one gets the impression that they are not supposed to look into any matters that are not consonant with the purposes; one almost gets the impression that they are not supposed to hear conflicting opinions about it. Now I will expand on that in a moment. They go on to say:

The primary task in the view of the commissioners was to examine the feasibility of the approach to medical services insurance taken by the government in Bill 163, to suggest such changes in detail as would make the bill effective to the fullest extent, and to propose in the form of amendments to the bill or administrative regulations the organization and procedures needed for a programme of medical services insurance in Ontario, operated by private carriers rather than by government.

In other words, instead of making the scope of the inquiry broad enough to encounter opinions from people as to what form of medical care they wanted or they thought

feasible, the government loads the dice against that type of inquiry, and restricts this commission to an examination of the feasibility of the bill which had been introduced.

In other words, to put it in a nutshell, we never had a Royal commission of inquiry in this province, of the nature of the Hall commission. The government made up its mind; the hon. Minister of Health made up his mind. Indeed, his mind has been made up, one gets the impression, since he was a lad in the 1920s about this; he exhibits an inflexibility of mind. He and the executive council have made up their mind that we are going to have a system of medical care insurance in this province, financed by private carriers, and no other suggestions would be welcome to the Hagey commission.

The public, which, after all, in the final result, in spite of Barnum, cannot be fooled—you cannot fool the public—must have divined that that was the attitude of this government, with its overpowering majority; that it was, if you will pardon the expression, hell-bent on a scheme that would be based upon profit, and not upon need. The response of the public to this commission was not very great. They heard, I think it was, subject to correction, 57 briefs. That is all, in contrast to the 400 heard by the Hall commission. I do not know the reason: Whether they did not encourage the presentation of briefs, or whether they were restrictive in their invitations to people who might present briefs. Certainly they never looked into the other side of the coin, and the other side of the medal is this basic question. Is a government-operated scheme more suitable for the well-being and the best interests of the people of this province than the scheme envisaged in this bill, which my friend, the hon. member for Parkdale and I detest so mightily? That is the basic question.

I give it as my opinion, as the clock approaches 6 o'clock, that almost everybody in this province is against this type of medical care insurance. Farmers are against it, trade unionists are against it. Social workers are against it. Many people in the medical profession are against it. Most people in the middle-income groups—the forgotten men in our society—are against it. This is the man that makes the moderate income. His children belong to the Girl Guides. He goes to church. He obeys the law. He pays his taxes. You never hear of him, because he does not do anything abnormal; he does not do anything exciting. Most of the time he prays, but more often, he pays. That is the for-

gotten man—the middle-income group that make the very fabric and the bulwark of our society. He is against this bill.

The only organization in the country that appears to support a plan like this is the Tory party.

Mr. Bryden: The Ontario medical association.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. The Tory party; they are part of it. I say to the hon. Minister of Health, and this is the only comment I am going to make about them, that there is a reactionary wing of the medical profession, composed largely of two types of individuals. One is that type who is making so much money that he is afraid that any scheme of government-operated insurance would make him disclose the amount of money that he is making—probably, in many cases, something

in the order of \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year. That is the reactionary wing of the Tory party.

There is another group. The disaffected doctors from Britain—a small group of disaffected, noisy doctors who preferred to emigrate from Britain and come to this country. Indeed, the hon. Minister of Health and I know personally that quite a number of them ended up in Sudbury. Indeed, one of the strongest antagonists to this, and to any form of state intervention in the health care field, was the president of the Ontario medical association, who was one of the disaffected emigrants from Britain, and who practised law. He is a very good practitioner in the city of Sudbury.

May we call it 6 o'clock, sir?

It being 6 o'clock, the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, May 26, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	3273
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3293
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3293

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE (continued)

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, one cannot feel that one can always command a good House, and that I suppose depends upon the time of day. However, one feels that that does not in any way impair the validity of his remarks.

I was reflecting on the fact that it is my opinion, and an opinion shared by a good many people in this country, that the reactionary wing of the medical profession has had more attention paid to it and more influence upon government policy in connection with this bill than it deserves.

I was referring to the important part played in this whole affair, in the genesis of this statute, our approach to medical care insurance, by that disaffected minority of doctors who came from the United Kingdom. Again I refer to the fact that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) is not an amateur. He is a professional man, and he has a rapport with these people. He is a member of the brethren with them, and because of his intellectual predisposition he cannot help but pay very close attention to what they say to him; and what they have said to him, we charge, is incorporated in the body of this statute.

It always strikes me as something quite remarkable, sir—perhaps I should not refer to it and sometimes I am known for my bluntness—that the Anglo-Saxon, when he gets off the boat in Montreal, is ready to run the country the next day. It would take the central European two generations to get into the swing of public life. These people—and I know some of them personally—were disaffected, disenchanted, perhaps disillusioned by the national health scheme in Great Britain enacted in 1948 or 1949, and they preferred to emigrate to this country.

Right in my own community, right at the height of the debate about the type of plan that this province was going to have—and, as I say, at that time one of the immigrants was president of the Ontario medical association and no doubt the hon. Minister of Health had heard his views at a close inter-

personal level—I made it a point to conduct another little survey among other members of the medical profession. I was struck by the number of times that I heard other members of the medical profession say: "That group does not speak for me. I do not necessarily believe the sort of thing that they are expostulating as being the views of all the medical profession of this province."

Now, it might be apt to compare the attitude of lawyers and doctors in this connection. It might be helpful. I never heard one wail, not even a whimper of protest about the report tabled in this Legislature on a system of legal aid. I have yet to meet a member of the legal profession who believes that because there is government intervention in the realm of subsidizing people who cannot afford legal advice, that the profession is going to have its rights, liberties and freedoms in any way impaired. The legal profession, as the medical profession, has been content to give its services free of charge. They have been happy to do so.

I am sure I speak for the great majority of the members of the legal profession when I say that they would be content to continue to handle the legal affairs of those who are unable to pay in much the same way as they have been doing. However, the legal profession has the view that if the state, the government, can come up with a better system that will ensure more adequate coverage of the population, which will create a better system of giving legal assistance, then the profession is content to go along with it and without the wails of protest that one hears from the medical profession.

I have only made an excursion into that realm in order to get at the genesis of this bill. This bill must have come from some place; somebody must have dreamed it up. In fact, I have to—and I do not use this merely as a figure of speech—continue to pinch myself into reality that the government is serious about this bill. I can scarcely believe that the government is serious in foisting a half-baked system of medical care on the people of this province in confrontation of the very penetrating analysis of the health needs of the people of Canada conducted by the Hall commission report.

In other words, we would be in a bad

way if we stood in this House and emitted large quantities of oxygen against the principle of this bill, and were not buttressed by the Hall report. The Hall report is the touchstone of our argument. We hold it up in challenge and we defy any person, be it the hon. Minister of Health or anyone expert in the field of health care, and we say: "Show us a better analysis of the health needs of the Canadian people than this one," and we will stand or fall upon it.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am merely seeking, with my own limited capacities, to explore the philosophical basis that brings this type of legislation into this House as a mere routine bill. That is how it came in; it is a mere routine bill introduced by the hon. Minister responsible for the department under whose responsibility it comes. This is not, and is not proclaimed to be, as far as I can gather, a major step forward in health insurance in Ontario. Now, I leave that.

There are Tories and Tories. I thought the comments of the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) about the Tory connection with this bill were very apt. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) sometimes bruises easily. He has a type of dermatitis. I am not being unkind, but he bruises easily and that seemed to hurt him this afternoon when the hon. member for Woodbine said that, because he responded as though he had been stimulated by the point of a pin when the hon. member kept referring to that.

I thought it was very valid; I thought it was very apt to show the connection of this bill with typical Tory philosophy. Now there are Tories and Tories. There are the Tories who wrote the Royal commission on health services, and there are other Tories that wrote that Hagey report.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would remind the member that although this amendment is quite wide and has several sections to it and gives him a great deal of latitude, I think that at times he is straying perhaps a little too widely in his philosophy. I would ask the member to stick to the amendment a little more closely, if he could.

Mr. Sopha: Very well. There are Tories—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

I would remind members that I will keep the members speaking in order, and would ask them to await leave from the Chair to speak instead of interjecting.

Mr. Sopha: There is the one Tory, and I look across at some of them, Mr. Speaker, and

I do not see how they can support this bill. I do not see how the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) can support it; I do not see how my alumnus, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) can support it—to name two who deserve the appellation "progressive."

There is the one who, in connection with this bill says "They"—meaning the people—"simply do not want everything taken away from them by the state." That is a handsome statement.

Then there is the other type; and I want to read something to indicate the point of view of the other type. I hope you will agree with me, sir, that there is almost a perfect analogy with hospital care insurance and with medical care insurance.

Hon. Leslie M. Frost moved first reading of the bill intitled, The Hospital Services Commission Act, 1957. He said:

Mr. Speaker, in giving a very short explanation of this bill, because there has been considerable explanation given in the House heretofore, may I read the preamble which is part of the bill?

He read it.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the whole intent of this bill. The first part of the bill is really a re-enactment of the bill we passed last year. The second part of the bill deals with the needs of a hospital care insurance plan. I think it is thoroughly apparent to hon. members of this House that the action we must take under this bill is predicated at the present time on an agreement which is encompassed by the Porter-Martin correspondence, which was tabled in the House a few days ago.

Then he goes on to deal with the form of that agreement with the federal government and there is a brilliant interpolation, interjection, by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and then he continues:

I would not like to say—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The hon. member would not like to say what the interpolation was?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Yes, I will read it. It is very germane to this discussion.

May I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question? He said the plan would have to be cleared with the other provinces. What I want to get at is this, is it a fact that Ontario has moved closer toward the final composition of a plan than any other of the provinces?

That is the interjection of the hon. member for Grey South. That fits perfectly with what I was saying this afternoon about Ontario's responsibility to be the leader.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Why is there no interjection from over there?

Mr. Sopha: Just forgive me, Mr. Speaker, while I—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Finds his place?

Mr. Sopha: Now, let me continue.

But perhaps in moving the second reading of this bill, I can make some comments from just a little different angle. I am moved to do this because I received comments from varying points of view. One of the points of view that I received from some people is the fact that this type of legislation goes too far, that it is involving the government and the public in commitments in what might be termed business which goes beyond the realm of government.

Now is that not a perfect antithesis to the remarks that I read of the hon. Prime Minister of this province at the present time? —

Mr. MacDonald: Socialism.

That is even worse. You see, this reads like a CBC script.

Hon. Mr. Frost: I may say I have always been open to new ideas, and I hope I will always remain that way.

Mr. MacDonald: Even if it is socialism?

Hon. Mr. Frost: I think I have been practical in that way, I have been practical in regard to these matters. I do not profess to be a reactionary. I profess to be a member of the most progressive of all political parties, the Progressive-Conservative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Now, having made that bland and utterly indefensible statement, he feels an immediate need to come to the defence of it, for he says:

I have no apologies for that.

So he, too, is sensitive.

I think I belong to a school of thought that is very progressive. However, in line with what the hon. member says, I made this note or two before I came in here.

Just hearken to these words.

In some quarters, I am glad to say few

and small, there is always a somewhat hysterical opposition to a project such as I propose to the House this afternoon in the form of second reading of this bill. I point out that the social system in Canada, if one wants to use the hon. member's expression, is socialistic in a sense.

Mr. MacDonald: So is our educational system.

Hon. Mr. Frost: That is right. However, I would say to the hon. member that my references to practical socialism and the application of it are quite different from some of the things that the hon. member has advocated, and some of the thoughts that were notably in the Regina manifesto that he threw into the bay. I come from a progressive school of thought, and a line of progressive political thought, and I am advancing one more change in this House this afternoon in the same sense this applies to our great water programme.

He then goes on to say something about the hydro-electric power commission. Then he goes on:

Insurance companies operating in Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: I confess that I cannot follow the analogy that the member is trying to relate in answer to the various clauses in the amendment proposed here by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson). If he can point out to me the analogy a little more clearly, I shall let him carry on with *Hansard*, otherwise I would like him to get back on to the amendment which is before the House.

Mr. Sopha: I am completely subservient to you; I will obey your directions. I thought, as well as the amendment, that I was speaking to second reading of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is before the House at this time.

Mr. Sopha: I thought this was a time when we make composite speeches both on the second reading and on the amendment.

The hon. Minister of Health, in introducing the bill, said this. The hon. member for Woodbine read it:

It will be voluntary. Although many cry for compulsion, an equal or even greater number cry out against it. The records in Ontario show that, given the opportunity, our people do not want, do not like and would rather not have compulsion.

I am merely demonstrating that if that is part of his, the hon. Minister of Health's,

political philosophy, I am showing that there have been great Conservatives in the political life of this province who have different philosophies than that. We are asking for an extension of the benefits of medical care in line with the Hall report on a compulsory, universal, comprehensive basis and I was making the point of using the analogy of the hospital services insurance scheme. I want to read one more brief excerpt:

Insurance companies operating in Ontario have done a very marvellous job and I want to pay a compliment to those who are operating in Ontario and I hope they will continue to operate in Ontario and I know that they will. At the present time, we have between 3.5 and 4 million people covered by policies of private insurance companies. They may be co-operatives or they may be other types of companies but, in any event, they are not government subsidized companies. We have between 3.5 and 4 million of our people covered by policies that give them only partial coverage in regard to hospitalization. As with the case of power companies 50 years ago, it is impossible for these fine insurance companies, in any practicable combination I know of, to give to all of our people, regardless of the condition of health, financial circumstances and other conditions, complete hospital coverage which would be universal to all our people.

My point is that you could take those words of Mr. Frost, uttered on March 28, 1957, and you could translate them without the change of a comma to the principle of medical care. The words are as applicable, in our view, to medical care as they are to hospital insurance. He said that private companies cannot provide an adequate standard of hospital care. We say that private companies cannot provide adequate standards of medical care insurance, and upon that foundation we rest our case.

If we are wrong the electorate will tell us we are wrong, but we are convinced that we are right.

Now there are various types of Tory philosophy. Let me read this one.

In our complex society the individual has turned to government for assistance and government has responded by introducing broad social welfare and economic measures which provide basic services to the population. In the past 20 years there has been a steady shift in the nature of the demand for government services. While we still must provide such services as roads, water, schools, hospitals, more and more

are we concerned with such measures as medical insurance, municipal planning, pensions, pollution control, post-secondary school education, welfare, hospital insurance, and many other programmes in the field of human capital and human betterment.

Apparently Tories can talk out of both sides of their mouth at once. They can say that in a significant document, the Speech from the Throne, and yet at another time and another place the hon. Minister of Health can say people revolt against compulsion. Compulsion in the orderly development of the state and in the use of those powers that only government has.

Government is unique. Compulsion, then, is the hallmark and, to analogize to the phrase used this afternoon, not compulsion for compulsion's sake, but compulsion in the orderly use of our resources to meet the greatest good of the greatest number. Again I say, and it could not be re-emphasized too much, that that is in the context that there can be no freedom, there can be no liberty, without security, the security of a state of health and economic security.

The British North America Act, I reflect, assigns to the province responsibility for health. The federal government is limited in its scope until it meets a responsive chord among the provinces for the development of a national plan. We charge that health, one of our most precious assets, is not receiving the attention that it deserves here within this province.

Again I reflect, sir, and not for the sake of repetition, that we have presently a great emphasis on education. I do not want to be laborious and I do not want to be flattering, but it appears that the hon. Minister of Education has taken hold of our whole educational field and he is bent-out of whatever stimuli that motivate him, maybe he has hyperthyroid glands, I do not know—but he is bent on revising and reforming and changing the whole thing.

Sometimes one wonders how much co-operation he gets from his hon. colleagues on the Treasury benches; but we wish there was the same concern about things of the body, about the health of the body. We see in this bill before the House that there is a marked difference in approach, Your Honour, to the care of the body than there is to the care of the mind. I am one of those that is suspicious when I see the old hackneyed phrases, the old shibboleths, being trotted out, plus some other arguments of an economic nature.

They say we have not got enough doctors. The hon. Minister of Health wails there is only one doctor to 976 persons in Ontario. Well, we might aptly ask: Whose fault is that? Whose fault is it? This party has been in power for 22 years. It had the opportunity over that space of two decades or more to build medical schools, to entice people into the very honoured and very historic profession of medicine. It occurred to me back in 1947, when I was told that that building over on St. George Street housed the only dental college in the province, the thought occurred to me a priori, in a state of ignorance, that that was not sufficient to meet the needs of our children, that great harvest of war babies that were coming along in the sixties.

Now I read to my dismay in the popular press that the services of an orthodontist have become a status symbol in this province. If you live in certain parts of the sprawling metropolitan area, then it is a matter of prestige if the child has his teeth wired up. He is different, he is better, he is higher in the social scale than the little boy from Cabbagetown. That makes me reflect about the pernicious aspect of this legislation, that I could conceive in my own mind that two children might be in the schoolyard of one of the schools of the hon. Minister of Education comparing their appendectomies and one would say to the other, "My father paid for my operation, yours did not"—class distinction.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Not at all, not at all, I could very well conceive that. I can very well conceive that, children's minds being what they are.

On the public dole! I can remember when I was a child, if hon. members want to get serious about this, I can remember when I was a child having to suffer the brunt of being told that my family was on relief. I can recall that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member had no corner on that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. Minister has forgotten about it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is what the hon. member thinks, he does not know what poverty is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: Then to haul in arguments of this type is unworthy of a person occupying

the position of Minister of Health. Listen to this one:

Surely we have had clear and unmistakable evidence that compulsion brings in its wake many and great problems. Scarcely a month passes in which we do not read of the difficulties arising in nations and states where compulsory schemes have been introduced and imposed upon the people—France, Belgium, Italy, all have had serious difficulties within recent months with services not available because doctors were on strike.

Is the hon. Minister of Education suggesting that if we have a programme, a plan of national, universal, comprehensive medical insurance, that the medical profession in this province, in this country, is going to go on strike? Is he seriously suggesting that? I am sorry, the hon. Minister of Health. Is the hon. Minister of Health seriously suggesting that, or does he just use words for the sake of filling up the allotted time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You are a past-master at that.

Mr. Sopha: Then he goes on, carried away by his own exuberance in superficiality.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is the pot calling the kettle black.

Mr. Sopha: He says: "Britain is presently facing serious trouble with the plan there."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Is that not so?

Mr. Sopha: Where is the evidence? Where is the documentation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: All around the hon. member!

Mr. Sopha: Where is the documentation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Read the British press.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

I would remind the members that the speaker is asking rhetorical questions and therefore they do not require an answer.

Mr. Sopha: He answers and I quote:

There will be no dramatic revolt by doctors such as occurred in Saskatchewan if the proposals set forth by the Royal commission on health services are adopted as law, said Hon. Matthew B. Dymond, MD, Ontario Minister of Health, here Monday night. Speaking as a doctor I have too much conscience to revolt like that.

I can't see the doctors across the country just giving up their patients to battle a national health plan. I don't think there will be a stream of younger doctors out of Canada either if such a plan is put into force.

The Windsor *Star*, September, 1964. He answered.

Having made the speech in Windsor, I ask him through you, sir, when the hon. Minister gets up, when he is going to speak, will he tell us why he included this pernicious paragraph in his remarks in introducing this bill in first reading?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because I thought it very apropos.

Mr. Sopha: Then he goes on: "Need I remind the hon. members about what happened in Saskatchewan?"

Now what happened in Saskatchewan? This report tells us that the plan in Saskatchewan is working very successfully.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Ask Tommy Douglas!

Mr. Sopha: Val Sears of the Toronto *Daily Star* went across the country examining various medical care plans and he compared the Saskatchewan plan to the Alberta plan, much to the disadvantage of the latter. He reported to us as a result of his studies that in Saskatchewan, the plan being subsidized by the public purse, that the family of two or more pays \$24 a year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And is Val an authority?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He is?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am saying he is a reporter; but I buttress myself much more strongly on the remarks of this document, which I have read from cover to cover, with the exception of some of the statistical summaries in it. The report of Mr. Justice Hall is that the plan is working very finely in Saskatchewan; and if hon. members want to know about doctors, I happen to have noted that after the plan went into the effect the increase in doctors amounted to 50, between the years 1962 and 1963. Instead of doctors leaving Saskatchewan, they were in fact coming in.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): What happened to the specialists? They left. They all left.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: One hundred left, but only 50 came back.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I also read with some interest that the average salary in Saskatchewan was \$26,000 a year.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Too much!

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I think that is too much. As a matter of fact, one of the pillars of the medical profession made a speech which I read some months ago in which he related to his brethren of the medical profession that probably the greatest ill that affected the medical profession was that they were making too much money. They were putting the ideals of mammon ahead of those of the social needs of the community, so he said. That was one doctor talking to another. The same thought might well be ascribed to the profession of which I am a member, and I readily admit it.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Oh, I would not do that.

Mr. Sopha: Basically—and I am taking the opportunity to examine the philosophical basis of the approach the government makes, and the approach we would make, if we were charged with the responsibility—the test of any worthwhile government health insurance plan, is whether it guarantees adequate medical care to everyone as a matter of right, not of charity, regardless of ability to pay.

This bill simply does not meet that test. One of the most shocking things about this bill, I discovered in my study of it, is that twice in its pages, it refers to classes. I have never seen a piece of social legislation in the six years that I have been a member of this august assembly, that referred to the people of this province and delineated them into classes. This bill does that. Twice.

I ask the hon. Minister of Health, when he rises, to let us hear whether this government is setting up a system of classes in this province. In section six, it provides a standard medical services insurance contract for persons of such classes as are designated by the regulations:

B. Provide standard medical insurance contracts for persons of such classes as are designated by the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The lawyers wrote that.

Mr. Sopha: They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I agree with you, and I will tell them you said that.

Mr. Sopha: And I hope you will get them to revise it by withdrawing the whole thing. Not only section six, but the whole bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Too many lawyers!

Mr. Sopha: In this country, we talked about a national flag for half a century. We have considered some form of state intervention in the health field for 46 years.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That was the Liberals.

Mr. Sopha: There is no use of linking me with my ancestry. I am not responsible for those people.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I bet they did not see the hon. member in their crystal ball.

Mr. Sopha: I belong to the present party. I was a mere child. I was not born when this notion was first introduced.

You can take out of those 46 years, two significant periods. You can take out the period of the great depression, which lasted a decade of the 30s, then you can take out the period of the 40s in which the world was in a conflagration of world war. So, 20 of the 46 years can be removed.

However, we are told at this juncture of history, that is to say in the year of our Lord 1965, that we can afford the plan. We are told that in the report of the Royal commission, that the economy, the people of this country, can afford to pay for a comprehensive universal plan that will provide them with all the skills and all the knowledge and all the technical know-how that the medical profession now has to care for their health.

So, now is the time. We cannot afford, we say, to delay further. We cannot afford to reject the recommendations of this document. We cannot be satisfied, in a word, with the contents of this bill. And with the hon. member for Woodbine, with whom I am happy to be in a common cause, I hold out the olive branch to those people.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are knocking at the door to get in.

Mr. Sopha: In this great social area of social amelioration, we can make common cause, when we say that in 1965, we cannot be satisfied with the approach based on private profit that is inherent in this bill. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) dwelt very eloquently on this section, and I would say that in the Roosevelt, in the Kennedy, and the Trueman, Mackenzie King tradition, it is morally wrong for any institution or any group of persons to make a profit out of the sale of

health insurance. As a matter of philosophical basis with myself and other hon. members of this party, I say no person in this society has the right to make a profit out of illness.

I have looked at this dynamic statute. Everybody else has referred to it. I have looked at it, and it seemed to me that it talked more of insurance companies than it did about health. All kinds of provisions are interwoven into it for the protection of the insurance companies. There are all sorts of provisions for giving them the right to nominate various people to positions of influence over government policy inherent in its provisions.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, no. Only one. Be honest, at least.

Mr. Sopha: Of course, I want to be honest.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, the hon. member does not try very hard.

Mr. Sopha: I make every effort. I am referring to the right to nominate people to this group called Medical Carriers Incorporated.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, that is their own body. That is their own corporation.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, their own body, which, with government blessing, is going to sell health insurance contracts in this province.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, no, no, it is not. The hon. member has not read the bill.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it is enshrined right in the statute.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It is not statute yet.

Mr. Sopha: Then it talks a long time about the council. What is that council called?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Why does not the hon. member read the bill?

Mr. Sopha: Medical services insurance council.

Mr. Letherby: The hon. member had better give up and sit down.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Better set up a trans-fusion for him.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, would you tell the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) who has been here for more years than I, because I should not teach my grandmother to suck eggs, that it is against the rules of the House to refer to another member by his first name? I see no ringing declaration

in it about the health needs of the people of our province. It is a pretty fallow and sterile and emasculated statute in my view.

One final word. Surely a healthy nation is more important to the future of Canada than anything else in this year. Surely there is nothing we ought to be more concerned about than the health of our people. I venture to say that the health of our people ought to exercise our attention far more than the provision we make for national defence.

I would that we lived in an atmosphere of world harmony where we could take all of those resources—our goods, our youth that we divert to the defence of this country, and put them into some sort of national health care scheme for our people. That is the kind of change I welcome.

The hon. member for Woodbine referred to that statement, "no change for the sake of change." But it ought to be said that to be a true Liberal is to believe that change is welcome, so long as that change is directed toward the betterment of the lot of our people.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: A Liberal is not afraid of change, he is not afraid to meet change, he is ready to experiment, he is ready to try new devices, new measures toward the furthering of the public good. The Tory on the other hand prefers the intellectual predisposition of the status quo.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Is it not odd the hon. member has sat there for 20 years?

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister does not want change, he wants to remain as he is. He relies upon tradition.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Is that why the hon. member sat there for 20 years? He is dreaming.

Mr. Sopha: We will not always be. The best stimulus to put us on that side is for the hon. Minister of Health to adopt that attitude of divine right and conceit that he is exhibiting.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am just asking the hon. member a factual question.

Mr. Sopha: Or if he introduces a few more bills like this one, it will hasten the change.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): We will still be here and the hon. member will be over there.

An hon. member: Vote against it!

Mr. Sopha: In Canada, I say, we are not against government action, we do not fear the government. As Canadians and against the background of our history, we have grown into an attitude of trust of the government. We expect government intervention, we expect government direction. Government has operated in a friendly climate since this country became a nation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member's colleagues at Ottawa do not help him.

Mr. Sopha: Government built most of the capital works in the last years of the 19th century. Government has been accustomed to interfere in the economy to the extent of ownership of important sectors of it. The people have turned to government to meet the needs in areas of social distress.

Let me remind the hon. Minister of Health, and all else who would be willing to listen, that it is not yet 15 years since groups interested in the welfare of retarded children turned to government to fill in the vacuum, to cure the dislocation in that area and to take away the anxieties of people who were the parents of retarded children.

That part of our social philosophy and our social attitude toward government in this country is established, and it is idle for anybody on that side of the House to get up and try to attribute to our national character any fear of the spectre of government interfering in the affairs of people and taking away the ability of the individual to make decisions. That is nonsense and rubbish and deserves only to be put in the waste basket. So I say, against that background, where I have tried to explore the social philosophy, these are the things we will be pleased to say on the hustings about your bill. That no one—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): We are not a socialistic country yet.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, indeed we are.

Mr. Reilly: Oh, indeed we are not.

Mr. Sopha: Indeed we are. If the hon. member for Eglinton would but just open his eyes he would see that this is a socio-capitalistic society. If he would just come alive, he would see it. But however they view it, whatever point of view they take, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that no one, no one with a social conscience can vote for this bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that I rise along with my party to oppose the principle

enunciated in Bill 136 and support the amendment put forward by the Liberal Party. We oppose the principle of the bill because it provides a medical insurance plan with too little coverage at too high cost.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, I am sure of two things in my own mind: This piece of legislation is one of the most important that has been debated in this House since I have been a member and for many years prior to that. I believe the hospital insurance programme, which was debated, I think, in 1957 and came into effect in 1959, was one of the most important pieces of legislation.

Second, I think the volume of the report of the Royal commission on health services will be the most controversial subject that will be dealt with in this country for some time to come. I make that assumption based on the attitude of many of the provincial governments across the country.

It is surprising, Mr. Speaker, in this month of May in 1965, with so much uncertainty around the world, the great technological development, changes, the age of nuclear development, the benefits that we may derive from them and the hardships that we may face in the future because of these changes that at this time we are debating as to whether or not we will have a comprehensive medical insurance programme in the province of Ontario and eventually across Canada, when at the same time many of the countries in the western democracies have developed these programmes long ago and are now reaching out for new horizons in the social welfare field. One project of importance in many countries is income-maintenance; they have forgotten about the need and the arguments about comprehensive medical insurance programmes.

Mr. Speaker, many assertions have been made by those opposed to the principles of tax-supported universal coverage medical insurance:

1. It should be left to private enterprise since public coverage would remove the enterprise and competition of individuals;
2. If public funds are utilized, political bureaucracy will be rampant;
3. Universal tax-supported coverage will destroy the initiative and ambition;
4. Standards will be lowered;
5. Governments should only concern themselves with coverage for the needy;
6. Universal tax supported coverage is foreign to our country;
7. Requiring people to pay under universal coverage is dangerous and there is no confidence in compulsory equalization;
8. If all are covered through tax-supported funds, rancour, decay and discontent will ensue.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that all of the foregoing statements were taken from comments made in the United States 134 years ago, in 1830, by opponents of tax-supported education for all children within the population.

At that time the battle against universal tax-supported education was fought as bitterly as is the current battle by a minority against universal tax-supported coverage for medical care insurance.

Surely we must realize that good health is as essential to the well-being of a country as is the education of its people, so why must health be left to chance any more than education? Is private enterprise to dictate the terms under which we are going to treat our illnesses? Are we going to use human needs to serve the financial ends of the insurance companies?

Mr. Speaker, I repeated that—it has been said before many times—and I would suggest that the government withdraw Bill 136 and make it a requirement that all of the members of the Conservative Party who are hon. members of this Legislature read at least volume 1 of the Hall commission report. I think before they vote on this bill they should clear their conscience as Canadians and know exactly where they stand in regard to medical coverage.

As others have, I want to quote briefly from the report and I turn to page 6 in volume 1 and start at the third paragraph:

There are undoubtedly external forces causing us to explore new ways in which a democratic society can co-operate to enable its members and those of other societies to achieve a fuller life. One of these is the threat of totalitarian regimes with their professed greater concern for people. If a democracy fails to meet the legitimate aspirations of its people, there can be few who doubt that alien philosophies will win the right to try.

Another is Canada's membership in such special agencies of the United Nations as the world health organization, the international children's fund, the food and agricultural organization, the international labour office, all in some measure related to health. Apart from being bound by the various international agreements it has ratified, it should be remembered that this country, by signing the constitution of the world health organization, has subscribed to the following principles announced in the preamble to its charter:

"The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without

distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition."

"The health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security, and is dependent upon the fullest co-operation of individuals and states."

Thus, humanitarian considerations are at the source of Canada's concern with this situation, as much as her self-interest and formal international obligations.

The commission is convinced that, quite apart from humanitarian considerations, the health of Canadians is a matter of concern to us as a nation, and that no enlightened government can ignore that the economic capacity of its citizens to be productive depends upon their health and vigour as much as upon their educational attainment.

Mr. Speaker, I would quote further—just briefly—from page ten of the first volume, because I think it carries a message that all hon. members should be aware of:

The rationale of health insurance is now so well known and accepted that it scarcely needs restating. What Winston Churchill once described as "the application of averages for the relief of millions" is, in our opinion, absolutely essential for all but a small minority of wealthy Canadians. Many Canadians have availed themselves of the insurance mechanism, principally those who can afford the protection, or those who are in employment where coverage is provided or subsidized as part of their working conditions.

However large this group may be, it is not large enough. The national interest requires that the risk must be spread over the whole productive population to cover everybody, and not only those who choose to insure voluntarily. And the device must be used ultimately to finance the whole spectrum of health services, not merely hospital and physicians' services.

To make certain that all our citizens have access to the necessary health services is now clearly a matter for the public interest. That less than half of our population has some degree of reasonably adequate health insurance coverage for medical services is a matter of grave national concern, and of greater concern is the fact that few organized insurance programmes worth mentioning exist in equally important areas such as mental illness, dental, and optical care, drug requirements, retarded and crippled children.

These are the areas—environmental

controls, education, facilities, personnel and universal availability and access to services—that now clearly constitute the public interest in health care and call for public action.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That fellow Churchill was quite a Tory, too.

Mr. Bryden: He was certainly away ahead of you fellows, anyway.

Mr. Gisborn: I did not quote the Honourable Winston Churchill in total—there was just a brief reference to what he said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Always start off with a good Tory comment—

Mr. MacDonald: Apparently the hon. Minister is immune to reason—even Tory reason.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, as a boy of a family of eight, in the early 1920s, I remember the continual indebtedness of our family to the family doctor, and one of my weekly chores at that time, among many, was to go to the grocery store each Saturday and pay the grocery bill for the past week and pick up the groceries for the coming week. A second chore I had each Saturday was to take what was left to the family doctor. This was one of the religions of my father, that food came first and then the doctor must be paid, and all were in sympathy with the fact that the family doctor had to wait and take what was left. This was not just my problem; this was a problem of many.

My early family life might have been somewhat the same, and during the early 1940s my wife and daughter were stricken with scarlet fever, and my daughter was left with a rheumatic heart. I remember that at that time—1941—we were on what was called compulsory savings, and we were requested to buy victory bonds, to make the sacrifice that everyone wished to make during the war years—the rationing and restrictions of wage increases and price increases. But these supplementary savings, and the victory bonds maturing in a year went directly to my family doctor for a period of three years to the extent of \$1,800. At that time it was not just my problem. It was the problem of thousands of wage earners across the country, the continual indebtedness to medical services.

Of course, the coming of prepaid insurance programmes guaranteed, to some extent, the

doctor his fee, and of course brought some degree of protection for the wage earner.

Mr. Speaker, when I became active in the trade union movement in the early 1940s it was not just because I thought there was a need for more wages and better conditions in the steel industry, but because of my studies of the aims and objectives for many years back of the trade union movement. The aims and objectives, as far back as 50 years from that time in the old trades and labour congress and subsequently in the Canadian congress of labour, were for the benefit of the community as a whole. On the resolution books you can find today resolutions that called for adequate workmen's compensation, adequate pensions for the elderly, adequate housing, unemployment insurance and foremost of all, reiterated year after year, was the resolution in support of a comprehensive national health insurance programme.

Now I say this, Mr. Speaker, because it has been said by many, particularly one speaker from the Firestone Company of Canada on behalf of the Canadian manufacturers association, that the trade labour movement was a self-centred, selfish group trying to take everything out of industry and put nothing back into the community.

But no group was more strongly in favour of these benefits for the community than the organized trade labour movement over the years. Of course, in this particular field, there has been support by many other organizations. The Hall commission report on behalf of Her Majesty's federal government brought great hopes for achievement in the field of health care for the Canadian people, and not without the greatest effort should we let an obstacle deter its implementation. To do so would mean we have forsaken our responsibility to the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the trade union movement, as I have said, has fought strongly over the years for the kind of a programme that our party, and the Liberal Party, are in favour of, and the latest reiteration of this programme in opposition to the present legislation before us, was released by the president of the federation of labour. I would like to put it on record:

To the Honourable John P. Roberts, QC,
Prime Minister,
Province of Ontario,
Parliament Buildings,
Toronto, Ontario.

Honourable Sir:

The views of Ontario federation of labour on the matter of health care legislation have been brought to your atten-

tion on a number of occasions, and are therefore well known to you and your government.

Now that the medical services insurance bill is before the Legislature, we would again draw your attention to certain deficiencies in this proposed legislation. Specifically, our federation finds this bill unacceptable because of lack of universal coverage, the limitation of service, its high cost and its use of private carriers.

We believe any Medicare legislation must have as its basis universal coverage. This is essential if it is to provide maximum service at minimum cost. To try to equate universality and compulsion, as Health Minister Dymond seems to have done, doesn't make sense to us. With universal coverage we are convinced that a much wider range of benefits could and should be provided. Simply paying the doctor bills does not by any stretch of the imagination cover the cost of health care. Drugs, dental care, eye-glasses, preventative measures, rehabilitation and such are equally as important and at times even more costly than actual doctors' bills and should be included in any scheme.

While no specific figures are available, indications are that the cost would be very close to that recommended in the Hagey committee report. Using the \$175 a year premium suggested by the Hagey committee and adding the \$78 per year Ontario hospital services premium, a family would have to pay \$253 for the limited coverage. This represents three or four weeks wages for the average family. In addition to this, drugs, dental services, etc., would still have to be paid.

We believe this to be excessive. Much of this cost is due to the reliance on private carriers. The Hall commission estimated that by using one public carrier rather than a multiplicity of private carriers, administrative costs could be reduced substantially.

For all of these reasons we would suggest that the bill be subject to careful scrutiny and the defects remedied before your government forces its passage in the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario federation of labour, the parent body in Ontario for the affiliates of the organized trade union movement, have participated in joint co-operation to scrutinize most of the health measures and problems across the province and to carry out their responsibilities in drawing public attention to this medical insurance bill. They

did on Friday, May 14, and I quote from their release:

Our federation sponsored an informal meeting in order to obtain the views of representatives of other organizations on the revised medical care insurance Act introduced last week by the Ontario government. Leaders of 24 groups attended, representing farm, church, and social organizations in the province. Most, if not all of these organizations, had, like the federation, submitted their views to both the Hall commission federally and the Hagey committee provincially. Most of them had also questioned the adequacy of the original Bill 163 introduced by the government in April, 1963.

All aspects of the proposed legislation were discussed and with few exceptions the representatives of the organizations at this meeting voiced objections very similar to the federation's. This meeting confirmed that a great cross-section of the people of Ontario are dissatisfied with the proposed Medicare legislation and will seek to have improvements made. The stand taken by the Ontario federation of labour is outlined in the enclosed letter sent to Prime Minister Robarts. A copy of this letter will also go out to every member of the provincial Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, along with the very documented absolute evidence of the Hall commission report, plus the feeling of a cross-section of organizations in our communities, I think it is well that hon. members of this House give a lot of consideration to the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would also put before the House the feeling of an organization, a religious organization, the United Church of Canada. I am sure no one can deny that this organization has great or greater knowledge of the problems of the people in our communities in regard to health and welfare needs than any other group. They did submit a lengthy brief to both the federal commission and to the Hagey committee, but I would like to just quote part of their brief that indicates they have studied this matter for many years. I quote from part of their brief:

(a) The 15th general council, Hamilton, Ontario, September, 1952:

Be it resolved that this council expresses its considered opinion regarding national health insurance as follows:

1. Commend the federal, provincial and municipal governments concerned for progress made to date in providing more

adequate health services, increasing the number of hospital beds and in related ways improving effective diagnostic, remedial and other forms of medical and surgical care and treatment.

2. Recognize the contribution that has been made by certain organizations and agencies that have promoted voluntary health and hospitalization plans.

3. Urge all responsible governmental authorities, in co-operation with the medical, dental, nursing and related professions, to move as quickly as possible to the establishment of an integrated and contributory national health plan.

(b) The 16th general council, Sackville, New Brunswick, September, 1954:

The resolution quoted above passed at Hamilton in 1952 was reaffirmed at this general council meeting at Sackville in 1954.

(c) The 19th general council, Edmonton, Alberta, September, 1960:

Whereas the cost of medical care and treatment, the heavy burden which many are unable to bear and whereas there are those who are deterred from seeking medical care and treatment because of the high cost involved;

and, whereas existing medical insurance plans are inadequate to cover all medical needs;

and, whereas the 16th general council has endorsed an integrated and contributory national health insurance programme, it is recommended that this general council:

1. Re-endorse the principle of a national health insurance plan.

2. Commend the province of Saskatchewan for steps to be again taken to implement such a programme in the provincial level.

3. Urge the federal government, in co-operation with the medical, dental, nursing, pharmaceutical and related professions, to establish a comprehensive national health insurance programme.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is evidence of the great need.

Now, I would just take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the concern of the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells)—who is not in his seat—about the possible implementation of the New Democratic Party programme into the industry that has union-management sponsored medical insurance programmes. Some of them, as he said, are completely paid for by management. Some

are partly paid for by management, but, nevertheless, partly negotiated by the unions involved. Certainly this is a method of covering their members with prepaid medical care. Whether or not they negotiate for complete coverage, or for partial coverage, is a matter of difference in any particular union.

My particular local union did not believe in negotiating for fully paid company plans, because we felt if we paid part of it, we would have better argument for having something to say about the administration and experience of such a plan. But the specific point the hon. member made was that what a situation we would be in if the New Democratic Party plan was implemented into General Motors, stating that they now pay \$156 a year on behalf of the employees, and if our plan was implemented, then, based on our plan, they would pay a basic premium of \$31.20, which would leave, in the hon. member's figures, \$106 for the industry to pay.

But my figures show me that \$31.20 deducted from \$156 is \$124.80. Nevertheless, it would leave a savings of \$124.80 for the industry. He said that this would give General Motors a profit of two-and-a-half million dollars for that year.

He said, on the other hand, the employee would have to pick up the difference on the six per cent surcharge on his taxable amount, the amount he pays in taxes, basing it on \$5,000. He said they then would be paying \$18.60. So, he said, with our plan, General Motors would save two-and-a-half million dollars, and the employee, after paying nothing, would have to pay \$18.60 a year.

Well, this might be the case, but I would just assure the House and the hon. member for Scarborough North, that all of the unions in Ontario, the organized unions in Canada, and particularly the UAW local in Oshawa, would heartily endorse this kind of a situation. To implement the New Democratic Party plan, they would forego the profit to the company happily. They have never been against General Motors making money. And they would happily pay their share for the balance of the contract.

Certainly the transition is always negotiated, as it has been in the hospital insurance programme, and will be in regard to the portable pension plan of Ontario, and the transition will be negotiated in good faith for the benefit of all, in regard to any kind of a health insurance programme.

With these brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can, before this measure is passed, convince the government that the

bill should be either withdrawn, or drastically revised to implement some of the proposals put forward by the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party in the House.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, in his remarks addressed to this bill in the House yesterday, the hon. leader of the Opposition—and I am sorry to note that he has not been in his seat today—professed a very high respect for the report of the Royal commission on health services, prepared under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall. I am sure that all hon. members of the House have the same high regard for that great work, which is serving, and will continue to serve well, the people of Canada.

In its 1,400-odd pages and its 256 recommendations, the report of the Royal commission on health services has given us a nearly all-embracing view of the vast array of services and facilities involved in Canada's health programmes, in the past, the present and the future. Indeed, the commission's review has extended not only across a very broad spectrum of services and facilities, but it has extended throughout seven decades, from 1921 to 1991. And we see a system involving hundreds of thousands of scientists, of professional and skilled workers and technicians, and thousands of millions of dollars invested in social capital in the form of educational facilities, hospitals, rehabilitation centres, convalescent centres, and all the panoply necessary to the health of our people.

I think that in their high regard for the report, certain hon. members opposite have, in some cases I am sure unwittingly, and in some cases I am sure wittingly, neglected the full import of all its recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the words of Judge Hall, spoken in Toronto last September, as reported in the *Canadian Tax Journal*, when he was describing one of the significant problems which the commission faced, and he said:

It is the overemphasis given to the question of payment of physicians' bills, i.e., Medicare. No one would suggest that the payment of physicians' bills is not an important item, but it is after all but one item in the full range of health services, and it must not be permitted to dominate the whole field.

Mr. Sopha: I read that into the record, too.

Mr. Dunlop: You read the report of the commission and you will find that the text

is different as reported in this speech in Toronto.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Do not speak so quickly.

Mr. Dunlop: Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that hon. members opposite have become obsessed with the question of the payment of physicians' bills. It is important, as Mr. Justice Hall has said, but in terms of expense it represents about one-fifth to one-quarter the total health services bill, both today and in the commission's future projection. The obsession that hon. members opposite have is with one particular means of paying the doctor's bill at one particular time, and that is universal, comprehensive, tax-financed medical services insurance now.

In his report Mr. Justice Hall referred to the great importance of priorities. Let me again quote from page 84 of the commission's report. He said:

A programme of health services should be provincially organized and administered with the staging, timing and scope determined by provincial governments.

Now that is what this government is doing at this very moment. It is presenting a bill which provides for the payment of medical services insurance on behalf of certain persons as part of its responsibility for determining the priority, the staging, the timing and the scope of services. It must be regarded as one measure in a programme for discharging its responsibilities which this government has been undertaking in the past, is undertaking today and will continue to undertake tomorrow. To the hon. members opposite obsessed with universal, compulsory, totally tax-financed payment now; and a tendency to regard the provision of health services as something of an iceberg four-fifths submerged from their view and one-fifth, the payment of the doctors' bills, blinding their eyes.

The Hall commission report, Mr. Speaker, did not settle the question of priorities. The commissioners said the first priority was of course to do something. They laid great stress on research, medical education, nursing education and the education of the other professional workers in the health field. They laid great stress on the development of adequate facilities, hospitals and so forth. They laid particular stress on amendments to the federal Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act to place the treatment of the mentally ill and the tuberculous on all fours with the treatment of the generally ill. At no point did the commissioner suggest that

it would be possible to introduce their comprehensive programme before 1971, and that based on the assumption of the success of the crash programmes of medical and health personnel education which they recommended.

Now this government is doing something. It has not waited for the recommended conference, recommendation 199 in the Hall commission report, between the Dominion and provincial governments to determine the order of priorities. It has appreciated the report of the Hall Royal commission which can only strengthen its own view of these priorities. It has appreciated the Hall commission's reinforcement of its views as to what should be done in these priorities.

I will not review the entrance of government into the health and hospital field in the province. It has been done most excellently on the introduction of the bill by the hon. Minister, but I do want to refer particularly to the educational programme announced by the hon. Prime Minister on October 29 last, a \$115 million programme for speeding up and enhancing our medical and nursing and dental education. Now this, along the lines recommended by the Hall commission, is doing something.

The amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think, Mr. Speaker, certainly should not be approved. In subsection (a) it would direct the committee to bring in a recommendation leading to an immediate introduction of universal, compulsory medical services insurance. This would run counter to the recommendations of the Hall commission which urged a progressive implementation of a health programme and does not, I think, at any point suggest that universal, compulsory medical care insurance is the first priority. Thus the amendment, I submit, is running counter to the basic recommendations of the report of the Royal commission.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a delusion to believe that any simple system for paying the doctors' bills, whether solely from taxes or otherwise, will of itself improve the quality and the distribution of medical care services. I think it is cruel to attempt to delude people that there is so simple a panacea for so complex a question.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to review briefly the situation before us and the principles embodied in Bill 136. The population of Ontario can be divided into two groups so far as their medical service insurance status is concerned: Those who have such coverage or do not need it or do not want it; and those who need such coverage and at the moment cannot

get it, either because of age or state of health or their economic status.

Although the hon. member for Woodbine would be disposed to dispute the figures furnished by the Canadian health insurance association, I am prepared to accept that somewhere in the neighbourhood of 75 to 80 per cent of the people of Ontario have adequate medical services insurance today, adequate at least to their own wishes and desires. That leaves us then some 20 per cent, or perhaps less, who do not have such coverage and who may wish to have it. They cannot get it on account of their health, their age, their income status. Now it is to apply public funds to the needs of that group that this legislation addresses itself.

In addition to the provision for the persons of low income it will also provide certain improvements in the policies of persons already insured under private plans. Some people face the possibility of the cancellation of their insurance as their age increases or they show a frequent record of illness, but henceforward standard plans must be non-cancellable. Sometimes the private carriers who are doctor-sponsored, non-profit, co-operative and commercial, find it difficult to meet the so-called "bad risks." This legislation provides for a pooling of the so-called "bad risks" under the Medical Carriers Incorporated provisions, and enables the private carriers to cope with the problems of bad risks.

It provides for standard contracts but it does not make it necessary that the standard contract is the only kind of contract that can be written. It provides for the establishment of a maximum premium for standard contracts but it is a mistake to assure or to promote the idea that the maximum premium to be charged for standard contracts will be the generally applicable premium in the province. No change will be made in the excellent group provisions which already exist, and there will be no disruption of the satisfactory arrangements which have been so successfully developed in many companies through collective bargaining and otherwise.

A good deal of time has already been spent, Mr. Speaker, on the outline of the provisions to assist people of low incomes to obtain medical services insurance at rates which they can afford, and I shall not dwell further on that subject, save to say that it can hardly be called timid or inhumane to provide a first-class standard of medical services insurance for which 1,000,000 people in this province will be eligible at little or no cost. It can hardly be called timid or inhumane to provide a fine standard of medical services insurance

for which 800,000 more people will be eligible with some degree of assistance, and which is not now available to them.

The hon. member for York South, Mr. Speaker, expressed concern about the costs which are estimated as being applicable to these provisions—some \$70 million. I would not like to place my judgment against that of the actuaries, who have been retained by the government to develop that estimate. Still, he noted that it came to a per capita cost of something approaching \$50 a year. I cannot believe that the cost will be as high as that and I will be surprised if the cost exceeds \$50 million in the first full year of operation. I do not think we will find that it will be as he expressed it, a low-coverage high-cost programme. But that, of course, will be revealed in the accounts for the years 1966-67, and at the moment it is really a matter of speculation.

The hon. member for York South also suggested that a universal plan could be instituted now, and unlike the hon. leader of the Opposition he presented a plan by which that might be achieved. His recommendations, of course, run counter to the recommendations of the Royal commission on health services in many areas, as I am sure he knows very well.

The Royal commission on health services suggests that such a programme should be financed jointly by the federal and provincial governments, each paying about 50 per cent of the costs. This was its judgment after very careful review of the tax resources available to both levels of government, and the workings of conditional grant programmes in Canada. It did not suggest at any point that the plan should be financed by a provincial government out of its own resources.

Also, the Royal commission recommended that taxes for the support of medical care insurance should be visible taxes, and by that of course, it meant taxes which can be identified, such as the personal income tax and sales tax, but not corporation tax or excise tax, where you cannot identify the participation of that tax in the goods and services that we buy.

The hon. member for York South suggested that the costs of the programme of universal medical care insurance today would be about \$165 million a year. In the very able commentary on his remarks made by my friend the hon. member for Scarborough North, he pointed out that that estimate was seriously understated by probably \$60 million to \$70 million a year. But even supposing the estimate was correct, this would require, under the proposal of my hon.

friend from York South, a six per cent surcharge on personal income tax, and a three per cent increase in corporation tax. I am sure he is sufficiently interested in economic planning and in strong central government, to wish to leave as many as possible of the instruments of fiscal policy in the hands of the federal government and not have individual provinces fragmenting the ability of the central government to direct our economy, by establishing different rates and especially fluctuating rates of taxation in the several provinces. This would be a disrupting force in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I have been at many meetings where at various times medical services insurance has been discussed. One of the most common questions asked from the audience is, what's in it for me? This is an easy way for people to try to judge a complicated social measure, and it does not mean that they are so self-centred or so lacking in altruism as the question might seem to imply.

What's in it for me? The answer for the majority of people who already have medical services insurance, particularly where this is partly or totally paid for by their employer, is a very simple one. Whether it is a universal compulsory plan, as advocated for immediate application by hon. gentlemen from the other side, or whether it is this voluntary and, I grant, partial plan as proposed by the government, the answer is still this: For them there is nothing in it except the opportunity to pay a little more by way of taxes for the support of the insurance for those who do not now have it. I find most people are sufficiently altruistic when they find that really there is nothing in it for them, that they are still glad to think that the programme will be of help to others.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is a step in a long programme of priorities which has been developed by this government. I submit that it is the right step taken at the right time and I trust to see the defeat of the amendment and the passage of this bill through its second reading.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Forest Hill who has just completed his address to the House, I feel, has done a considerable service. Particularly in his introductory remarks where he dealt so thoroughly with the recommendations of the Hall report, which has been brought to the attention of the House so frequently this afternoon and this evening.

I would like to take a moment to read what I consider to be the basic recommendation and it is in the form of a proposal:

To establish a comprehensive universal

health service programme which will be available to all regardless of age, condition, place of residence or ability to pay. The programme will cover not only medical care but the whole range of personal health services—

I might comment here that this is where the hon. member for Forest Hill indicated the submerged part of the iceberg was not something that we on this side were aware of:

—including prescription drugs, dental and optical care for children and public assistance recipients. Organized care for crippled and retarded children, prosthetic services and home care.

And he made the point that Mr. Justice Hall in his report, and, in fact, this government in its proposal, is bringing this into being in the province of Ontario in phases. And I would say that we on this side would not expect a plan as is suggested by the basic proposal of the Hall report to come into being full-blown and overnight. But I would submit to you, sir, that there is one part that does not admit of phasing. That is the word, the important word, "universal," which is interpreted by our hon. friends opposite as compulsory. I suppose we must accept the word as a proper synonym, with all the implications that have been put upon it, as that involved with what we, in a democratic Legislature, do not propose. Nevertheless, in this House, in this very session, we have had an opportunity to discuss and, in fact, support many proposals of the government which were in every respect compulsory—having to do with the economic business of the province, its education and in so many other areas with which we as members are so familiar.

So, I would submit to the hon. member for Forest Hill, and to those who agree with his position, that if one is going to stand up and be counted with those who are favouring a voluntary approach to this—an approach that we consider on this side to be completely inadequate when we see that it will not present the minimum requirements for an adequate health care programme to all the citizens of this province—that they in turn are establishing a precedent much more powerful than that which has been put before the people of Canada by the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. We, in the words of the hon. member for Sudbury, are at the fulcrum of this country, and what we decide to do here will in fact establish the future of medical care for this country for a good long time.

It is on this basis that I submit the hon. member's emphasis on phasing is misdirected,

because his government is not in a position to phase universality. The legislation that is before us tonight is one that is going to be presented to the people on a voluntary basis and I would submit that there would be large areas or large groups in our population that will not have sufficient coverage, in fact any coverage at all, if this legislation is allowed to be passed into law.

Now, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the government that we in this province have had for the past 21 years, we are, in fact, in an age of enlightenment that spreads over a large part of the world. Twenty-two years? I stand corrected; time does fly. We read the newspapers and after we get past the more interesting events having to do with our own political scene, it is apparent that we live in a world of disease, of hunger and, in many areas, mass destruction. Yet here in this Legislature the thing that concerns us more than anything else is how best to provide for adequate medical care and services for those people that we have the honour to represent. Surely it will be that, when the great day comes when wars shall cease and the swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, then in fact we will have the wherewithal to stop all talk of phasing and give the services that we so earnestly desire for the people of Ontario. But until that millenium arrives, we do have to accept the principle of phasing that has been described by so many hon. members in this debate.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): The hon. member for Brant is making a better speech than his hon. leader.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the one basic principle that I wish to refer to tonight has to do with this idea of universality, or the fact that this legislation should be amended so that it will be applied in a compulsory manner to, if not every, citizen of the province, at least practically all citizens of the province, so that all of us can fulfil our responsibility of assisting our fellow man; at the same time providing for the needs of ourselves and our families with a coverage that will be adequate; and with a sharing of responsibility that will bring the premium price to the individual family down to the level where all can participate, and a level of services that we consider necessary in 1965.

There is no one in this House who can say any representative of the Liberal Party would do anything but continue to respect and encourage the development and application of individual talent and initiative. The fact

that we advocate a universality in the application of this legislation is something far from being against this individual initiative that we all know is so valuable in the development of our province and, as a matter of fact, our civilization. But we do know that the realization of the opportunity for the full life—the full, useful life of the citizens of our community—and the opportunity to undertake the pursuit of happiness cannot be denied to anyone because the basic needs of the individual cannot be met by individual endeavour. This is true in education. This has been brought to the fore several times already, as it is in health services.

I would say my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, dealt very well with the compulsory aspect of education, not only in the matter of attendance, but in the matter of financing. He did digress a bit in referring to the hon. Minister himself and it seems to me we will have to make a caucus point of restraining ourselves when we tend to praise the hon. Minister of Education unduly and too frequently. If he listens too often to the Opposition, he is liable to get a swelled head. However, we would say that the principles that tend to have a compulsory aspect to legislation are ones that we are used to dealing with in this Legislature and in every other jurisdiction when the great good of the greatest number is what we are concerned with in that particular manner.

Now I would say, Mr. Speaker, that after dealing with education so extensively in the years past in this province, and in the years to come, and taking on ourselves as taxpayers such a heavy burden in the financing of education, we must realize that the fertile mind and the mind that has been well educated can be stifled by a sick body. If we consider investment in education as being the type that will give the proper return to the province of Ontario, then we must consider equally that investment in medical care will return an even greater amount of good as far as our responsibilities are concerned.

Now at times I am under the impression that the debate is whether or not Mr. Justice Hall in his report has given us a document that is worthy of respect and worthy of direction, as far as government policy is concerned, in Ontario. I do not believe that there are too many hon. members of this House who have studied the document as carefully as, let us say, the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. member for Sudbury, and perhaps a handful of others. But when the hon. member for Forest Hill tells us that we on this side are obsessed with only a small

amount of knowledge that might be available from this report, I would submit to him, sir, that outside of himself and his seatmate, the hon. Minister of Health, there is no group in the Legislature more concerned with seeing that the legislation that is put into effect by this House in the future, concerning medical care, should follow the principles laid down by Mr. Justice Hall in this excellent report, which I feel should be the guiding principle of the introduction of medical care in the provinces of Canada. It is accepted by all, even the federal leader of the Conservative Party, who has embraced it in toto, and the recommendations contained in it should be a guide for the deliberations of every Legislature and the Parliament of Canada, when they are considering this very important topic.

I submit, sir, that the decision of this Legislature is going to have great effect across Canada, much more effect than the decisions of the Legislatures of Saskatchewan and Alberta have had in the past. It is in this light that we must view our special responsibilities as members of the Legislature of the province of Ontario, the banner province of Canada in many ways. It is our responsibility to lead. It is our responsibility to accept the Hall commission report as what it is—the outstanding document for the guidance of any government body, for the years that remain in the 20th century, in the establishment of these services that are so important to the development of our community.

As I say, our pattern will be the deciding factor. The basic recommendation that cannot be phased and the one that is ignored by this government, is the recommendation for universality that is stated clearly and without equivocation by the report that so many hon. members have dealt with today.

There are many things to be said for a voluntary application. For one thing, it will enable the government to satisfy certain groups in the community that feel that the status quo, as far as medical insurance is concerned, should be maintained. But I would say that the voluntary method is going to be useful only for those who primarily are able to look after their own responsibilities as far as insurance is concerned.

This would include all the hon. members of this House, many of whom I suppose do not have adequate insurance, because they feel that under the circumstances, any emergencies that may arise they can meet on a personal basis. I would say that voluntary insurance would certainly be sufficient for

large numbers in this province who are employed in industry where, by negotiation over the years, the industry itself has accepted the main responsibility for paying for adequate and complete medical coverage.

But this means that large numbers are going to be left outside the purview of the bill that is before us. Those who are aged, those who are chronically ill, those who are self-employed and those working in small establishments, are going to have to apply their own initiative to a great extent. They are going to have to squeeze their budgets to pay for a premium of great size, but we are not informed specifically of its size by the hon. Minister.

It seems to me that after 35 years, the insurance industry in Ontario has covered just about all the voluntary aspects that are going to get the coverage under that basis. Three-quarters of the people in Ontario, of course, do have some type of coverage. It is inadequate, certainly by the researches that the Hall commission has done, and it would remain for a universal plan, a compulsory plan if you like, to give us the coverage that we need.

There are many drawbacks to a voluntary plan. Those who are healthy, wealthy and young, are not going to see fit to invest in the large premium that is required. And because they will not enrol in the plan that the government proposes, they will not be in a position to take part in the levelling out of the premium aspect to those who do need it, because they are in a group that would certainly not benefit very greatly from it. They will not have an opportunity then, except through their share in taxation, to share in this responsibility. As a matter of fact, the government programme itself, which will be applied by a branch of The Department of Health, will have a government-sponsored programme for those who do not pay income tax, and this will not be available in any way, even on a voluntary basis, for those who wish to enrol. Therefore, although they are put in a position of supporting this with their tax money, a good many people in this province are not going to have the government plan available to them and they will not have the funds themselves to pay the high premiums that we would expect would be found in the voluntary plan that the government is proposing.

It is also true, Mr. Speaker, and I am not in a position to say how extensive this would be, that there are certain people in our community—one might call them lazy and irresponsible—who will not avail themselves of the opportunity to cover themselves and

their families with the basic plan that would be made available by this legislation. All of us, as members, have had to deal with citizens in our community who have not availed themselves of the opportunity of coverage with the hospitalization plan, and frequently through inadvertence, and perhaps irresponsibility, the plan has been allowed to lapse. When they then come forward with a claim, we all know of the great difficulties associated with this and associated with the worst aspects of any voluntary plan.

But we find that the bill that is before us will set up another bureaucracy that will administer the part of the plan that would be available to those who would not pay premiums. This would be in addition to the present large staff that applies the hospitalization plan, and it seems to me that this is unnecessary duplication. Surely the facilities that are under the direction of the hon. Minister of Health, or at least the Ontario hospital services commission, might be combined very efficiently to apply the plan in this regard.

We have said something about means tests. It seems that the government feels that by applying the means test to the income tax requirements, it has removed any odium that might be associated with it. But in the bill that is before us, it is not clear precisely how this means test would be applied. It is known that this government does not have access to income tax data, and certainly we would expect the hon. Minister to clarify this point, because if the means test is to be applied, this would certainly add to the bureaucratic requirements. As my hon. leader pointed out in his speech, moving the amendment to the bill that is before us, it is true that if one sets a standard means test as the government proposes, a person's means changes and fluctuates and it would have to be a continuing test, with all of the expense, difficulty and red tape that would be entailed as an individual citizen's means go up or, unfortunately, down. There is going to be a great deal of difficulty that should be explained by the hon. Minister before the bill is carried to any further stages.

I feel that the government plan combines the inefficiency and high cost of the voluntary schemes, with the double bureaucracy of two provincial offices for government coverage of essential health services, and I feel that this is done without assuring that the basic problem will be met.

The hon. Minister of Health has said in the past that he assumes everyone would join the plan that would be made available. But it is true that in Alberta, where a some-

what similar plan is available, 15 per cent of the population has not touched the plan in any way and there is every reason to believe that among that 15 per cent are a large number who require this coverage. This is a problem that the government plan does not meet.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about the supposed virtue of the free enterprise application in hospital insurance, or, I should say, in medical insurance. In my own constituency of Brant, there are, of course, many citizens who have a variety of coverage but the Physicians' Services Incorporated coverage is generally used.

I would like to recall to your mind, sir, that I believe it was in last July that PSI undertook an expensive and expanded advertising campaign in many areas across the province, Brant county included, in which there was a supreme effort to enrol everyone who could possibly be enticed into the plan. There were spots on the radio about every ten minutes. It reminded me, actually, of the provincial election campaign of 1963 when the Tories were dominating all of these media; you would almost think they had the same sources of funds. The PSI advertising extended from radio into television and full-page ads in the newspapers. But believe me, the doctors themselves are the best salesmen for their own campaign and for their own plan and a good many people whom I know personally were enrolled at that time in PSI.

You know, sir, it was not but a matter of weeks following this extensive campaign that the directors of PSI raised the premium considerably, from between 12 and 20 per cent, so that the very first premium that was paid after the initial premium was raised by, in many cases, an amount of 20 per cent or more. I do not know of any single instance that has occurred in my brief public life that brought more of an outcry from a good many of the constituents in my area, who had been enticed into the plan under circumstances that were put to them by the very best advertising methods that were then available. And within a very few weeks the whole basis of the contract had been changed.

It was quite within their rights to withdraw. They had made changes in the plan, they had left one insurance company and joined another. At that time, I went out of my way to question a number of doctors who, of course, were committed to the plan themselves and certainly did everything they could to advance it.

I am deeply impressed with the concern

for the medical profession, particularly those in it who work in rural areas, those whom I know personally, from their efforts to be of great assistance in these rural areas. The miles they drive, the services they render are unknown to a good many of those practitioners who are living, I suppose, a life of comparative professional ease in some of the more metropolitan areas.

But these professional gentlemen were able to point out to me the fact their expenses had gone up tremendously, because we, as citizens in rural areas, expect most of the facilities that can be found anywhere else in the province. Our doctors have electronic devices that answer the phone for them while they are out on calls, so that we can always get in touch with medical assistance. And it was brought home to me in the very best way that the advances in the premium were justified by the requirements that the doctors themselves had from the fund.

But at the same time, there were other competitive organizations in our area offering medical insurance. I would say the outstanding one was the local medical cooperative, which has a large and extensive coverage in Brant county. It is interesting to note that for a considerably lower premium, the Brant county medical co-operative is able to pay the local doctors 100 per cent of the OMA schedule, whereas the PSI premium is a bit above it, as a matter of fact considerably above it, and I understand pays the doctor members of PSI somewhat less than 100 per cent of the tariff—somewhere around 85 to 90 per cent.

So I would say that the co-operative insurance companies have an outstanding record, and they are really a non-profit organization. Their overhead is very low, and they are able to offer this service to citizens of the counties where these co-operatives exist. I know that they are widespread across the province, and there are a large number of our citizens who have availed themselves of this type of insurance.

But I think back to the campaign of PSI, which was supposed to blanket so many areas of the province, and the fact that if the medical co-operative was going to stay in business at all they had to meet this advertising campaign with expenses of their own. One need only read the annual report of these two organizations to see that as non-profit organizations, a good amount of their overhead was actually used up in the good old free enterprise competition that I have described to hon. members, involving radio, television and the newspapers, in an effort

to wean allegiance of the citizens from one plan to the other.

I do not think this is in the general good. I feel that in this case, the citizens themselves are paying for these elaborate advertising campaigns, and although I have great regard for both of these medical insurance plans, it still is the reason why there should be a universal plan, government-sponsored, which would in fact see to it that every dollar of the premium is applied to an overhead that can be justified. More than that, to the provision of the services that are the main reason for these plans existing.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the premium proposed in the basic plan in the government bill is unknown. We have heard several estimates of its size, but whatever it is it is going to be crushingly high when one adds it to the already very high hospitalization premium that was raised 52 per cent, just a few months ago. The responsibility, then, for the provision of medical care through premiums, is becoming very high indeed, and I would submit to you, sir, beyond the reach of a good many of our citizens who are in the income tax paying bracket.

The Hall commission which, by the way, is a far more detailed work than anything that has been presented to this House for our consideration, also rejected the voluntary aspect for statistical reasons.

I want to refer to a few statistics here which I feel are very important. The Hall recommendations estimate that the average Canadian family would have to pay a premium of \$345.60, practically \$350—this was in 1963—to be fully covered for medical and hospital services, dental care, drugs, optical services, nurses' care, the works. No one is proposing at this stage that a plan with that expensive coverage would be enacted immediately. We have all been talking about phasing. This is our goal. But as a matter of fact, a citizen who requires these services, if he were to be covered by insurance, would have to pay a premium of about \$350.

Assuming, as the Hall commission did, that such services should be no greater in cost than about five to seven per cent of a family's income, then it becomes clear that a family must earn between \$5,000 and \$7,000 a year if they are going to be able to adequately provide on a voluntary basis for their medical needs.

It was the conclusion of the Hall commission that too many Canadian families—a large number of Canadian families—earn salaries below this level and, therefore, a voluntary scheme could not possibly meet

their needs. They asserted that a voluntary scheme was primarily suited for those who could look after themselves, and for organized groups, especially those with stable employment, where the employer makes a substantial contribution to the premium.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government offers a scheme through which, on a voluntary basis only, free or subsidized coverage would be offered to a smaller group than that which Hall said would be unable to afford the premiums. For the average family discussed above, if it was to earn an income of more than \$3,700, it would be without any assistance in meeting the medical care premium. This leaves a \$1,300 income gap between the Ontario plan and the minimum set by Hall.

According to the latest figures issued by The Department of National Revenue in Ottawa, almost 20 per cent of the tax returns from the province of Ontario showed incomes in this range, from \$4,000 to \$5,000. In other words, 20 per cent of our people are going to be out of the range of the help that the government offers and they are going to be \$1,000 below the income level that Mr. Justice Hall in his report said was essential if they were going to be able to look after themselves adequately.

We have to add to this number of people those with an income from \$3,700 to \$4,000. We find that in all about 25 per cent of our citizens are going to be in the income range where they will not receive assistance from this bill, and according to the recommendations of the Hall commission, they do not have the wherewithal to adequately provide for themselves.

I feel that this is a serious gap, including a large number of people, and something that the government cannot afford to overlook as it introduces this legislation, which it so proudly refers to as voluntary. These people,

then, have the freedom to go without. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this bill could be amended in such a way that the coverage would be made available for them, and that we would be following the recommendations of the report that is surely the guide for any government in introducing legislation of this type.

I would say, sir, in closing, that the amendment before the House standing in the name of the hon. leader of the Opposition provides a means for correcting the mistaken approach that this government has taken. It is before the House at the present time, it is being fully debated, and as I have said, we in Ontario are leading the way, more than any other province could possibly do. Our responsibility is clear and I recommend that the amendment be carried.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have estimates and on Friday we will deal with estimates and go into committee of the whole House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What is the order of the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Treasury and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the House will sit tomorrow evening.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:20 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Report, standing committee on education, health and welfare, Mr. Wells	3297
Université d'Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Guindon, first reading	3297
Hospital Services Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. S. Lewis, first reading	3300
Estimates, Treasury Department, Mr. Allan, concluded	3305
Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart	3308
Recess, 6 o'clock	3326

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1965

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, members of the women's institute, Ivy, Ontario.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North), from the standing committee on education, health and welfare, presented the committee's report, which was read as follows and adopted:

The committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. 119, The Child Welfare Act, 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

UNIVERSITE D'OTTAWA

Mr. F. Guindon (Stormont) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member mind giving an explanation?

Mr. F. Guindon (Stormont): The citizens of this province should feel a sense of pride and satisfaction in the knowledge that Ontario possesses a sound system of higher education. Having been built over a lengthy period of time on a firm foundation, it is not only growing larger year by year but also stronger. Credit for these circumstances can be given to a significant number of persons and organizations, not the least of whom are the many educational leaders who have served the cause of higher education in this province over the years.

If a single group of individuals had to be selected as having made the greatest contribution, however, it would be my opinion that such honour should be designated for the founding fathers of this province. For it was

their foresight, more than a century ago, when Ontario was little more than a wilderness, that led to the establishment of a university that would serve the needs of our citizens, and it was from their foresight that evolved a system of government support to higher education on which sound future growth was able to take place.

As has been explained in this Legislature on several occasions, it has been the policy of successive governments of Ontario for close to 100 years to direct financial assistance to those institutions of higher learning which are free of the restrictions and control of any single religious body. This policy was initiated by Robert Baldwin with the introduction of an Act creating the University of Toronto in 1849 and confirmed, so to speak, by the decisions of the government of John Sandfield Macdonald shortly after Confederation. From these decisions emerged a new concept which, while unique to Ontario in its time, has since been imitated in various other jurisdictions.

This concept was the federated university, an organization which allowed a strong central institution, receiving the benefits of full government support, to work in conjunction with one or more religious colleges. The latter, relieved of the heavy financial burden of certain aspects of the university programme, have been able to concentrate their attention, efforts and financial resources on those areas where they were best able to make a contribution. A sound, co-operative system of higher education has been the result.

With this policy clearly established and having the full support of the people of the province, a number of our institutions of higher learning have reorganized under independent boards of governors and have thus qualified for provincial assistance. In the early part of this century, Queen's University at Kingston and the University of Western Ontario both carried out such changes. More recently, McMaster University at Hamilton and the University of Windsor have been reorganized along non-denominational lines. At the same time, institutions such as Laurentian University of Sudbury and the University of

Waterloo have developed as federated universities from what had previously been more strictly denominational bases.

Some time ago, the government was approached by the council of administration of the University of Ottawa, an institution which has been operated to the benefit of this province for nearly 120 years by the order of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. The council submitted a proposal by which this bilingual institution might also be reorganized under an independent board of governors. I am pleased to report that the discussions which followed have led to an agreement which will remove the University of Ottawa from religious control, qualify it fully for provincial support in all aspects of its operation, and lay the foundation for extensive future growth and development. The new organization of the university is set out in the bill that has just been introduced.

The University of Ottawa is one of our oldest and proudest institutions. Its founding dates back to the year 1848 when, under the leadership of Monseigneur Joseph-Eugene Guigues, the order of Oblates of Mary Immaculate established St. Joseph's college in what was then the village of Bytown. The following year, the Legislature of Canada granted the institution its first charter, under the name Bytown college, and the college operated a full grammar school programme under this title until 1861 when, consistent with the change in the name of the community in which it had been founded, it became known as Ottawa college. In 1866, one year prior to Confederation, the government of Canada amended the charter of the college to give it degree-granting powers, and it has operated with full university status since that time. Perhaps it is significant that just one year short of a century later this proud school has reached another milestone in its history.

It was in 1933 that the Ontario Legislature last approved a new charter for the institution, and it was at that time that it assumed the name University of Ottawa. The Act of that year has been the basis of the university's operation ever since and shall, as the hon. members of the House will observe from the Act being presented, continue to be the charter for the new St. Paul university, an institution through which the Oblate Fathers will continue to render direct service to the Ottawa area and to this province.

Over this period of nearly one and a quarter centuries, in which the University of Ottawa has served our people so fully and so well, a number of characteristics have come

to be associated with the institution. One, as is well known to hon. members of this House, is a tradition of achievement and scholarship which has few parallels. Its graduates occupy important posts throughout this nation and, indeed, beyond its borders, and reflect in an effective manner the pursuit of excellence that has for so long motivated its alma mater.

A second, and important characteristic of the University of Ottawa, has been its willingness and ability to adjust to the changing needs of the Canadian society. This is reflected, in part, by the growth of the university over the years—not only in size, but in breadth and depth. At this time, the institution offers one of the widest ranges of programmes and courses in Ontario, a factor that will give the new governors and administration an extremely strong basis for future growth.

Monsieur le Président: Je suis très sensible à l'honneur qui m'échoit aujourd'hui d'introduire un projet de loi visant l'Université d'Ottawa. A titre de diplômé de cette noble institution, je ne puis évoquer le souvenir de mon alma mater sans en ressentir une vive émotion car aujourd'hui nous écrivons une nouvelle page dans l'histoire de cette université. Il tient du prodige qu'une institution, forcément limitée par ses sources de revenus, ait pu grandir et atteindre l'importance, l'envergure et le prestige qu'elle détient dans le domaine du haut-savoir.

Je voudrais rendre un bref, mais vibrant hommage de reconnaissance à la congrégation des Oblats de Marie Immaculée. Grâce à leur zèle intrépide, à leur dévouement inlassable, à leurs sacrifices incalculables, Les Oblats de Marie Immaculée ont édifié une institution séculaire qui n'a cessé de rayonner non seulement en Ontario mais dans le Canada tout entier. Les changements rapides et radicaux qui s'opèrent dans le domaine de l'éducation, tant au Canada qu'à l'étranger, furent une cause de soucis et d'inquiétudes pour les autorités de l'université. Après mûres réflexions et longues et exténuantes discussions, le conseil d'administration de l'Université d'Ottawa et le gouvernement provincial finirent par tomber d'accord sur une formule qui permettra à l'université de s'épanouir davantage et de répondre aux besoins toujours plus grandissants de notre jeunesse désireuse de fréquenter nos universités.

Espérons qu'avec le concours de la divine providence, la voie dans laquelle nous nous engageons est celle qui conduira aux cimes des plus grands succès.

Most important of all, however, in the light

of the present Canadian scene, is the bilingual nature of the university and its programme. A detailed review of the history of the University of Ottawa would show that over the years there have been periods in which the emphasis upon both the French and English languages as media of instruction has varied, depending on the particular circumstances of the era. Throughout the twentieth century, however, the university and its staff have been dedicated to the goal of making the University of Ottawa a truly bilingual institution—a place of higher learning where both English- and French-speaking students are assured of a sound education, an opportunity to learn of and appreciate our two major languages and cultures, and a chance to live and learn within a single educational environment which reflects our mixed heritage. Nothing could be more important at this time than the fact that such an institution should exist. Nothing could be more important than its growth and development. Nothing could be more important than the fact that it be encouraged and supported in the attainment of the ideal which it seeks. That is why this new charter, and the new organization and strength which it gives to the university, is so appropriate and so necessary at this time.

It is not possible to find adequate words of praise for the members of the Order of Oblate Fathers on this occasion. Particular commendation, in this regard, should be paid the Very Reverend Henri Legaré, recently retired rector of the university, and the Very Reverend Roger Guindon, the present rector. It was during the rectorship of Father Legaré that discussions on possible changes within the administration of the University of Ottawa first showed that an acceptable change of pattern could be attained. It was more than fortunate, therefore, that when the system of appointments used by the Oblate Order resulted in Father Legaré's retirement in July of 1964, he was succeeded by a man with equal dedication and foresight. Father Guindon, despite the heavy burdens befalling him in his new and most responsible office, ensured that the trend of events continued at a steady pace and, indeed, it is largely through his leadership that this final, satisfactory solution has been reached.

The University of Ottawa, as it exists today and as it points to the future, is solely the result of the efforts of men such as Father Legaré and Father Guindon, and of those of the teaching and research staff of the university whom they have gathered around them. Their dedication and sense of vision have

been the foundations on which the University of Ottawa has been built, and it is these characteristics that have led to their decision to turn over the reins of control to a larger section of our community. That the members of the Oblate Order will continue to serve, through the federated University of St. Paul's, is a clear indication of their willingness to support and encourage the reorganized university in future years as they have so effectively done in the past. For this we can all be grateful.

And now we move to a new era. Under the new, independent board of governors, most of whom are named within this Act, the university must look to the years that lie ahead. They will be years of challenge and opportunity for our entire system of higher education and they will be years of trial and problems. That such a group of citizens, most of whom are already burdened with heavy responsibilities, are willing to undertake the challenge should be a lesson to all of us.

The University of Ottawa must and will play an increasingly important role in higher education in the province. The way is now cleared for it to do so. I have every confidence in the success it will meet.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to say at the outset that I, personally, welcome the introduction of this bill; a bill which will place the University of Ottawa on a non-denominational basis, so that there will not be discrimination in grants to it in the future—as there has been in the past—as one of our institutions of higher learning. It is a bill that I think should be welcomed in this House and I assure you that we in this party will support it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise on two points. First, I think the House is entitled to an explanation as to why this bill was not introduced as a government bill. All other legislation in connection with universities this year has been introduced as government bills. Second, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion go by without pointing out that the rules of this House stipulate that, on first reading, there is a brief explanation as to the purport of the bill, not a long historical essay which would be appropriate at some other time. We on this Opposition side of the House have attempted many times to give even a brief explanation of a bill, let alone a long speech which would be appropriate at another time, and we have been cut off.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is out of order. And if we are going to keep from

straying further from the rules of the House, we just cannot tolerate this kind of thing. Otherwise we, on this side of the House, are entitled to it also.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I speak to this point? I recognize that the procedure we followed this afternoon was not exactly ordinary. I was rather interested to have the hon. member for Stormont introduce this bill, as I believe he is the only graduate of the University of Ottawa who sits in this House.

While the procedure may be, as I say, somewhat out of the ordinary, on the other hand this bill, as has been pointed out, is somewhat out of the ordinary, too, and I think all hon. members of the House on all sides are very interested in what it is going to accomplish.

Mr. MacDonald: Why is it not a government bill?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is a government bill. If the hon. member will notice, it was seconded by the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis). For a very personal reason, we asked the hon. member for Stormont to introduce it. We thought that from his position as a graduate, there would be some historic significance to this day, and that is the reason that this procedure was followed.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my point is directed wholly then to the latter part of my remarks, with regard to what is legitimate on first reading, because I think we should have clarification, for our guidance in the Opposition, as to what are our rights.

Mr. Speaker: The member was asked to give an explanation. Although I agree with the member for York South that perhaps the explanation was longer than is ordinarily the case with most bills, I allowed the member to continue because of the distinguished delegation that was present today. Since he is a graduate of the university, I thought perhaps we should give him some extension of the rules.

THE HOSPITAL SERVICES COMMISSION ACT

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would explain the purposes of the bill.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, as it happens, I have a half-hour presentation relating to the introduction of first reading of this bill, but in deference to the hon. Prime Minister and the Speaker, I shall abbreviate myself to the following short explanation.

The amending bill is a simple procedure, designed to have The Hospital Services Commission Act parallel the basic principle of the newly proposed Medical Services Insurance Act. It would provide continuity of hospital coverage to persons who are unemployed or without income due to illness or disability.

For some years we have argued that paying of hospital premiums sometimes five or eight months in advance, imposes an intolerable hardship on a wage earner whose income has suddenly been sharply reduced. Being faced with a huge bill for hospital insurance, he often decides to drop it for the time being, until he has been restored to gainful employment.

It has been our contention that arrangements should be made to continue payment of hospital premiums for anyone who finds himself in this kind of situation. Under its new Medical Services Insurance Act, the government agrees with this contention. Section 7 reads:

Any person who is unable to continue payment of his medical services insurance subscription because of lack of income due to unemployment, illness or disability may within the first 30 days of such default make application to the council for assistance during the period of unemployment, illness or disability, to continue his medical services insurance contract or toward the purchase of a standard contract.

My proposed amendment will extend the same right of assistance for hospital purposes.

I thank the Speaker for allowing me to participate in this precedent-making explanation.

Mr. Speaker: May I say to the member that it really is not precedent-making, because his colleague, the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), was allowed to make an explanation of his bill just a little more than a week or two ago. I may say that if any member has a bill to present to this House, he will be allowed to give an explanation on its introduction.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: If requested.

Mr. Speaker: Whether requested or not. If the member wishes to give an explanation, it may be done.

The member has a question before the orders of the day?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes. I should like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given.

In view of the statements made at yesterday's inquest by Dr. Davidson, ward supervisor in Toronto Ontario hospital, and Dr. Paul Christie, superintendent at Toronto Ontario hospital, would the hon. Minister inform the House: (1) what he intends to do about the question of staff morale, and (2) what the present staff complement is and what it desirably should be in the respective categories of (a) psychiatrists, (b) psychologists, (c) social workers, (d) nurses and (e) attendants?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, it appears that the hon. member assumes the statement regarding the level of staff morale is to be taken at face value as reported in the press. This is a statement of one man and may very well be the statement of his own morale, rather than that of the staff generally.

However, we are always concerned that staff morale be maintained at as high level as is possible. At a big institution internal improvements are constantly required to be made, and these we are attempting to make.

There is, however, one factor which is external and potent and one over which I have no control. I have been repeatedly advised, and more so particularly in recent weeks by my senior staff, that the abuse and disparagement to which our services and staff have been subjected in the past few months are having a very deleterious effect on staff morale generally. I am concerned that the continuation of such attacks and depreciation of the efforts being made, will make employment in the service so unattractive that a steady decline in the numbers and efficiency of the staff will be inevitable—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That is a poor excuse, a poor excuse!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I ask members that when a question has been asked and the Minister or other person to whom the question was directed is giving an explanation—

and he does not have to give an explanation, if he does not wish to—members will show him the courtesy of listening to his reply.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am concerned that the continuation of such attacks and depreciation of the efforts being made will make employment in the service so unattractive that a steady decline in the numbers and efficiency of the staff will be inevitable. In such an event, the people of the province may well find themselves without services on which they have depended so much.

The hon. member asks what I intend to do about staff morale. This is a question which cannot be answered without thought and consideration, but I can assure the hon. members that this is a matter under constant attention. In the light of this latest report, we will look again at every possibility which might aim at the maintenance of high staff morale.

The total staff complement at the Ontario hospital, Toronto, is at present 805. Of these, the present level of professional staff is as follows:

Qualified psychiatrists	12
Residents in post-graduate course:	
Junior	7
Senior	8
Other physicians	4
Psychologists	8
Social workers	12
Nurses (registered)	40
Nurses (unregistered)	50
Attendants and nursing aides	277

This is a total of 419 patient-care staff. On March 31, there were 1,000 patients in the hospital and 247 residents in the residential unit. The ratio of ward staff to patients would therefore be 1 to 2.4.

I am quite at a loss to understand how the 50 per cent staff turnover figure came about, because it is quite out of keeping with the facts. In 1962 there were 45 resignations from the attendants' staff and there were 52 appointments made. In 1963, the resignations were 60, and the appointments 61. In 1964, the resignations were 64, and the appointments 55. This is far from the 50 per cent figure reported.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of order in connection with a question that is not being asked. This morning, Mr. Speaker, I submitted to you a question I wished to ask of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) in connection with the dinner tendered by the province to the Shahanshah of Iran. You refused me permission to ask

this question, sir, and appended to the bottom of the question, which was returned to me, in your own hand, the following:

No urgency to be justified before orders of the day. For the notice paper.

D. H. MORROW

I should like to refer you, sir, to Lewis and the comments made by Lewis in connection with the putting of questions. Page 44 of Lewis reads as follows:

The putting of questions, particularly to Ministers of the Crown, is a most important portion of House procedure for the private member, especially so to a member of the Opposition party.

Under modern procedure with the party system in effect and with the management of the House largely in the hands of the government, the putting of questions affords a useful method of supervising the work of administration and provides the private member with his greatest opportunity to take part in the proceedings of the House and to secure information which is often enlightening and of great public importance.

The question hour provides one of the most interesting and useful portions of the day's proceedings and the answers to questions on private members' day are always eagerly awaited. If a question requires a lengthy or voluminous answer, the Minister to whom it is addressed may require a motion to be made for a return. Similarly, a Minister may refuse to answer a question asking an expression of opinion on public policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would especially direct your attention to the last part. It is the Minister who declines to answer, and Lewis clearly indicates that it is the Minister who requires the question to be put on the order paper, insofar as it may require statistical information by way of reply, or a voluminous return. I say with the deepest respect to you that there is no mention of the Speaker's intervention to prevent a private member from asking a question of a Minister.

Second, Lewis makes no reference whatsoever to the question of urgency in respect of a question.

Last—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Lewis did not figure the hon. member would ask.

Mr. Sopha: I am sure that was a brilliant comment; I just did not hear it.

Last, sir, I direct your attention to the order of business in the House that is made out in Lewis. You will observe on page 108,

"Rules of the House," and rule 28 is as follows:

The ordinary daily routine of business of the House shall be as follows:

The order of business for the consideration of the House day by day, after the above daily routine shall be as follows:

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that on every day, Monday to Friday, there is an item, "Questions put by members." Presumably, at some time in the distant past—certainly before I had the privilege of becoming a member of this assembly—that rule got buried, no doubt by precedent, custom and usage.

Beyond the writer of the rules of the House, beyond which there is no greater authority, clearly anticipated that there would be a daily question hour; indeed, Major Lewis at page 45 refers to the very phrase, "a question hour." Certainly, sir, this has become somewhat altered, and I would ask you why I, as a private member who at this time feels that his rights have been somewhat violated, could not ask what was the total cost of the dinner tendered to the Shahanshah of Iran.

Mr. Speaker: The member is not to ask the question now. He is rising on a point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I dealt with it and I would ask him not to abuse the privilege by asking the question which I have refused to permit at this time.

Mr. Sopha: I want to make one further point on the question of urgency, because we in this party are thinking of inviting Haile Selassie to a dinner for defeated Liberal candidates.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before you rule on the point of order, may I say a word? I want to direct attention particularly to the notation on the question which was returned to the hon. member for Sudbury.

In it you indicated that there was no question of urgency to this matter. I think that if 90 per cent of the questions that have been asked during this session, before the orders of the day, were subjected to the same scrutiny, one could say that there was no urgency attached to those questions.

I want to say further that I do not think for one moment that hon. members on this side of the House have abused the privilege and the responsibility and the opportunity—or whatever you like—of posing questions to the Ministers before the orders of the day. There has been no rash of these questions,

and I am sure that so far as the hon. Prime Minister is concerned—and I will say this directly to him—I think it would be a good thing if my hon. friend would encourage questions before the orders of the day. I think it is one of the best ways of getting information for the public good and for the public service. I am sure his hon. Ministers are not that overworked and I am sure that he, as the Prime Minister, would be anxious that they would be put on their toes to the extent that they would always be on the alert to the place where they would be willing and anxious to answer legitimate questions before the orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, we are having quite an afternoon with procedure. I would just point out to the hon. member that I did not know this question had been asked, and I did not know that the question had been refused. I would agree with my hon. friend that if this is a privilege—perhaps it is not; it is a right of the Opposition—I have never found anything we had difficulty in handling in any way at all. We get questions and we are quite prepared to answer them, and there is no effort being made by the government to cut off any questions. I want to make that point very clear.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps each will have his turn on a point of order.

First of all, I should like to say that I have never thought that I have been very restrictive with regard to questions before the orders of the day. Perhaps the member for Grey South is quite right in that there have been many questions asked before the orders of the day that did not have too much urgency about them.

I have always thought myself it was the privilege of each and every member to ask questions. If a question has any relevancy or urgency about it, and if I think the member needs the answer to this question in order that he may complete a speech that he is making to the House that day or the day after, I allow the question and submit it to the Minister to be answered.

There are certain questions, however—and I will come to that in a moment with regard to urgency—that really do not have any urgency before the orders of the day. It has always been my opinion that they should have some urgency. I had trouble last year before the House mostly in regard to the form of the question, and after editing questions for a month or two, we got over this difficulty. I must say the questions which have been submitted this year by the members have been in good form and very seldom

have we had to change the form of a question.

Only yesterday I refused a question from the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) pertaining to something about brine and salt in meat, which I figured did not have any urgency. I returned it to him with the comment that he should ask the question through the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) in his agricultural estimates, which are coming on today. There really was no urgency that it should have been asked yesterday, and today was in plenty of time. I do not think too much meat was spoiled in the meantime.

Now I may say to the member for Sudbury that those questions to which he referred require two days' notice as provided in the rules. The questions in this book refer, when it says: "questions may be put to Minister of the Crown relating to public affairs and to other members, etc." to questions by way of the notice paper. There is really no provision in our rules for oral questions at all.

It is only by the adoption of a British practice of allowing private notice questions that we permit oral questions before the orders of the day.

I have looked up the reference in May relative to this point, at page 358, and which will bear on the question of the member for Grey South on urgency, under private notice questions, and it reads thus:

Questions which have not appeared on the paper, but which are of an urgent character, and relate either to matters of public importance or to the arrangement of business may be taken—

now it says here, "after half-past three," that is the hour for the British House to open. Ours is at three o'clock:

—provided they have been submitted to the Speaker before noon on the day on which they are to be asked, and have been accepted by him as satisfying the conditions imposed, and provided notice has been given to the Minister concerned.

Now you will notice here that this is what we have been following with regard to the urgency. Rule 37 refers to the form of the question which it must take; that it must not be argumentative; it must not make a statement, and so on.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, wherein what you have quoted does it revolve around the question of urgency? Let me have that again, I am not just to sure of that.

Mr. Speaker: To repeat:

Questions which have not appeared on the notice paper—

that is, the ones that you do not put on the notice paper:

—but which are of an urgent character, and relate either to matters of public importance or to the arrangement of business . . . may be asked in writing to the Speaker before noon of the day on which they are to be asked.

So we really have no provision in our rules for asking oral questions, but we accept the practice of the private notice questions of the British House to allow them in writing to the Speaker before noon of the day on which they are to be asked.

Mr. Sopha: Then I take it I may ask the question, in view of your ruling, of the hon. Provincial Secretary?

Mr. Speaker: I take it that I have made my ruling before 12 o'clock today, at noon, and I do not wish to reverse it at this time. I hope the member will accept it and not feel that he would have to appeal it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if I may pursue this point of order just for a moment. If, as I understand it, your interpretation is correct, we have no procedure at all for asking oral questions and we adopt—

Mr. Speaker: I say we have no provision in our rules, but we have a procedure in that we have adopted the British practice of making oral questions private notice questions.

Mr. Singer: Well, you establish my point, sir. If we have no provision in our rules, what right have we to adopt half of the procedure? In other words, we have been proceeding in a manner which our rules do not recognize, and we have been proceeding in part by custom established in another jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: By precedent.

Mr. Singer: By precedent which we accept when it apparently suits us, and by precedent which we discard when it does not suit us, sir. We have a resolution on the order paper which I hope, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister will call, referring to the whole question of orders of this House.

To my mind, the restrictions placed in the asking of oral questions before the orders of the day are so restrictive that a great deal of benefit that can be derived from the sittings

of this assembly is lost, and it is long overdue that we re-examine this, and re-examine it thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker: The member though will appreciate the Speaker can only go by the precedents and usages that we have had in this House over the years, and that is what I have been following.

Mr. Singer: Well, with the greatest respect, sir, the precedents and customs that have been established over the years seems to vary, not only from year to year, but from month to month. The ruling you made a little earlier this afternoon, sir, was in direct contradiction to a ruling that was made either a year, or two years, ago when a similar approach was used on a private member's public bill. When a member had introduced a private member's public bill and one of his colleagues said, "Explain it;" either you or your predecessor said, "No, that is completely out of order;" and I can find that reference for you.

But this afternoon, the direct contrary order was made, and you said you had done the same thing a week or so ago, which I accept. But the rules are made from day to day, and from month to month. If we are going to be in the unhappy position where sometimes we follow rules, sometimes we follow precedents, and sometimes we follow a compromise or marriage of each of them, we get into the present unsatisfactory state which does not allow, in my opinion, the public business to be properly conducted, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The only thing I can say to the member for Downsview is that that is perhaps his opinion on the matter, but I do not agree in whole with what he has said.

Mr. Oliver: Well, may I ask Your Honour if my hon. friend's ruling is the Speaker's ruling, that the question of the hon. member for Sudbury is not one of urgency or public importance. Is that the ruling?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I made my ruling in writing back to the member for Sudbury before noon today, that I did not think it had urgency to be asked before the orders of the day, and asked him to submit it for the notice paper. That is the usual custom. Whenever we do not think that the question has enough urgency and importance about it that it should take up the time of the House before the orders of the day, it is submitted to the order paper.

Now, I might also say that running through my mind at the time I examined the question, which was almost a page long and con-

sisted of considerable statistics, that it had a statistical nature to it that would require some time, perhaps, to answer and would be much better placed on the notice paper. Having made that ruling before noon today, as I said before, at this time I do not care to reverse it.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twentieth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (continued)

On vote 2205:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned this debate the other night, I had concluded some comments with regard to the Ontario racing commission. Indeed, we had gotten into something of a discussion as to whether it was appropriate—dare I suggest whether it was in order—to consider the racing commission by way of detailed questions on the estimates, since there had been a report from the chairman of the racing commission before the standing committee on government commissions.

I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, on this point, and then leave it, that I, on reflection, am a little puzzled as to why down through the years, the chairman of the racing commission has not come before this House, in the fashion that most other chairmen have—I concede not all of them. As I reflected on this, I find we have a very mixed pattern.

For example, I do not think that the chairman of Hydro has ever come here into the House during consideration of estimates. He has come before the standing committee. Certainly the chairman of the water resources commission, the hospital insurance commission, and many other bodies has been here when the department whose estimates under which the jurisdiction falls, have been under discussion. He has been there, ready to brief the hon. Minister on detailed questions that might be put to the hon. Minister.

I can quite understand the hon. Minister's hesitancy in entertaining detailed and technical questions with regard to the commission, when he has not got advisers from the commission, who are familiar with the detailed operations, at his elbow to assist him. This is quite understandable and natural reticence.

I would like to suggest that in the future

the procedure that normally has been the case, should be followed in the instance of the Ontario racing commission.

I would also like to underline—because I thought I was making some headway in drawing it to the attention of the hon. Minister—some pretty extraordinary procedures in the operation of the Ontario racing commission. I cite this one here by way of recapping my comments of the other night—the fact that there are no regulations. Since there are no regulations, they cannot be published in the official publication of regulations, so that they are not readily available. It is run by directives and orders that are to a degree secret. It is true anybody who wants them can go and get them, but they are even less readily available than regulations, and part of our problem with regulations is that often they are made and people who are seriously affected do not know about them. So I think we have to take a look at the whole operation of the Ontario racing commission.

However, before I sit down, I want to raise one other aspect of the Ontario racing commission, and I state at the outset that I recognize this falls partly in the jurisdiction of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), through the racing commission, and partly in that of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko). It is this double-barrelled responsibility with regard to charters, which has got into some difficulties in years gone by.

The contention of the government has been—with the hon. Provincial Secretary chiefly being its spokesman—that he has cleaned up the companies branch, and the granting of charters. He has made quite a production in the House on a number of occasions, of indicating the extent to which it is cleaned up, the back files which have been accumulating there for years, and that he has brought in new regulations which presumably were going to eliminate either abuses or possible areas of abuses.

I just want to draw one to the attention of the hon. Minister—and to the hon. Provincial Secretary, since he is back in his seat—which is indicative of a continued rather sloppy approach to this situation, which allegedly the hon. Minister had cleaned up.

We have had some very heated debates and a great deal of public interest focused in the last year on the racing charters involved in the Windsor raceway. In the first instance, those were accumulated by the Rowe family. To an extent a somewhat embarrassing situation arose very early in setting up the Windsor raceway and the

accumulation of these charters, when Earl Rowe was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario. It was highly appropriate that he should then resign as director from these racing charters.

I draw this, too, to the attention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, to indicate the illegalities involved in that process, and I hasten to add right away that it is not the responsibility of His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor. His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor resigned from the directorship of the Picton Driving Park Association Limited, and also from the Desoronto driving park association, two of the charters that are involved in the Windsor raceway. He resigned on February 1, 1963. To my recollection, that is very shortly after the announcement of his appointment. The law requires that within 15 days the Provincial Secretary's department shall be informed of any change of directors.

It is interesting to note this, Mr. Chairman, that that law is an amendment which this Provincial Secretary brought in, presumably as part of his cleaning-up procedure. Indeed, in the statutes of Ontario 1961-1962, you will find An Act to amend The Corporations Information Act. Section 1 of it is an amendment to the section 5 in the original Act, adding a 5(a), and let me read 5(a):

Every corporation to which section 1 applies shall file with the Provincial Secretary a notice of every change in the membership of its board of directors within 15 days after the change has taken place and the notice shall specify the date upon which each person became a director or ceased to be a director as the case may be.

That was assented to on December 15, 1961. That was brought in by this Provincial Secretary. Indeed, he brought in another amendment, even tidying it up a bit more, so that you have addresses—almost everything up to and including telephone numbers—so that the company files would be up to date for anybody who wanted to see them.

Now, actually what happened in this instance?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We have been discussing order here quite a bit this afternoon, and my point would be that this is completely irrelevant to the estimates that we are considering at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that I am pointing out that it is either the Ontario racing commission's

responsibility, or the hon. Provincial Secretary's responsibility, or there is joint responsibility for—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, the procedures in the hon. Provincial Secretary's department certainly have nothing to do with the racing commission. Any amendments that the hon. Provincial Secretary may have introduced to The Corporations Act are completely irrelevant to what we are discussing here this afternoon.

Mr. MacDonald: What I am drawing attention to, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the Ontario racing commission has tolerated illegalities in charters on which it is permitting the Windsor raceway to operate. The fact of the matter is that the notice with regard to the change in directorship did not come in until June 1. It arrived on June 3, as a matter of fact. It was dated June 1, and arrived on June 3. Either the hon. Provincial Secretary is not enforcing his own laws, so that the illegality carries over into the Ontario racing commission, or alternatively, the legal offices in this province just do not pay attention to the law.

I just draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, when is the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who has jurisdiction over the Ontario racing commission, or the hon. Provincial Secretary, who brought in these changes in the law—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): That has nothing to do with the legality of the charters.

Mr. MacDonald: It has nothing to do with the legality of the charter, but changes in directorships are illegally handled as far as the law is concerned. You are splitting a hair very neatly. The hon. Minister may have a fine legal point, but my point is that the procedures for notification of changes in directors are illegally handled. This is the hon. Minister's law. He brought it in. What is he doing about it? What is the hon. Provincial Treasurer doing about it?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with some of the comments that were made when these estimates were before the House and some of the comments of the hon. member for York South today.

First of all, I may say that it is still, in my judgment, proper that details in connection with the operation of the Ontario racing commission should be discussed with the commission when it appears before the committee on commissions. I have no objection

at all to speaking for or accepting my responsibility as far as the racing commission is concerned and the general actions of the racing commission.

I objected the other night to the discussion of certain details in connection with Murray Waples. I still think it was unwise, because Murray Waples is appearing before the commission on June 2; this is known. Although it is not a court, it may have the effect of a court, and I think in fairness to him that we should not have gone into the details regarding the charges—

Mr. MacDonald: I did not go into the details of the charges at all. I dealt only with procedures.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am happy to—

Mr. MacDonald: I deliberately avoided details of the charges.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not think we should go into them and I said that then. I do not object to discussing the actions of the commission in this particular case, because in my opinion the commission acted as a wise commission should act. There was nothing done that prejudiced the position of the person who came before it and in just a few minutes I would perhaps review what happened.

In the first instance, the judges who were concerned were Clare Smith, representing the Canadian trotting association; Floyd Milton, who was the commission judge, and Max Hill of the jockey club, and the race in question was the sixth race on August 4.

The judges—and I am not trying to excuse or to justify the action of the judges in this particular, because I think the judges should have acted more promptly. But that is only the opinion of a layman, and I do not want by that to indicate that they acted improperly, because they did call the driver in very soon after the race. Perhaps—I am not sure—it was the next day, but very soon.

Mr. MacDonald: Three weeks later.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it was not three weeks, it was within the next couple of days. They called the driver in and discussed this race with him. Then they laid a charge of collusion, charged Lockhart and Waples with collusion in the driving of this race. They, in turn, appealed the judgment of the judges, appealed to the commission the judgment of these judges.

I think the action of the commission in this instance is evidence of their desire to

be fair, and to mete out justice because the appeal came before the commission and it was allowed. However, in the meantime, having viewed the film patrol very carefully, and having allowed the appeal—this was the judgment of the judges, that there had been collusion between these two drivers—charges were then laid by the commission against each of these drivers for driving in a way that was not in the interests of the public.

I see nothing wrong with the laying of this charge. The counsel for these men, or one of them, objected to the hearing of investigation on the sixth race on August 4—this was laid in connection with two races—and the seventh race on August 5. They served a notice of motion prohibiting the commission from proceeding with the hearing.

The application for prohibition went before Mr. Justice Landreville of the Supreme Court of Ontario. He reserved judgment. Later the commission was informed that Mr. Justice Landreville allowed the prohibition, and there is a copy of his reasons on file.

The chairman of the commission requested the counsel to appeal the prohibition. This was done. The court of appeal gave judgment in favour of the Ontario racing commission, revoking the order of prohibition granted by Mr. Justice Landreville prohibiting the commission from investigating owner-driver Waples' conduct in the sixth race at Greenwood raceway on August 4, 1964. And that case is coming before the commission on June 2.

Now, the commission is composed of reputable men—Magistrate Tupper Bigelow is the chairman of the commission; Brigadier C. S. McKee is a member of the commission; Ronald W. Todgham is a member of the commission; Clayton W. Hodgson; W. Erskine Johnston—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Who never says a thing in this House about the racing commission as far as I am aware. He draws the salary.

Hon. Mr. Allan:—and Kenneth C. MacKinnon. This case will be heard on Tuesday next.

I have every reason and confidence that this man will receive a good hearing, and that justice will be meted out as a result of that hearing.

Mr. Sopha: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment on the perennial subject of interest to me, in the hope that some day there will be some reform in this regard. I reiterate my comments that I think it is

something less than salutary that the public Treasury of this province should pay moneys to a member of this House for sitting on a commission, and the hon. member who sits on the commission has never moved to get on his feet and report to this House anything about the deliberations of that commission.

In respect of the per diem rate, I have raised with the hon. Provincial Treasurer over the years—and I have raised it with the chairman of the racing commission—the suggestion that the Ontario jockey club should be required to pay a sufficient per diem rate to defray the entire costs of the operation of the racing commission. I must say that there was some success, because I first raised this in 1960 and the rate was raised after that. It was increased.

But the place where it now stands—I think it is \$400 per day for 196 days of racing—is not yet enough according to an answer given by the chairman of the racing commission before the standing committee on government commissions this year. It is not yet sufficient to pay the total operating costs.

I maintain that it is simple justice that if the commission is in existence for the sole purpose of supervising racing in this province from the point of view of the public interest—it performs no other functions than that; it is there for simple justice—then those who race horses in the province, those who make a profit out of the racing of horses, ought to pay the total cost of the expenditure for the existence of that commission.

As for the public, the taxpayers in Kenora, in Killaloe and other hamlets—indeed in Dunnville—who have no interest in thoroughbred racing, it is injustice that they should be asked to pay part of their taxes for the operation of this sport, which really is only of interest to those people who go to the race tracks to participate in the spectator and the betting aspects of the sport.

The 6 per cent tax which we have maintained ought to be increased. It ought to be pure profit for the province, because anybody who thinks about it for 30 seconds knows that there are economic dislocations which result from gambling on the horse races. Indeed there are economic dislocations and distress and financial worry which arise from any form of gambling.

To put it a little more graphically, we know that many the light bill and the milk bill and payments for them go into the mutuels. And we know that many children throughout the province are perhaps denied some benefits accruing from the income of the parent, because the parent has such a weak

nature as to take the money that should go into the home and bet it in the mutuels at the race track.

Indeed some of them are so weak that they take little children with them to the race track, which I think is a shameful exhibition. It shows a disregard for a person's children to take a four, five, six or even 10-year-old as I have seen at the race tracks.

The pleas fall on deaf ears with the Ontario jockey club, because they neither forbid the taking of children to race tracks, nor do they provide a nursery where the children may be left. Indeed, with my own optics, I have seen children in the betting area, right up against the windows where the punters put their money. They are well on their way to establishing the validity of the maxim: like father like son.

Once again, I plead with the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who, after all, is the boss of the Ontario racing commission, to see if he can give directives telling the Ontario racing commission to increase the per diem rate to the Ontario jockey club, to defray the total costs of the expenditure that this House is asked to approve for the operation of that body.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I realize there is reason in the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury, and I assure you now that I shall have a very careful look at the matter he refers to.

Vote 2205 agreed to.

Vote 2206 agreed to.

This concludes the estimates of The Treasury Department.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, as we progress through the Budget estimates of the Ontario Department of Agriculture, we are quite prepared to examine in detail the various items. However, there are a few general comments I wish to make.

As Minister, I take very great pride in my staff and would like, in this Legislature today, to pay tribute publicly to their dedication of purpose, which results in a closely working team who realize that the agricultural and food industry will assume ever-increasing importance in the provincial and Canadian economies and in its service to the public. We have been fortunate to attract to The Ontario Department of Agriculture men and women of energy and wisdom who, in their

service to the agricultural industry, are willing to stand up and be counted. They have enabled me, as Minister, to develop policies of vigour and purpose, designed to expand and strengthen the industry of agriculture in Ontario. There are no magic buttons to press; there is no wizardry to employ when you are working with people or dealing with economic situations.

I have in turn been criticized and commended by hon. members of the Opposition for the appointment of committees of inquiry and committees of investigation. I would be the first to admit that, on occasion, I have been disappointed that some of these reports were not tabled more quickly. On the other hand, I will not consider introducing new policies for agriculture in this province unless I have all the facts at my disposal. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, from time to time, I will continue to appoint fact-finding committees, or to use other means of obtaining the facts of any particular situation. I am interested in the long-term solidarity and success of this industry.

As mentioned, we in the department are working as a team toward a common goal. We have recognized that in order to reach this goal for Ontario farmers, we must also develop a team effort of all those concerned with the agricultural and food business in this province, from the producer through to the processor and handler of food products, giving proper recognition to the consumer. However, we cannot limit our attention and confine our action to activities within the province of Ontario. We must seek greater interprovincial understanding and co-operation; we must seek a national recognition and national action on long-term agricultural policies, and a dynamic and active interest in the food markets of the world. We are and have been doing just this.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to outline to this House the several avenues of activity in this all-embracing field, avenues of activity which are necessary for a sound foundation for the agricultural and food industry, and avenues of activity which our department has been vigorously pursuing. I would list them as follows:

1. The necessity for farmers to receive better prices for agricultural products.
2. A comprehensive research programme.
3. Expanded facilities for and encouragement of agricultural education.
4. Improved agricultural technology on the farm.
5. Larger farm production units.
6. Extension education.

7. Availability of qualified farm labour.

8. Expanded markets for Ontario farm products.

9. Consumer understanding and co-operation.

10. Co-operation within the agricultural industry.

11. Improved interprovincial and national agricultural co-operation and policies.

We are providing, and are continuing to implement, marketing machinery for farmers which will increase their bargaining power. Contrary to impressions which have been given, marketing machinery in Ontario to date has received greater acceptance, and is being utilized to a much greater degree, than in any other province in Canada. Thirty-five farm products are being marketed in Ontario through The Farm Products Marketing Act and The Milk Industry Act. Seventy-five per cent of all producers are organized under the various marketing plans, through which more than 60 per cent of the total value of agricultural production is sold within this province. The only major commodities not covered by organized marketing programmes are beef and some vegetables and grains.

The use and development of marketing legislation in Ontario has outstripped that of other provinces in Canada to the extent that the total of marketings in all other provinces combined is slightly less than 15 per cent of that in Ontario. It is evident that organized marketing is regarded by producers as an effective instrument to give them increased bargaining power in the marketplace. The Ontario farmer has accumulated a wealth of experience in orderly marketing. Yet, in many respects, it is a process of continual research and pioneering in the rapidly changing marketing channels, the purchasing power of fewer and larger buyers, the pressure for market expansion and the great strides in agricultural technology.

Our department and the producer marketing boards have welcomed and encouraged the frequent and current inquiries on marketing, and conferences with producer groups from other provinces on all aspects of this subject. We know that there has been considerable discussion on a broad national or regional approach to marketing plans. This may be the next step necessary to give the farmer more effective bargaining power in national and international markets.

Research is basic to the success of any industry. The entire agricultural research programme of Ontario is co-ordinated through the director of research who has the status of an assistant deputy Minister and

who reports directly to the deputy Minister. He is assisted and guided by the Ontario agricultural research institute, made up of successful farmers and successful people engaged in agricultural business. In this way we are ensuring that the research projects and programmes carried out within Ontario are designed to meet the needs of the industry as experienced and expressed by those people who are actively engaged in the industry. To obtain further co-ordination of effort, late in 1964 a federal-provincial committee on agriculture and services was organized. This committee co-ordinates the service and research work within Ontario with the activities of the federal Department of Agriculture. It facilitates complete co-ordination between the deputy Minister in my department and the assistant deputy Minister of research under the federal Department of Agriculture at Ottawa.

Detailed and extensive agricultural research work is being carried out at the Guelph colleges and the Vineland research station, and applied or more practical research is taking place at the Kemptville agricultural school, the western Ontario agricultural school at Ridgetown and, to a limited extent, at the New Liskeard demonstration farm. The research and research service programmes carried out during 1964 represent a cost to the province of slightly over six and a half million dollars. The application of research in agriculture and food technology has always benefited the consumer and it is interesting to note that the cost to Ontario citizens has been approximately one dollar per person per year.

To judge the agricultural research programme fairly, recognition must also be given to work of the regional research stations of the federal Department of Agriculture within Ontario and to research carried out by industries related to agriculture. Taking this into consideration, our agricultural research within Ontario—which, as I mentioned, is receiving close co-ordination between our people and the researchers at Ottawa—is at a level of approximately one per cent of the cash income from the sale of farm products. This is approximately the same ratio as that of the United States, Britain, Holland and other countries with a dynamic agriculture.

It is of the utmost importance that research findings be assessed very carefully prior to general recommendation. It is in this regard that I want to pay tribute to various agricultural organizations which help our research and extension staff in assessing research findings from experimental stations, both here

and elsewhere. Special mention should be made of the Ontario soil and crop improvement association, whose members have conducted field scale trials of new practices in soil and crop management for the past twenty-five years. This organization greatly increases the reliability of soil and crop recommendations published annually by The Ontario Department of Agriculture. Other organizations, like the swine improvement council, the Ontario beef improvement association, and the various purebred dairy cattle associations, and other livestock associations, have also played an important role in interpreting research results in relation to actual farm operations.

Agricultural education is the necessary key to open the door of agricultural success for Ontario farmers in the future. With this idea in mind, we are encouraging the attendance at practical agricultural courses at the Kemptville and Ridgetown schools. As well, it is intended, on a trial basis, to conduct a practical agricultural course for northern Ontario boys at the New Liskeard demonstration farm some time during the fall of 1965.

The change in status of the Guelph colleges, and their inclusion within the University of Guelph, will strengthen and broaden the educational opportunities for our rural people. The two-year associate course at the Ontario agricultural college will continue, sponsored from the standpoint of cost by The Ontario Department of Agriculture, and conducted by the Ontario agricultural college in the University of Guelph, under a contract with this department.

This will mean that there will be three agricultural courses of a practical nature conducted by The Department of Agriculture within Ontario: namely, Kemptville, Ridgetown and Guelph.

Recognizing the need of encouraging students to attend the Ontario agricultural college, the Ontario veterinary college and Macdonald institute to ensure a continuing stream of agricultural, veterinary and household science graduates, it is proposed that bursaries of \$125 each, per year, will be provided for all Ontario students attending these institutions. In addition, entrance scholarships of \$600 per student will be provided to Ontario students entering the three colleges, under certain conditions of academic standing, that is, first class honour standing in grade 13, written in one year. This is felt to be most necessary to encourage young people with keen minds to enter some phase of agriculture as their life vocation.

The research findings and information, which result in improved technological knowledge on the part of our farmers, are passed on to them through the extension branch and the county agricultural representative and his staff. The extension workers are aided, to a very significant extent, by the information branch of the department. We have recognized the business aspects of farming and have strengthened the farm management programme in the extension branch. Four highly qualified and competent farm management specialists were appointed during 1964 to provide training and advice in the specialty of farm management. They co-operate with each agricultural representative who has been providing valuable advice and guidance to the farmers in the respective counties on the matter of good business management. The department, in co-operation with the CBC, produced three one-hour television programmes in which our extension workers co-operated. Throughout the year, extension workers have co-operated with local radio and television stations and press in providing up-to-date information on the business of farming. Our agricultural representatives and other extension workers are actively engaged in their role of dedicated service to Ontario agriculture. Agricultural activities within a county circulate around the office of the agricultural representative.

As an example of some of the activities within the responsibilities of extension branch personnel, we could point up the making of approximately 60,000 individual fertilizer recommendations, based on soil analysis; the surveying and drafting of hundreds of drainage plans; and the designing and drafting of plans for remodelling and construction of new farm buildings to mention only a few. In addition to co-ordinating the department's various programmes and policies and providing outstanding leadership at county level, the agricultural representatives and other extension workers are actively engaged in the development of local leaders and rural farm people through the 4-H and junior farmer programmes. Approximately 4,000 volunteer local leaders gave assistance to 20,500 4-H club members who completed 30,200 projects in 1964. We must pay tribute to the dedicated service of these unpaid voluntary local leaders. Approximately 7,000 junior farmers are active in the various counties in 192 clubs across the province of Ontario. We continue to place a high priority and great emphasis on our junior agricultural and homemaking programme because we believe that this is essential to ensure a healthy and

strong agricultural industry in Ontario for the future. It is of interest to note, as far as the value of this programme is concerned, that the majority of the officers and leaders in many of our farm organizations today were former 4-H club members and junior farmers.

It goes without saying that today's competitive conditions in agriculture and the capital overhead, which have resulted from the increased mechanization of Ontario farms, have increased the necessity, in some instances, for larger volume and a larger production unit per operator. This expansion has necessitated greater credit requirements for the farmer. We have recognized this and have expanded assistance available through the junior farmer loans administration. Here again, farmers contemplating expansion, and those who have expanded, receive the ready assistance of our farm management specialists and the agricultural representatives. In the fiscal year 1964-65, the average of 906 loans granted to junior farmers was \$17,400, compared with 452 loans for an average of \$12,576 the previous year. An increasing number of these borrowers are taking advantage of farm management assistance provided by the department. The increase last year in the maximum loan available, from \$20,000 to \$40,000, permits a larger and more comprehensive loan to young farmers and has enabled the young farmer to establish a larger production unit. We recognize that credit, under certain circumstances, can be as much an enemy as a friend. On the other hand, we recognize that our Ontario farmers must be provided with the means of expansion to meet the demands of present-day agriculture. Therefore, it follows that, in most cases, this will have to be done on borrowed money. It is also a fair and logical conclusion that the interest on this borrowed money be recognized as a normal farm cost when considering agricultural policies and, in particular, an equitable level for farm prices.

Our department has taken the initiative in the farm labour problem and has had several discussions with the national employment service of the federal government and The Ontario Department of Labour. At our request, a federal-provincial conference on farm labour was held on December 18 in Ottawa. The shortage of qualified farm labour is being experienced in other provinces as well. The overall farm labour picture continued to deteriorate in 1964. A number of factors have been responsible for this situation, the chief one being the slow-down in immigration, beginning in 1957, which resulted in a steady decline in the number of persons available for farm work.

Each year, more and more persons find their way to permanent employment outside agriculture, making it difficult to obtain satisfactory agricultural help. The situation is acute in all phases, for both year-round and seasonal work. It is most serious in cash crop areas, particularly at harvest time. In 1964, the federal-provincial farm labour committee organized various local committees in an attempt to deal with the situation. Through these efforts, considerable progress was made. Arrangements were made to move persons from unemployed areas in the Maritimes and Quebec to areas where labour was scarce. As well, a number of Indians were recruited in northern Ontario. National employment service figures indicate that a total of more than 30,340 placements were made in agriculture from the first of April to the end of October, 1964.

In planning to meet the situation for 1965, the following areas of effort are being stressed:

(a) A continuance and expansion, if possible, of the movement of workers from the Maritimes and Quebec.

(b) The stepping up of the use of northern Ontario Indians with greater assistance and guidance from the federal Indian affairs branch.

(c) Negotiations with the rehabilitation service of The Department of Health with reference to the employment of patients during convalescence and rehabilitation.

(d) Closer liaison with growers' committees with particular reference to housing, continuity of employment, wages and other conditions of work.

(e) Continued negotiations with federal officials towards the setting up of a more complete farm labour service under the national employment service at Ottawa.

(f) Housing subsidy for summer help.

We are in the process of developing a long-term farm labour policy for this province. Since this a national problem, I feel assured we will receive the necessary co-operation from the federal government.

During the past, the Ontario food council was given prime responsibility in the development of marketing opportunities for Ontario food products, with the following avenues of approach:

(a) Export development and import replacement.

(b) Market development in Ontario and throughout Canada.

(c) New forms in which agricultural food products can be merchandised.

(d) Aiding market stability by co-ordinated production, marketing and merchandising programmes to alleviate possible shortages and surplus situations.

Throughout 1964, studies were made of the United Kingdom food market and the possible demand of continental Europe. As a result of these studies, the Ontario food council concept was extended to the United Kingdom by the formation of an overseas food council committee in an effort to develop closer food relationships between Ontario's producers, processors and shippers and United Kingdom trade representatives. A meeting was also held in Ontario House, London, England, in October 1964, with Ontario trade officers from European offices, in order to develop as close a liaison as possible between all departments of the Ontario government, but in particular between The Department of Agriculture and The Department of Economics and Development with their offices in London, Dusseldorf and Milan. As an addition to staff, a market development specialist was appointed to the food council. He is located in The Department of Economics and Development, Toronto, in order to afford the greatest co-ordination of effort between the two departments in working with all segments of the food trade in Ontario and in helping to develop and promote expanded exports. Arrangements have also been made for the food council to assist in selecting Ontario agricultural food product representatives to be included in trade missions abroad, sponsored by The Department of Economics and Development.

The Department of Agriculture sponsored exhibits at the following overseas food and trade shows during 1964:

(a) The ideal home exhibition in Olympia, London, England.

(b) The Israeli international trade fair, Tel Aviv, Israel, held in June, 1964.

(c) The London food fair held in Olympia, London, in August and September of 1964.

In addition, the department sponsored a trade mission of United Kingdom food importers and distributors to Ontario in August and September, 1964. This was a confidence-building mission to enable members to visit growers, processors, suppliers and shippers in this province, to further cement their trade relationships and to make arrangements for new business.

During 1965, the department will be carrying on with the export programme. The food council again sponsored a food exhibit at the ideal home show this past March and, for the first time, will be sponsoring a show

on the Continent at the Anuga food fair, Cologne, Germany, in September. We will also be bringing over another trade mission from the United Kingdom and continental Europe of importers and distributors of food products. On this particular mission we will stress new business.

A complete Ontario food products directory is now being prepared, covering products and companies and people in all segments of the food industry in this province.

Our department has embarked on a new concept to deal with the problems of marketing and merchandising Ontario's agricultural food products. Under the food council, we are bringing together the four main groups concerned, so there will be a co-ordinated effort to solve current problems and to aid in the development of long-term policies which will be in the best interests of all groups. We term this the "total approach" in maintaining and expanding a healthy food and agricultural industry in this province. The food council in its activities embraces all those, from the farmer to the consumer, who are concerned with agriculture and food. Co-operation and interest from all segments have indicated, in a most definite way, that this new approach is welcomed by all groups and that it will work.

The food council has adopted a philosophy, namely, and I quote:

The Ontario food council's purpose is to encourage the most efficient form of food production, processing and distribution, consistent with our ability to produce food and be as self-sufficient as possible in order to maintain and expand our agricultural food products industry.

We feel that this is a sound programme in the interests of all segments of the agricultural food products industry, especially in this age when all groups, producer right through to the consumer, are becoming even more interdependent. This philosophy referred to, "the total approach," is based on the premise of common aims and objectives. This is a development which is the first of its kind in Canada. We have been gratified to receive suggestions that this method could very well be part of the solution on a national basis and that possibly the food council approach should be extended to the whole of Canada.

Be that as it may, this is certainly the first time that all groups have agreed to sit down together; it is certainly the first time a real opportunity has been afforded the consumers to not only assist us in the development of our policies, but, at the same time,

to be in a position to gain a first-hand knowledge of the problems facing the agricultural and food industry. The public relations and understanding impact of this policy are immeasurable.

We have added to the staff of the food council a graduate nutritionist and home economist. Her work is conducted in recognition that consumers are entitled to three basic rights:

(1) the right to be informed, (2) the right to make a choice, (3) the right to be heard, and I think we could add a fourth, that is, the right to protection and confidence in the food products which they are being asked to buy.

The nutritionist and home economist works closely with consumer committees and consumer organizations, and through this excellent two-way channel, the many phases of the food industry are becoming better known to consumers who are gaining knowledge of the problems, hazards, policies and other matters which affect the day-to-day existence of producers, processors, manufacturers and distributors of food products. At the same time, the food industry is being made more aware of the consumer's point of view and of the frustrations which are experienced from time to time. It has been gratifying and refreshing to note the change which is already taking place, through understanding, in the attitudes of the processors and handlers of Ontario food products. Such understanding within the industry as a whole and co-operation from the industry are most necessary to the future strength of Ontario's farmers.

This "total approach" is showing encouraging signs of success and is resulting in all groups working together with the aim of improving and strengthening the Ontario food products industry, both now and throughout the years ahead. We must recognize there is less true appreciation in Ontario and Canada, by the general public, of the problems of the agricultural and food industry and its necessary role in the economy, than in possibly any other country in the world, because we have never been short of food. It is essential to recognize that the agricultural and food industry is by far the largest industry in Canada and that it must maintain a healthy position in the dynamic economy which our province enjoys.

With preparations being made in all parts of Canada to celebrate Canada's centennial, there has been a great interest in the event on the part of the farm people of Ontario. I am happy to announce that, after Cabinet consideration, it has been decided to mark

the occasion throughout rural Ontario in a manner which will express the feelings of the farm people in a way that, I am sure, will add a very great deal of attractiveness to the Ontario farmstead.

It is proposed to inaugurate a farmstead improvement competition in every county and district, with provision being made for a provincial competition open to first-prize winners in each area. These competitions will be ancillary to programmes sponsored by the various municipalities. Under the programme, farmers, townships and county groups will be asked to participate in a general improvement of the whole countryside.

To assist each county or district committee to finance a satisfactory prize list, The Department of Agriculture will make a grant to each county on the basis of an average of \$8 per entry with a maximum grant to each county of \$1,800. Provincial prizes will be awarded, with the first prize winner receiving \$500 and a championship trophy, and the reserve champion receiving \$400 and a trophy. Third- to eighth-prize winners will receive \$300 scaling down to \$25.

The competition will be divided into two categories: the farmstead improvement competition, open to all farmers and organized on a county and provincial basis; and a rural landscape improvement programme, on a cost-sharing basis with county councils.

It is hoped that by 1967, as a result of the programme, many buildings would be improved and painted, dead trees removed from the countryside, fences repaired and painted, along with renovation of some of our old cemeteries and the general removing of debris around the countryside.

I am sure that everyone will agree that the programme provides a very practical way of marking Canada's centennial. Not only will it encourage the beautification of our rural scene, but it will also provide an area of personal participation in marking this important milestone in our country's history.

We recognize, and this has been shown as a continuing thread through all my comments today, that Ontario cannot be an island unto itself. We have welcomed the many opportunities for consultations with the federal government and the meetings with other provincial Ministers of Agriculture and their officials. We are a willing and active participant, Mr. Chairman, in the philosophy of co-operative federalism and interprovincial relationships designed to strengthen the bonds of unity within our great country.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, in rising to take part in this debate I want to say that I listened to my hon. friend very carefully as he reviewed the activities, achievements and plans of his department during this last year and for the year to come.

I could not help but think as the hon. Minister of Agriculture was talking, notwithstanding the efforts of the department to help agriculture in one form or another, that the basic agricultural problem remains unsolved. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly critical year after year. This year has seen a deterioration over last year, and the same applies to the preceding years since the war. The basic problem to my mind is lack of adequate income.

That may seem like a very ambiguous and perhaps oversimplified diagnosis. However, the more pressing problems facing agriculture today stem from and revolve around the fact that farmers want and feel they are entitled to an adequate income—not only an income based on fair interest for their large capital investment, but an income that would be more in line with other segments of the economy.

Before I become too deeply engrossed in this subject, let me point out that a number of things I will mention will fall under the purview of the federal government. Nonetheless, I intend to be no less critical in these areas because of federal responsibility or lack of it. It is rather obvious that such things as price supports, deficiency payments and subsidies of one kind or another fall under the federal government and are, by and large, federal programmes.

However, much can be done at the provincial level to stimulate the agricultural health. As each province becomes more conscious of its responsibilities to the agricultural community with the resultant aid in one form or another to it, this tends to raise provincial government participation in other provinces, because government assistance in any one province, over and above that given to the other provinces, places the other provinces at a distinct competitive disadvantage, especially in export trade. There is a tendency toward equalization, or equalizing government assistance in the other provinces particularly where the same commodities are involved.

I will relate this particular aspect of assistance to Quebec, the assistance that Quebec is giving to its farmers and how it affects us in the province of Ontario.

I would like to turn now to a speech made by Mr. Everett Biggs, the deputy Minister of

Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the Ontario soil and crop improvement association this year. I do not want to read this in its entirety, but I want to read a good portion of the article:

Delegates to the annual meeting of the Ontario soil and crop improvement association were told today that serious consideration should be given to the current farm situation by farm organizations in co-operation with all levels of government, which would ensure an adequate return to agriculture and the farmer.

Speaking on the topic, "Focus on Agriculture," Everett Biggs, deputy Minister of Agriculture, said that while the farmer and government must give serious consideration to the current situation, the development of long-term policy was essential to the continued welfare of the industry.

If I may just interject, Mr. Chairman, I would say that that is absolutely correct. I noticed today that the hon. Minister mentioned long-term policies in connection with farm labour. I think this is good. I think it is absolutely necessary, but up until this point, we certainly have not had any long-term policies, at least they have not been evident in the agricultural field. If we have had them, they must have been stashed away on some dusty old shelf.

Mr. Biggs goes on, and I am quoting him again:

First of all, we must make sure of an assured and adequate income, not only based upon fair interest for their large capital investment but an income that would be more on the level with other segments of our economy, said Mr. Biggs.

"I am convinced that we can get a better public understanding of our industry, and I am convinced that through this we will get better financial returns for our Ontario farmers and help overcome the entirely unrealistic and unfair situation that has developed," said the deputy Minister, "a situation where the farmers' costs have progressed in pace with the general buoyant economy, which has resulted in the markedly increased costs which have tended not only to wipe out all his profits in some cases, but which, in all cases, have more than trebled over his increased income."

Mr. Biggs pointed out that following World War II and up until about 1952 the farmer experienced an expanding economy. Then it changed and he has seen a cost-price squeeze which has been getting tighter ever since.

"I am advised that since 1947, the cost of beef has gone up 25 per cent to the consumer and down 13.8 per cent to the producer. Wheat was \$2 per bushel to the farmer and bread 17 cents to the consumer. Since 1947 the production per farmer is up 147 per cent, and the production for industrial workers is up 37 per cent. Since 1951, the prices that farmers receive have gone down 13 per cent, while the farmers' costs have gone up 13 per cent. During this decline of food prices to the farmer, food for the consumer has increased by 12 per cent."

Recalling that the Hon. W. A. Stewart, Minister of Agriculture, had said that there is no place in our present thinking and economy for a philosophy of cheap food, which has been placing the farmer in an untenable position, Mr. Biggs said that he, too, would like to reiterate the feeling of the Minister.

"There is no place for a cheap food philosophy in our present economy," said the deputy Minister. "Too many people for too long now have embraced a food philosophy which is not in the best interests of agriculture or our economy. That is one of the thoughts that we should keep in mind in our future planning."

I am delighted to see that my hon. friend has come out and said that he is against a cheap food philosophy, because to my mind, it was a cheap food philosophy that brought on the moratorium placed on milk and prevented the 19-cent increase—I believe it was last year. It was a cheap food philosophy that resulted in the changing of the formula which deprived the farmers of another increase of 19 cents per hundred.

And so, if the government has adopted an attitude which scraps the cheap food philosophy, I am delighted because I, too, would agree that there is no place for it in this country, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Biggs concluded by saying:

It would be money well spent to retain a team of the best brains in the country to develop a long-term plan which would give full recognition to the needs of agriculture.

There, again, is a very worthwhile suggestion, and I hope that it is done. The obvious question now is, when are we going to start?

I think it is rather important that we take a look at some of the things in that particular article, because I think there were a good many which give food for thought and

perhaps, if taken seriously, would result in something tangible being done for the farming industry in this province.

Mr. Chairman, it is something of a paradox that agriculture today is Canada's most important primary industry; it is the most efficient and yet it is the most troublesome. Historically, Canadian governments have been dedicated to a cheap food policy for Canadian people. Canadian people eat more cheaply than any other people in the world. If you include per capita costs of price supports and food, it takes less of each dollar of one's wages to cover the food budget of the average consumer in this country, than for the average consumer in any other country.

In Canada, an average of about 21 cents of every wage dollar is required to cover the food budget. In the United States, it takes some 23 cents in the United Kingdom it is 39 cents, and in Russia it is 60 cents. The largest subsidy ever provided for any purpose in Canada is that which is granted to the Canadian people by the Canadian farmers. This subsidy, of course, is in the form of cheap food.

Evidence everywhere has indicated that farmers have given much more to Canada than the Canadian people have ever provided for them in return. Of Canada's national budget, slightly more than two per cent is spent on agriculture, and this includes the expense of maintaining The Canada Department of Agriculture and all its research facilities—and they are many. The amount spent annually in supporting agriculture in one way or another, is slightly more than two per cent of the national budget.

The average for the United States, the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland is slightly more than eight per cent. Indeed, George McLaughlin, vice-president of the dairy farmers of Canada, put it very well when he spoke at the annual rural appreciation luncheon which the Rotary club has reported in the *Barrie Examiner*. He said that Canadians ate better at less cost than any other people on earth. He pointed out that this remarkable feat is achieved at the direct expense of the farmer, whose income in relation to his costs, has declined steadily until it is now 30 per cent lower than it was in 1949.

In the same period, the figure for his fellow worker in industry has risen no less than 54 per cent. Mr. McLaughlin very rightly stated that this spread of 84 per cent represented the subsidization of the economy by the

farmer, the biggest subsidy in Canadian history.

Of course, the same thing holds true in Ontario. Put it another way. If this discrepancy had not come about in farm returns in relation to costs and had kept pace with industrial wages, dairy farmers would have had an additional \$425 million to spend in 1963. And they would have spent it on things like radios, furniture, homes, new tractors, machinery, milking machines, tires, water pumps and what have you.

Let me stress, this is only the dairy industry, an industry that has long been considered to be one branch of agriculture that is better off than most. It can be said, with some justification, that agriculture is industry's best customer, not only because farmers themselves spend over \$3 billion annually for goods and services for their farms and families, but also because they have allowed consumers, other than farmers, more of their take-home pay to buy new cars, television sets, better health care and housing, as well as many of the luxuries which we enjoy today. And they have done this by providing them with cheaper and cheaper foods in relation to wages and costs.

You may well ask how a farmer in Ontario—in indeed, in Canada—can stay in business? Many of them do not. Since 1956 more than 110,000 dairy farmers have stopped milking cows. Those who have remained have been able to do so only by increasing their efficiency.

Each farmer or farm worker produces approximately 150 per cent more food than he did in 1949. This represents a greater increase in output for a man than any other major industry. All the benefits from this—and more—have accrued to the Canadian consumer, and has benefited the farmer only to the extent that it has allowed him to stay in business.

Many farmers are deeper in debt today as a result. It takes an ever-increasing amount of capital to increase farm efficiency.

I should like to quote another remark of Mr. Biggs, made at the soil and crop improvement annual meeting this year. He said:

We must not allow the farmer to be sacrificed on the altar of his own efficiency.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, he is being sacrificed on the altar of his own efficiency. Many farmers have been living on the money that should have been used to replace machinery and neglected buildings and houses. In other words, they have been living on their depreciation.

The two concluding paragraphs in the *Barrie Examiner* editorial in connection with Mr. McLaughlin's speech are worthy of noting, and I am quoting from the editorial that appeared in the *Barrie Examiner* in connection with that speech:

We believe Mr. McLaughlin to be exactly correct in every point. There can be no question but that cost of a policy of cheap food, traditional with all western governments, should be borne by the community as a whole, not simply by the farmers who produce the food. Mr. McLaughlin suggested that such spreading of expense could be achieved either by permitting food prices to find their proper level and subsidizing consumers unable to afford them, or by subsidizing agriculture itself, a less desirable policy from the farm point of view, but perhaps the most easily workable one.

And the concluding paragraph:

Surely it is time for Canadians everywhere to take stock of their agricultural industry and grasp the implications of its continued collapse, for without a thriving and prosperous farm industry of their own, this country must inevitably become a dependency of the United States, dependent upon American farmers for their surpluses and handouts. The Canadian farmers need help in the worst way, and they need it now.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no question that the cost of a policy of cheap food, traditional with all western governments, should be borne by the community as a whole, and not simply by the farmers who produce the food. Mr. McLaughlin suggested that such spreading of expense could be achieved either by permitting food prices to find their own level, and by subsidizing the consumer who could not afford that food, or by subsidizing agriculture itself—as pointed out in the editorial, a less desirable policy from the agricultural standpoint but perhaps the most easily worked out.

The predominant philosophy is that everyone in the population should be able to buy food, so it must be cheap. This is a reasonable and just philosophy, no question about that. It is reasonable and just but it is neither reasonable nor just to expect the farmers to sacrifice their living standards in order to make it work. It should be a charge against the whole population. In other words, we in this province and in this country as a whole have some catching up to do on our agricultural thinking.

Just to give the hon. members of the House an idea of what has happened to the farm prices, let me cite to you a few of the statistics for the different farm products sold on August 15, 1951, compared with the prices received by the farmer on August 15, 1964. I am quoting my friend, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve), who I believe used these figures in his Budget speech. I hope he does not mind if I use them also.

Commercial dairy cows of all breeds in 1951 brought \$280 per head. In 1964 they brought \$212 per head. These cattle were worth \$31.67 in August, 1951; \$20.93 on an average in 1964. Hogs, dressed, were \$32.29 in 1951; \$26.51 in August, 1964. Chickens dressed were worth 50 cents per pound in 1951, 32 cents in 1964. Turkeys dressed were worth 58 cents per pound in 1951; 41 cents per pound in 1964.

This is the picture facing agriculture in 1965. Is it any wonder that rural poverty, instead of being confined to small pockets in this province, is now widespread? Is it any wonder we face the farm problems we do? As a matter of fact, a similar situation in a number of other segments of the economy would have resulted in a revolution in this country and this province, but the farmer being the responsible citizen that he is has tended to accept the situation. Outside of a few faint cries for help issued through farm organizations, they have generally tended to hope that time would correct the situation. This just is not so.

Of course, there have been a number of factors which have tended to complicate the situation—namely, the difficulty of organizing farmers because of their large numbers, and second, as an outgrowth of the first, the lack of a unified, loud, clarion voice on behalf of the farmer. I am not saying for a moment that the federation of agriculture and the farmers' union organizations have not done a good job. I think they have done a good job. I think they have done a tremendous amount of work on behalf of the farm people across this province. All I am saying is that this work has been impeded by disunity, and the expression of different ideas and often conflicting opinions by the two groups and people within the two organizations themselves. For this reason, farm poverty, lack of adequate income, call it what you will, has not received the attention it deserves.

Michael Harrington in his book, *The Other America*, states:

Perhaps the harshest and most bitter

poverty in the United States is to be found in the field.

Have we any reason to believe the situation is different here? I do not think so. Harrington goes on to say:

Technological advance has been of great service to the large corporation farmers and they exercise their powers in governmental circles to secure that which will further benefit them. They actually oppose some of the much-needed reform in the depressed rural areas.

Still quoting:

Farm poor are for the most part without a voice in the United States. The dominant voices are those representatives of the wealthiest conservative stratum of the farmers.

Is the situation drastically different here? I do not think so. Because of the underrepresentation of the poor in the circles of power, because they are by-and-large invisible to the middle-class conscience, there will have to be a vast social movement—a new period of political creativity, if you will—before there will be any large-scale abolition of poverty, either in rural Ontario or anywhere else. I am hopeful that Mr. Pearson's war-on-poverty campaign will create the political creativity that will cope with this poverty that we have, not only in our own province but certainly across Canada.

John F. Kennedy, in a letter to Lyndon Johnson on April 10, 1963, said:

Poverty in the midst of plenty is a paradox that must not go unchallenged in this country.

May I ask my hon. friends, are we going to allow it to go unchallenged in this province? I should hope not.

Professor A. S. Scott, professor of economics at the University of British Columbia, stated in a document, "A Policy for Declining Regions," which was presented at the conference that was set up by my hon. friend's colleague, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall):

In agriculture there is a continent-wide contraction in labour requirements of food production, coupled with a rather slower growth and demand for food and for other goods, and a high rate of natural increase among farm families and in rural regions generally which have tended to prevent a steady rise in farm income, and of course a steady migration to the cities and to other industry.

Within the last few years we have witnessed the transformation of farming from an art to a science and from a way of life to a business. Notwithstanding this, people are prone—and when I say people I use it in the general sense because I think that people in the urban areas tend to feel, notwithstanding what I have said, that farmers are doing very well financially—to forget that for the protection of the consumers during the war the price of Canadian farm produce was frozen at prewar levels. They forget that farmers were denied world prices, and they forget that the prices of farm commodities have never been able to catch up since the war to those of other goods and services.

So pronounced is this disparity between rural and non-rural incomes that Hedland Menzies, a Winnipeg consulting firm, took a survey of low-income farming areas in eastern Canada, and said that the low-income farmer constitutes the core of the agricultural problem in Canada. We have the Menzies report describing the low-income farmer as one with a farm cash income of less than \$2,500. Half of these, the report said, are candidates for absorption or abandonment. Sixty-four per cent had cash incomes of less than \$2,500. A publication by the Ontario federation of labour, *Poverty in Ontario '64*, points out that 27 per cent of Ontario farm families, or 131,000 farm persons, can be said to be living in destitution; 43 per cent of Ontario farm families, or 203,800 farm persons, can be said to be living either in poverty or destitution; 65 per cent of Ontario farm families, or 315,400 farm persons, can be said to be living either in deprivation, poverty or destitution.

It goes without saying that it is difficult in declining rural regions, to maintain facilities such as schools, roads, and what have you. Is it any wonder that the rural young people are tending to gravitate to the larger centres and to the cities? The schools are not well maintained. The families of farm operators are deprived of the opportunity to become well trained. Then eventually the cities will become affected, because these young people will eventually end up in the cities.

Poor people are not able by themselves to take advantage of the abundance surrounding them. They must be rescued, with public effort and with public funds. If farmers are to be expected to provide food at prices so that everyone can buy, the benefit is to all of the people, therefore all of the people carry a responsibility in providing agriculture the security and stability it requires.

To put it very simply, the people of

Ontario, indeed Canada, cannot have their cake and eat it too. Suggestions have been made at various times that tactics used in other countries should be employed in an attempt to cope with our farm problems in this country, in this province. On more than one occasion I have heard responsible people say: "Well, they work very well in that particular country, but I am afraid they will not work here. Our country is too big. Our conditions are so much different. Those policies just will not work here."

I say to those people, perhaps they will not. Perhaps they will not work on a national basis. If they will not work on a national basis, try them on a provincial basis, on a regional basis. Try them. To say that something is not possible is an intimation of a conjured excuse rather than a legitimate reason. If poor farmers are to be rescued by public effort and public funds, as I believe they must, then I think one of the means employed can be the ARDA programme.

Maurice Sauvé, the federal forestry Minister who now has ARDA under his wing, has said that ARDA is an agricultural programme where necessary, but not necessarily an agricultural programme. He pointed out in his speech to the Ontario federation of agriculture annual meeting in November, here in Toronto, that as far as ARDA is concerned, Canada has three types of rural areas:

One—Farm areas of intensive commercial farming where rural development programmes are not needed. In other words, we do not need to worry about them. They will look after themselves.

Two—Farm areas that do not have a viable system of commercial farming and need help.

Three—Non-farm areas that are plagued by diminishing power and need a lot of help.

Mr. Sauvé also said, the types of programmes needed are:

One, the consolidation of the low income farms.

Two, creation of employment opportunity through the development of resources and the stimulation of industry.

Three, the re-establishment of people in certain areas and regions.

Last year, when I was discussing the ARDA programme, I recall advocating more local involvement. I think this has been done. I know the county councils have taken responsibility in this regard. I think the local involvement has been more or less given over to

them. However, the success to date has not been what one might call earth-shattering. The big problem, of course, is how to get local people involved; how to get them to recognize that they have a problem in the first place. Certainly if they do not recognize that they have a problem, then it is almost impossible to sell them the fact that they need help.

It would seem to me at this point, and as we have progressed along in the ARDA programme, that we should be considering the need for what I might call an ARDA county co-ordinator, a community development officer, call him what you like, who would actually work with the county councils, the local people and the farm organizations in the areas. It is only by transposing the views and the ideas of ARDA into action at the local level that we are going to get anywhere, and that ARDA in the final analysis is going to mean better rural areas in Ontario.

To my mind, the function of this co-ordinator or development officer could be much the same as an EMO co-ordinator. Not only should he be involved with the local people, and the local organizations, he should have easy access to Mr. Crown's office here in Toronto; and the liaison should be an easy one. In a number of instances there has been a definite lack of co-ordination between the local organizations and The Department of Agriculture here in Toronto. I can think of the Bruce county area, for instance. Bruce county has been trying to get a community pasture for months. The project has been approved. Everything seems ready to go, and yet nothing happens. According to my information, Toronto says everything is okay. Toronto says it is Ottawa's fault, but Ottawa says everything is okay as far as it is concerned; yet nothing happens. They are not getting their community pasture programme, even though the project has been approved. The fruition of the community pasture has subsequently not been forthcoming. Indeed, there would appear to be a hiatus between the local people and the various levels of government. It is my feeling that the local co-ordinator would do much to relieve this situation.

When I say this, I am saying it with the full knowledge that a co-ordinator, or some person to co-ordinate the programmes and to establish liaison between the various organizations and The Department of Agriculture, has been functioning on Manitoulin Island. I know that my hon. friend and colleague from Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) has done a great deal of work and

I know that the ARDA programme has been used extensively in Manitoulin Island. I realize that this local co-ordinator has been appointed, so I simply say to my hon. friend: "Could not this be an ideal across the province?" If my hon. friend thinks this is good in Manitoulin Island, could it not be emulated across the province, with a great deal more success than has been seen up until this point? I make that suggestion to him and I hope he will comment on it, because I think that ARDA has tremendous potential, and I think we better start working these things out.

As I indicated, economic planning is a very large undertaking. It takes the fullest co-operation of all levels of government. The people of this province deserve that, because in an undertaking such as this, one is dealing with the lives of people individually and in a community sense. So it follows that what is done will affect the present generation, as well as generations to come. It is interesting to note that the federation of agriculture has embarked upon an energetic programme of rural development. According to the federation brief presented to the Ontario Cabinet this year, it perceived the use of every means, plan, project and proposal to increase income opportunities for rural residents, to direct resources into their highest and best use and to improve community services of all kinds. The brief says in part:

We are concerned with poverty that demeans and breaks the human spirit. Especially are we concerned with young people who, raised in economic and social want, may have too little opportunity unless prompt action is taken to know any other conditions.

In short, rural development is a total programme. A total programme demands total effort, yet there are three paragraphs in the brief in connection with rural development which I find very interesting. I think I will read them for the benefit of the House. The federation brief says in part:

With the passing of time we are beginning to believe that our assumption concerning the amount and timeliness of government help may have been too optimistic. Provincially, the requirement of close communication and co-operation within and between government departments, so vital to the total concept, has not been realized, with one notable exception in our experience. Most government departments have displayed a singular lack of interest in what other departments were doing. Branches within departments erected bar-

riers instead of bridges. A competitive rather than a co-operative spirit too often has been the prevailing attitude. In addition, there has been the problem of finding technicians to help perform the necessary job of appraising and cataloguing the fund of human and other resources available for development.

The brief goes on:

Were we not so sure that there our approach was sound, we might have been tempted to withdraw from the field, but we are certain of our ground.

Mr. Chairman, if I may just interject at this point: The federation is saying in effect, "We believe so strongly in the rural development programme that nothing is going to stop us. We have had no encouragement from the provincial government, we cannot get any co-operation from it; it is establishing barriers instead of bridges between the departments and between branches within the departments, and if we did not believe so strongly in it we would have given up long ago." I say it is most regrettable, Mr. Chairman.

The brief goes on:

But we are certain of our ground. The necessity of maintaining our present course is dictated by the quickening march of change. We are bolstered in our resolve by the existence of ARDA, whose published aims make it the most hopeful piece of farm legislation yet devised.

We urge the government of Ontario to recognize the need for a total effort and to provide in full for the mighty task of re-organization confronting rural society.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, it is most regrettable.

Let me say to my hon. friend that this is no time to be plodding along with feet of clay. If my hon. friend has not already done so, he should be setting up lines of communication with other departments, and with his colleague the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) for one. He should be setting up lines of communication within the branches of his own department.

The brief says:

Most government departments have displayed a singular lack of interest in what other departments were doing. Branches within departments have erected barriers instead of bridges. A competitive rather than a co-operative spirit too often has been the prevailing attitude.

I say: absolutely inexcusable. This points up the lackadaisical, lazy attitude this government has toward ARDA.

In my opinion, it is just about time the government started to recognize the need for a programme of rural development in Ontario. It is just about time the people of the province had some revitalized thinking coming from this government in respect to ARDA and its potential. In addition to what I have already said, there is a crying need for a number of people to do some concentrated research on the human and other resources across the province.

This research should be interrelated with research done by the federal government on various projects. It should be carried out as a province, not on a piecemeal sort of approach. It should be carried out with the thought in mind, is there a need for ARDA in one area as opposed to another area? None of this to my knowledge has been done on a provincial basis. There has been a great deal of research done on the federal level, but no extensive research done on a provincial basis. Furthermore, such research should be done, as I have said before, in co-operation with the federal authorities to avoid overlapping and duplication. In other words, the government should be working toward a freely co-ordinated, research-oriented programme to ensure that the fullest and best use is made of the ARDA programme.

It is interesting to see what Leonard Gertler said when he presented a paper at the conference of regional development sponsored by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. My friend, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) read this particular paragraph when he was discussing the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, as it related to regional development associations. However, I intend to read it again, if for no other reason than to underscore what it says:

One of the most striking demonstrations of the difference between the Quebec type of approach and the Ontario type is the relative importance placed by each on research in their ARDA programmes. In the figures released by federal ARDA this past summer on projects at the end of the first full operational year of the federal-provincial programme, Quebec's projects are shown to include an amount of \$1,203,546, or about 23 per cent of the total, for research, while the amount for that purpose in Ontario was \$187,405, or about six per cent of the total ARDA expenditures in the province.

The descriptions of the Quebec research project indicate that the greatest effort is being made in comprehensive studies designed to evaluate resources with a view to increasing income, employment opportunities and the standard of living of the population on the lower south shore of the St. Lawrence, to study the physical resources and their economic impact so that the first draft of an overall plan of action can be prepared and solved.

And the paper goes on to say:

The ARDA projects are not isolated phenomena but are what appears to be an increasingly systematic approach to the basic problems of economic development in the province.

How is this government going to know in what direction to go if it does not do research to find out? Then after the findings have been assessed and the course of action decided upon, there is a definite need for close co-operation between the various departments and the various branches within the departments. Up to this point, it appears that very little of this has been done in the province.

In Quebec, for instance, 80 specialists have been working on a research project; they have been doing intensive research, they have been working for more than two years now. I am told it will take at least another two years before their work is completed. They are spending approximately \$4 million in this research project. It is commonly referred to, I believe, as the eastern Quebec planning bureau.

Completion of plans to build one of the finest ski resort areas in the world in the Gaspé peninsula is near. I am told that this ski resort is being built under the ARDA programme. It is in a low-income area and the area needs some lifting or some boosting in terms of money being poured into it. The research has indicated that this would be an economical project and one in which support would be forthcoming from within the area itself. In other words, the ARDA programme will build it, then the local people will look after it and it will be an economical and money-making project from then on.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): It is not farming.

Mr. Gaunt: The hon. member says it is not farming. Granted it is not farming, but in some of these areas you cannot develop good farms because there is nothing to work with. The land is not such that it is conducive to the farming operation and so you

have to bring in something else. This is precisely what the Quebec people have done in this connection. This project is a very elaborate project because it includes an airport so they will be able to fly people in from New York and fly them back out again, Mr. Chairman.

I repeat, all of this is being done under ARDA, and millions and millions of dollars are involved.

I point this out simply to show that Quebec is doing and has done extensive research to actively assess the needs and the type of project required, taking into consideration the human and other resources. Then it is moving forward very quickly into the areas in which the studies have indicated it should go. In the meantime, this government stands around wringing its hands, carrying out the odd little project here and there, trying to look busy even though it is not too sure whether the project was the right one in the first place or not.

I am saying this with the full knowledge that the initiative has to come from the local people, but how are the local people going to make a wise decision if the relevant facts are not made known to them? The only way the relevant facts can be made known to them is to conduct a research study, and this has not been done on the scale in which I have indicated.

Certainly these things should be done and they should be done within the broad confines of economic planning, and surely that is a government responsibility. I dare say that more extensive use could have been made of the ARDA programme in the unfortunate, and in some cases rather drastic drought situation in eastern Ontario in the last three years, culminating as it did last year when this government declared the region a disaster area.

The Ontario Department of Agriculture has given aid to the area; it has given aid on a 50-50 basis with the federal government, to the extent of 75 per cent of the payment toward hay transportation up to \$10 a ton. The government has guaranteed bank loans up to a maximum of \$4,500, repayable over a period of three years, for the purpose of purchasing feed. Those who have junior farmer loans have had the principal amounts deferred for a year, as I understand it, or they can be amortized over the remaining period of the loan. In addition, the government offered freight assistance to farmers in eastern Ontario who wanted to ship their cattle from their farms to the stockyards. There was also help offered in the building

of farm ponds, a policy which applies right across the province.

Having said all this, let me say further, in the light of this being declared a disaster area, that I think the help that was offered is peanuts. Of course, the people appreciated the little bit of help that was given to them, of course they would. Why would they not? When you are desperate, you appreciate anything. Anything looks good.

As far as the 75 per cent payment toward hay transportation up to \$10 per ton is concerned, what happened in a good many cases was simply this: those who were doing the transporting moved their prices up accordingly, because they knew the Ontario government was subsidizing the cost of transportation. So, in the final analysis, very little saving was realized by the farmer—the man who really needed the help. It did not happen in all cases, but it happened in a number of cases.

The Department of Agriculture has guaranteed bank loans up to a maximum of \$4,500, payable over a period of three years for the purchase of feed. In an article in the *Family Herald* of February 4, 1965, page 13, Mr. Suderman, in an article about eastern Ontario, says:

Sixty-four per cent of the farmers in Renfrew county make less than \$2,500 per annum.

How, by any stretch of the imagination, are these people going to be able to pay back \$4,500 in three years? I will tell you. They are not. They are not.

My hon. friend may say that if a farmer does not make any more than \$2,500 per year, no one is going to lend him money, not even the government. If this is so, then it strengthens my argument, because, after all, there are 64 per cent of these farmers in this state in eastern Ontario, according to Mr. Suderman. It becomes obvious that this would be an area for concentrated research, and a fairly substantial ARDA project.

I realize that a number of smaller projects have been carried out in eastern Ontario. I do not know precisely what projects, but I know that work has been done. But it seems to me that up until this point it has been done in a rather piecemeal fashion.

I am looking upon this as a complete rural development programme project. This could be one way out for my hon. friend. I am suggesting to him that I think this could be one way out, since he did not see fit to give the eastern Ontario farmers the kind of help required to get them back on their feet, after

the area was declared a disaster area. The connotation "disaster area" in the United States means that large sums of public money are poured into the area in order to rehabilitate the area, because such things as this—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: By the federal government.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, it is done by the federal Treasury. That is right. But it is done in order to rehabilitate the area, to get it back on its feet, because things such as drought, tornadoes and so on are acts of God. No one can help them. It is not the farmers' fault that they are placed in this particular position. Everyone is powerless to stop it. With all respect to the hon. Minister, and to what he has done, the kind of assistance he has offered certainly will not do this. Worse still, it will not even come close.

Even more far-reaching is that everyone in the community—not only the farmer, but everyone—suffers, because basically eastern Ontario is rural in nature, and the businessman, from the grocer to the druggist, the car dealer to the dentist, suffers because the farmer has not got the money to spend. At this juncture I would like to make one suggestion to my hon. friend.

Where guarantees have been made on bank loans of \$4,500 or a portion thereof, and where a farmer has had less than \$500 income over the past two years, after deducting expenses from gross income and allowing for capital depreciation on buildings and machinery, but not including his own labour, The Department of Agriculture should forgive the debt of that farmer provided he is a full-time farmer. This would be established either from his farm account books, or from his income tax returns. What could be more reasonable?

Where in this country would you find anyone willing to work as hard as a farmer has to work during the year, and do it for \$500 or less? I do not think you would find too many. To me this is a very reasonable suggestion, and I hope the hon. Minister will give it serious consideration. Surely, that is the least the government could do for this stricken area.

I realize this is getting into an area dealing with the government's attitude and philosophy towards agriculture. It seems to me that this government has, over the years, adopted the attitude that if the farmers yell and scream hard enough and long enough, we will throw them a crumb or two. This philosophy towards agriculture over the years

has hampered, in my opinion, impeded, yes, and almost made impossible the development of long-term planning needed for agriculture today and needed so badly.

Indeed, I am inclined to wonder whether this government has any policy other than a day-to-day, "eat, live and be merry for tomorrow we die" attitude towards agriculture.

In this connection I noticed an article in the *Rural Co-operator* in which Mr. G. F. Perkin, marketing commissioner with The Ontario Department of Agriculture, is reported as addressing a meeting of the county wheat committee members in Toronto last fall.

I want, first of all to take out a paragraph from Mr. Perkin's comments because I find them very interesting. This article, as I said, appeared in connection with Mr. Perkin's comments when he was addressing the meeting of the county wheat committee members in Toronto:

Higher prices are important, but higher net incomes for farmers can be obtained by several means. Ontario marketing boards have never made any effort to realize lower costs of production.

A most interesting statement. I realize that Mr. Perkin is a civil servant, that he is a very fine man, and presumably he was reflecting the government attitude, the government thinking and policy in this connection.

Let me read for you again:

Higher prices are important, but higher net incomes for farmers can be obtained by several means.

The key word in the sentence is "but." What Mr. Perkin is really saying, or was really saying at that meeting, was that higher prices are important, but I do not think you are going to get them, so you will have to get them through some other means.

Then he goes on to spell out the one other means that he thinks farmers can use in order to increase their income. Then he makes another interesting statement, he says:

Ontario marketing boards have never made any effort to realize lower cost of production.

In other words, Mr. Perkin is saying to the farm people gathered at that meeting, "You are not going to get higher prices, so one of the ways to raise your income is by lowering your cost of production. In other words, increase your efficiency."

How does this opinion jibe with the parting shot offered by the deputy Minister at

the soil and crops improvement annual meeting in Toronto in January, when he said:

I do not think that the farmer should be expected to allow himself to be sacrificed on the altar of his own efficiency.

Those words by the deputy Minister are the words which reflect a realization that the farm problem cannot be solved by increasing efficiency alone, and neither it can. In the past number of years, all the advantages from increasing the efficiency of production have been more than wiped out. Is a farmer expected to increase efficiency in the next few years, and end up in, let us say 1975, in a worse state than he is today? Of course not, and this is what Mr. Biggs was saying.

On the other hand, Mr. Perkin comes up with what I would call an incredible piece of rationalization when he said, "Ontario marketing boards have never made any effort to realize lower cost of production." Of course they have not. That is not their job. The job of marketing boards is to market the product in the most efficient manner in order to obtain the best possible price for the primary producer in a market place where the bargaining power and the expertise of the buyer and the seller are closely aligned. That is the job of the marketing board. There are a whole host of farm organizations interested in increasing the efficiency of the farmers across this province. I can think of the soil and crop improvement association. I can think of the federation of agriculture and its many allied member associates. All these people are interested in increasing efficiency and in the increased efficiency of the farmer. Let these organizations do the job and let the marketing board do the job it is intended to do: Market the product the farmer produces.

As I say, and I will repeat again, Mr. Perkin is a civil servant and certainly he cannot be blamed for what he said, because presumably he was simply expressing government policy and he did it at this particular time. Yet there is another aspect of government policy that is expressed by Mr. Perkin, in the same address, which is rather interesting. Mr. Perkin talks about the fact that marketing boards should be broadened:

It is time for processors, retailers and consumers to be represented on producer marketing boards, according to an Ontario government official. The official, G. F. Perkin, marketing commissioner with The Ontario Department of Agriculture said: The best efforts of the Ontario department over the past five years to broaden the outlook and strengthen the member-

ship of existing or new producer marketing boards have largely been rejected.

The editorial, Mr. Chairman, by Corinne Hughson, which appeared later in the *Rural Co-operator* in connection with Mr. Perkin's comment seemed to be appropriate at this time. It was entitled: "To strengthen which board?"

It is true that the farm products marketing board has been urging marketing board officials to add processors and even consumers to its board. To my mind the much superior way is to have the marketing board advised by an advisory committee, and we have already done that in legislation which has been presented to this House during this session. That, to my mind, is the way to do it. This, of course, is a matter of opinion and how I feel about it. I think that it is just about time the government stopped advocating this dual multi-purpose representation on producer marketing boards.

A few months ago Ellen Morningstar—I believe Mrs. Morningstar is president of the Canadian consumers association—stated:

The consumers association of Canada has never wanted or asked to be represented on producer marketing boards. In fact, the CAC would consider it has no right to do so.

How explicit can one be? Mrs. Morningstar says we, as consumers, do not want to be represented on producer marketing boards. We even consider that we would have no right to be on them. And yet her pleadings have gone unanswered. I am sure my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Morningstar) would concur with what I have said. As I said, her pleadings have gone unanswered.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Give me an instance where they have gone unanswered.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, Mrs. Morningstar says that she would consider she had no right, or any consumer had no right, on a producer marketing board; yet she wants to be represented on the farm products marketing board, and as yet we have not seen the fulfilment of that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is the hon. member recommending that she should be?

Mr. Gaunt: I am not recommending it, I am just simply saying that Mrs. Morningstar has said that she does not want to be on producer marketing boards, but would like to be on the farm products marketing board, presumably as vice-chairman with Mr.

McCague. She would no doubt like to sit on that board to keep up with the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not blame her, as far as that goes.

Mr. Gaunt: —to keep up with the trends in the industry and inform the consuming public accordingly.

At the same time Mr. Perkin was down at the wheat producers marketing board asking to have the processors, retailers and wholesalers on the producers marketing board in order to broaden the outlook and strengthen the membership. My hon. friend, if he really believes what is good for the goose is good for the gander, should have had a member of his farm products marketing board over talking to Canada Packers—urging them to have a member of the hog producers association on their board. He should have been over at Campbell Soups urging them to have a member of the vegetable growers on their board. A tobacco grower as a member of the Rothman board. The farmer can expect nothing less. If there is going to be give and take it cannot be the farmers who do all the giving and the retailers and the processors doing all the taking. As a matter of fact, if we approach anything like that which I have mentioned, then in the next few years I would fully expect this government to ask Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the auto workers union, if Mr. E. H. Walker, president of General Motors of Canada, could be a member of the union executive.

To me, marketing boards are an implement of, or a method of, collective action on behalf of the farmers. I ask you how can collective action be effective on behalf of the farmers when sellers, when buyers and middlemen are all represented on the same board through which effective collective action must be taken on the farmers' behalf? It cannot be done.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is as much of a philosophic mishmash as the government's medical insurance bill.

Mr. Gaunt: I would urge the government—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Give us an illustration of where this is happening.

Mr. MacDonald: One of your civil servants—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, what he suggests and what the government does are two entirely different things.

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad to get that point clear!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Quite clear.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I am glad of the interjection of my hon. friend. I had presumed that Mr. Perkin was reflecting the government's policy in this connection; perhaps he is not, according to my hon. friend. I am willing to accept his word and I will leave it to his decision.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe he was flying a kite—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No kite!

Mr. Gaunt: Notwithstanding, it is my feeling, by and large, that farmers are in favour of marketing boards. I think this has been pointed up by the recent vote taken by the Ontario broiler growers. They have established a marketing board for themselves and they did it with a large percentage of the growers coming out and voting, and the percentage in favour of establishing a marketing board was quite large.

However, in some cases, it has been all too easy for farmers to imagine a market place which will enable them to set prices, just as prices are set for the items that they have to buy. Where this has not materialized, disillusionment has set in, and the farmer and the marketing board personnel have failed to recognize less spectacular gains. Despite this, requests for the setting up of new marketing boards continue to come before the farm products marketing board.

While a study of government philosophy toward farm marketing boards is an interesting one, so is the analysis of some of the trouble spots in which the government is trying to deal in the area of marketing boards. The bean board is a good example. The Ontario bean growers marketing board has been investigated by a firm of business consultants, and the consultants, Price, Waterhouse and Company, named to do the job by the Ontario government, have come up with a report. I saw this article in the *London Free Press* of Saturday, May 22. It says:

Complete separation of the Ontario bean growers marketing board from its wholly-owned subsidiary company, Ontario Bean Growers Limited of London, has been strongly recommended by an international firm of chartered accountants, it was announced today.

In a report to the Ontario farm products marketing board, Price, Waterhouse and Company said separation was essential if bean industry co-operation and harmony is to be obtained.

It said the separation is in the best interests of growers, the public and the industry.

In its bean report, Price, Waterhouse said the London company has not been influential in establishing a firm price for beans in the market place. It noted that the marketing board has the right to negotiate prices, so it would seem quite unnecessary to have a company to establish price.

Under the separation arrangement, the report suggested that the board should obtain separate office space and engage adequate staff and maintain appropriate records to carry out its basic function. The company was incorporated in 1952, but over the years it has been heavily subsidized by producer funds that were turned over to the company by the marketing board. The board has absorbed losses on operation of the company in the amount of \$408,286.

In other words, the report of Price, Waterhouse and Company has confirmed what the government has already said, and has already indicated to the bean board. Obviously, the

bean board takes the position that they would like to maintain the status quo.

Ironically, the dispute has come to a head at a time when unfair competition seems least valid. Apparently the Ontario Bean Growers Limited made a profit of \$7,600 through normal competitive channels and operations last year. This was according to the secretary-treasurer. The secretary-treasurer has made it abundantly clear that no losses have been made up in the last three years.

A number of the bean growers have indicated that there were a few complaints from the dealers while the farmer-owned company was struggling, albeit with grower subsidies. Now the company is becoming successful and competitive without subsidy, there is a squawk from the dealers to the effect that this is unfair competition, and the government moves in and indicates that the bean board and the operation of the board and of the company must be separated.

Mr. Chairman, I move adjournment of the debate.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, May 27, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, May 27, 1965

Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, continued	3329
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3367

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (continued)

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at 6 o'clock, I was discussing various aspects of the white bean board problem, and in this connection, I want to read part of an article that appeared in the *Rural Co-operator*:

The bean board is unanimous that it should continue to operate the processing plant. A recent annual meeting of the bean growers gave enthusiastic backing to this stand.

"We have no intention of splitting the two operations," Robert Allen, vice-chairman of the board, said last Saturday. "We will divorce the two operations only if ordered to do so by the government but we won't do it on our own."

Mr. Allen says the present operation best serves the farmer. The bean company gives the board a true indication of marketing conditions, profit margins, the situation on export markets and economic floor prices.

"The bean company also acts as a healthy price setter," the vice-chairman continued. "Early this season private dealers started bidding \$6.75 per hundred for beans. Knowing market conditions, our bean company felt that the market could stand a more competitive price of \$7. We started buying at this figure and immediately all of the private dealers matched us, getting this extra 25 cents for the farmers and putting another \$300,000 into their pockets.

"We know the dealers don't like what we are doing. They say we are too keen in setting top prices," he said.

Ontario Bean Growers Limited handles only between eight and 12 per cent of the Ontario crop. Two thirds of the total crop is handled by one company, W. G. Thompson and Sons Limited, of Blenheim.

Recently dealers have complained that

the bean growers' plant has been competing unfairly. This accusation comes at a time when the company made a small \$7,600 profit under normal operations.

And I mentioned that particular aspect of it before dinner.

Also, the board has not subsidized the company's exports for three years, says Archie McMurchie, the secretary-manager.

Mr. Allen says he cannot understand the government's attitude. "Several years ago, after the supreme court findings, the farm products marketing board was suggesting that the bean board and company should merge their operations completely. Now it is the other way around." However, spokesmen for the farm products marketing board denied that the board made this proposal.

The board, according to my understanding, buys any surplus offered up until October 15. It buys a further 30 per cent up to the end of November. After that, the board buys beans only if the special committee agrees that the beans are truly in surplus at any time. The dealers would like the board to buy surplus beans, not only at the time the committee would like to buy them, but at any time, as does the Ontario wheat board with that commodity. The bean board prefers to buy only when the seaway is open, giving cheap access to European markets.

Without arguing the merits or otherwise of the bean board's buying pattern, the facts are that it handles only eight to 12 per cent of the crop, yet according to the article which I just read, it put more than \$300,000 more money into the pockets of the farmers last year than would otherwise have been the case.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that is a rather remarkable feat. Is it any wonder that the board refuses to separate the board from the company? It becomes rather obvious to me that the government is not going to change its stand on the matter. It is also rather obvious to me that the bean growers marketing board is not going to change its attitude toward this particular problem. It follows that we have here a collision course, unless a compromise can be reached.

It seems to me that such a compromise would be to turn the growers' company into a co-operative, which would have a special relationship with the marketing board. In fact, I cannot see why this special relationship could not include at least some of the same personnel, maybe even the same manager. It is my understanding that under the present marketing legislation, a marketing board has the right to name any company as its agent to perform specific functions, which would mean in this case that the bean board would name the bean co-operative as its agent, to process some beans and to provide designated marketing services. The co-operative could perform these functions on a fee basis, adequate enough to cover the co-operative's expenses.

Perhaps this would not be entirely satisfactory to the proponents on the bean board who insist that the company and the board should not be separated. Perhaps it would not be entirely satisfactory to the government which insists that a complete separation must be forthcoming. But I am suggesting it would be, in effect, a compromise of these two points of view. It would perhaps correct the government's charge of illegality and at the same time maintain for the bean board the advantage it now enjoys through what the government obviously looks upon as a common-law marriage.

In my opinion, farm market legislation and farm market legislators will have to reach the point where marketing boards have a very close relationship and liaison with processing and marketing facilities—not to the point of illegality, not at all, but most certainly to the point of allowing farmers through their marketing boards to control at least a portion of the end product. This is absolutely necessary because up until this point the expertise in the marketplace has been on the buying side, not on the selling side. Having said that, I realize well that marketing boards have done a great deal to increase the farmers' bargaining power in the marketplace and have been a vital step forward in the concept of collective bargaining rather than individual bargaining.

Nevertheless, the scales are still tipped in favour of the buying side. Never was this brought home so forcibly to me until I read an article in the *Farmers' Advocate* of December, 1964. It is entitled "Frankly Speaking We Can Sell More Ontario Food in Britain," says Honourable W. A. Stewart." I will read this article in part because it is rather interesting. It deals with white beans and that is the topic I want to deal with

specifically in this particular speech. The article goes on:

An exciting opportunity for larger export sales in Britain awaits many Ontario farmers. In many cases, farmers themselves, through their marketing boards, can capitalize on the opportunities. In others, they will have to work closely with the processing companies.

I would just like to stop there for a moment. Let me say this. Of course my hon. friend is interested in increasing export sales of agricultural products, there is no question in the world about it. He states that farmers themselves, through marketing boards, can capitalize on export opportunities.

That is quite true where the marketing boards control the end product, as in the case of white beans, wheat, onions and so on. In these cases, there is no doubt that marketing boards are becoming more aggressive in the export field, with a great degree of effectiveness.

However, my hon. friend and I part company when he said, "In others they will have to work closely with the processing companies." Let me preface my remarks in this connection by saying that I realize work has been done in this area, and in many cases with a limited degree of success, particularly in the cases where the product had to be changed or altered before export as in the case of cherry pie fillings and canned peaches, tomato juice and so on.

However, the real problem here is that we are dealing with corporate companies, companies who have export buyers and sellers on their staffs, as well as the extremely competent people who have an abundance of business acumen. These corporate companies and their executives have a responsibility to their shareholders—and there is nothing wrong with that. But I am simply making the statement that these people have a responsibility to their shareholders to the extent that they must try to make as much profit as possible. It is, therefore, probable that these companies are not anxious to export, unless a fairly substantial surplus exists or appears to exist at any given time. They are more interested in maintaining a three to four to five per cent surplus in order to depress the price to the producer, which in the end means more profit to the company.

For one to think that the company is going to export quantities of a product in order to raise the price to the producer and lower its own profit picture, is simply naive. It just will not happen. Certainly there is more

truth than fiction in the saying that a three or four per cent surplus sets the price. I realize that a slight surplus is absolutely necessary to maintain the continuity of supply, but not to the extent of substantially depressing the price.

If I may come back to my former point about the expertise in the marketplace being weighed largely in favour of the buyer and not the seller. That is why I say that before anyone can talk with assurance about increasing exports, the farmers, through their marketing boards, will have to control at least some of the end product. This is one reason why Danish pork has been so successful in the export market, and competing in world markets. The Danes can say to an importer, "We can supply you with 20 million pounds of pork," and mean it.

They can do this on a continual basis because the producers have control of the end product, to the extent that they can see all export demands filled and are interested in keeping within the confines of their own country only enough for their own consumption. That is one reason. The other reason of course is quality.

In summation of this point, I would say that in this province we should be giving every encouragement to marketing boards, to develop facilities to handle the end product—not in an illegal fashion but in an atmosphere where there is a very close working relationship between the board and the facility.

To continue the article:

The market has grown steadily for Ontario farm products since dollar restrictions came off. It is estimated we are selling \$100 million worth of Ontario products in Britain now. If we can even get ten per cent of the UK import market, we can greatly increase this amount of sales.

There appears to be a market in Britain almost for the asking for thousands of more beans—bushels of beans—than we are now selling. Our export chances appear brighter with this crop than with almost any other, but we must do a selling job to take advantage of it. We have been export-selling beans only when we know we have a surplus; that is always too late in the season and there is no way to develop a profitable market. We must grow for a market, not just market what is grown. We must be able to guarantee a continuity of supply and quality within reason.

Besides, if we were to forward a price in the spring, shipping space could then

be reserved for orders taken. We can set our price in the spring according to the US government's Commodity Credit Corporation price. Under the Commonwealth preferential tariff arrangement, we get an eight per cent tariff preference, plus the seven and a half per cent difference between the US and Canadian dollar.

Our main competitor in selling white beans in Britain is the US. Besides our price advantage over the US, our beans are also preferred by some processors in Britain from a quality standpoint. This year, with an Ontario white bean crop of close to 2,000,000 bushels, growers would have had an advantage in selling beans if a planned export selling programme had started in the spring.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Pretty good speech.

Mr. Gaunt: I would say to the hon. Minister that at least I was in accord with that statement because I thought that this could be done, and that being so, I was all in favour of it.

My hon. friend is saying that in the spring a contract should be signed with the importer for so many bushels of white beans, in this case, at such-and-such a price, and for so many millions of beans to go to that particular country with all the arrangements being inherent in the contract which would be signed in the spring. In so doing, the bean growers in the province would have a price advantage, as I have indicated and as has been indicated in the article, because of the eight per cent tariff preference plus the 7.5 per cent difference between the US and Canadian dollars. In this way, the bean growers could actually produce for an export market.

Although my hon. friend does not say so in the article, I presume that he thinks such a contract would be conditional, pending yields, weather conditions and so on—the things that farmers are subjected to in the course of a growing season. To be perfectly frank and honest I thought this would be the case too, and I thought it would work well in the sense that planned export selling could be done in the spring, but if weather and crop yields were such that conditions of the contract could not be filled, then the contract was not in any way binding. However, I find out that this is not the case and I want to point out to my hon. friend that this is set out in a letter from Mr. Hugo B. Hammerslag, who is one of the most experienced bean dealers in North America.

It is a letter addressed to Mr. Archie

McMurchie, secretary, Ontario bean growers marketing board. I think I will read the whole letter because it is quite interesting and it sets out the arrangements which are made in the US by which the US exports beans to the United Kingdom and other places.

Dear Mr. McMurchie:

This will confirm our telephone conversation of February 6, dealing primarily with marketing practices of the Michigan bean industry and The United States Department of Agriculture in connection with export sales of Michigan pea beans.

As you indicated that officials of the farm products marketing board stated that buyers in the United Kingdom could purchase Michigan pea beans in the spring or summer for deferred shipment on the basis that the seller would not be required to make delivery on such contracts if growing and harvesting conditions resulted in production that was an amount that would not provide a surplus for export, the party or parties that made such a statement either have been deliberately or unintentionally misinformed, as nothing could be further from the truth.

I have been actively engaged in the bean business for more than 42 years, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, I have never known of a sale of beans to the United Kingdom or any other country made on the basis of the above statement. When we make a sales commitment, either domestic or for export, under normal peacetime conditions, the buyer in the contract, and by the same token the seller, expects the buyer to accept delivery regardless of market conditions.

It is apparent that some of your officials connected with the farm products marketing board do not thoroughly understand the bean support programme as administered by The United States Department of Agriculture. It might be well for them to secure a copy of the provisions and conditions under which this programme operates, from The United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., together with the standard beans storage agreement.

I believe that you have copies of these documents in your files and to expedite matters you might desire to forward these to the proper officials so that these documents can be properly evaluated.

The United States usually establishes the support price of dry edible beans during the spring prior to the time when beans are usually planted. This price does not

become effective until September 1, and provides only for a loan to the producers at the support level that has been established. This is a non-recourse loan which permits the producer to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation at the full support price, less storage and processing charges. The loans mature at midnight April 30 of the following year, which for the current crop would be April 30, 1965, and for the coming crop year would be April 30, 1966.

The United States Department of Agriculture does not take title until this time and therefore does not enter into any export or domestic sales, directly or indirectly prior to this date. Only producers are eligible to procure loans under this support programme. Bean processors or dealers have no rights whatsoever under this programme to borrow money on beans that they may have in their inventory, from either The United States Department of Agriculture or the Commodity Credit Corporation.

After the takeover date and when a determination is made as to the quantity of beans that the Commodity Credit Corporation may have in its inventory, they then determine at what price they will be willing to dispose of these beans on an export or domestic basis. At times there is no price differential between the domestic and export price. However, when there is a sizable surplus, beans designated for export are sold at a lower level than for the domestic market. The farmer or producer has the right to repay loans to the Commodity Credit Corporation at any time prior to April 30, and in such event he is required to pay the government interest on his loan; whereas, if the producer does not redeem the beans or repay the loan, interest charges are waived and as stated previously there is no recourse to the board.

A producer can only obtain a loan on beans that he actually produces and there are several penalties provided for any violation of this phase of the programme. Producers can also place beans under support of the programme without borrowing money from the Commodity Credit Corporation. This procedure is known as the purchase agreement arrangement, whereby the producer notifies the government that he is placing these beans under support and the government is obliged to take delivery of these beans at the support level prior to April 30 of the crop year involved. There are some slight techni-

calities involved with this procedure, but I am sure they would be of no interest to either yourself or your government officials.

I sincerely trust that this information will help to clarify a marketing procedure that exists only in the minds of individuals who have been grossly misinformed and I am sure that they will welcome information of this type. It will provide them with the truth and the sales practices that exist.

Sincerely yours,
Hugo D. Hammerslag

This letter, I am sure, produces an entirely different picture. When the United States government enters into the field of exporting beans it is for the previous year's crop, and the government knows precisely how many beans it has to sell. The only piece of speculation is the price at which they are sold.

If a comparable situation were to exist here, the federal government would have to provide for support prices, storage facilities, and undertake the negotiation with Great Britain or any of the importing countries for the sale of beans in the spring following the crop year.

None of these things exists here in this country. In view of this, the only alternative is for the Ontario bean producers marketing board to undertake an export programme more elaborate and extensive than is now the case, because even though the bean growers in this province have an eight per cent tariff preference, and a 7.5 per cent advantage between United States and Canadian money, they have to, in effect, compete with the US Mint.

Frankly, under these conditions I find it rather difficult to visualize the Ontario bean growers marketing board getting into the export business wholesale, unless there was an assurance that it could be done at a reasonable profit to the growers. Unless beans were supported federally—which they are not—at a reasonably high level, then the producers would not know what they would get for the beans until the following spring, if they were producing specifically for an export market.

Undoubtedly our export trade in beans is going to increase, because production seems to be moving up in rather a spectacular fashion, particularly this year, and it follows that our exports are going to increase accordingly.

However, it would seem to me that if my hon. friend can convince Mr. Hays to do these things that I have mentioned, then

bean producers can produce for an export market. Barring that, it would seem that any major shift in the exporting of white beans could not take place, at least for a few years, unless the government was willing to move into the field.

I want to move into the final area that I intend to discuss at this time. This is the vertical integration problem. My colleague, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), talked about this problem two years ago, and documented a very convincing case against integrators and those who were moving into the field.

I am certainly not going to repeat what he said. However, this year there appears to be an alarming increase in vertical integration, notwithstanding the efforts of the food council. I am told by reliable sources that York Farms and Green Giant are moving into the field extensively, so much so that the vertical integration of these two companies is up one-third over last year. These companies are offering very attractive deals, so attractive that one could hardly turn them down.

They offer to rent the farm for 10 years. In some cases, as an added carrot, they say that they will tile-drain the farm. Campbell Soups, for instance, has moved into the field in a rather spectacular fashion, undertaking to produce much of its own produce. In the chicken and turkey field, the company is undertaking to produce its own feed for these operations.

Apparently the food council has been ineffectual in dissuading these companies from entering the field to this extent. Even UCO has been involved rather extensively in the integration field.

I do not want to be to the co-operatives what Pierre Berton is to the Church, but I do not think a little introspection does any of us any harm. To descend to the vernacular, it really burned my socks to see UCO and Tenderflesh Limited importing turkeys by the carload from the United States this past year. Not only did they import, but they were one of the biggest offenders. And yet officials of the company justify this action by saying that they have to compete. In order to be competitive, they say, and stay in business, we have to do this.

The obvious question then is, stay in business at whose expense? The farmers, of course! The very man the co-operative was designed to help. It is a strange paradox indeed, Mr. Chairman.

Another excuse given is that this sort of

thing guarantees a continuity of supply. I say hogwash. Who is trying to kid whom? Why are they not honest enough to say that they are doing it because they want to make a profit? Do you mean to tell me that in this country we cannot guarantee continuity of supply? Of course we can.

If I were offering advice to my hon. friend, I would say that he should get these people together to re-examine their aims and objectives, because I feel that the farming community as a whole cannot, and will not, tolerate this kind of action. Perhaps this kind of thing is the reason why some farm people, and even a few farm leaders, are becoming disillusioned about the co-operative movement in the province.

I repeat that the co-operative movement has done a lot in this province for farmers, particularly in the fertilizer business, and in a number of other fields. But I think it is about time that a reassessment took place, because I feel the co-operative movement has become misguided over the years, and I hope my hon. friend will help the movement get back on the rails once again. I say that most sincerely.

One of the main reasons for the immense increase in the vertical integration, from the farmer's vantage point, is the steadily increasing cost-price squeeze, and the resulting decrease of income in recent years. The farmer has turned to something that is sure to guarantee him a steady income with very little or no work, and so the climate is created for the vertical integrate.

If it has not already become clear, the tenor of my remarks has been centered around the farmer's inadequate income, and the problems that have arisen through farmers collectively—with the help of government—trying to better their luck in the marketplace.

When one talks about government help for farmers in the provincial field, it follows almost automatically that one will look at Quebec and what the Quebec government is doing for agriculture. The province of Quebec realizes the importance of agriculture to the province's economy, and is determined to help it, even if it means spending public funds to do so. Five to eight per cent of the total budget in Quebec goes for agriculture.

Let us turn for a moment to see what Quebec is doing for its farmers and for agriculture. First, let me make another point. Needless to say, when aid is given to agriculture to the extent that it is in Quebec by the government, no matter what the circumstances, it places our farmers at a very

decided competitive disadvantage when similar help is not given here.

Now then, let us take a look at what Quebec is doing for its farm people:

1. Quebec is giving farmers a direct cheque, amounting to 25 per cent rebate on school taxes.

2. Under the Quebec farm credit association, the counterpart of our junior farmer loan, the recipient of a loan is entitled to a remission of one third of the amount loaned, up to \$3,000, if he proves to the satisfaction of the bureau that he has lived on his farm and cultivated it without interruption during ten years following the date of signature of the loan. This is granted only once.

3. The bureau charges interest at the rate of 2.5 per cent per year.

4. In addition, under The Farm Improvement Act, 1961, the government will pay the interest up to 3 per cent on a loan of up to \$3,000, if a farmer borrows money in order to purchase cattle, pigs or sheep for breeding purposes, farm implements and agricultural equipment or machinery, or the improvement of land and buildings.

5. The government pays the interest up to 3 per cent on a loan of up to \$4,000 for one or more of the following purposes:

- (a) Underground or surface drainage or the improvement of the land in any way.

- (b) The erection or improvement of buildings.

- (c) Drinking water supply systems, or improvement thereof.

- (d) Installing or improving electric wiring.

6. The government of the province guarantees loans under The Farm Improvement Act, including losses of principal and interest up to 10 per cent of the total amount of such loss.

7. The government subsidizes the cost of transportation of livestock to slaughtering centres in remote areas, far removed from markets.

8. Special assistance and encouragement is given to farmers for purchases of purebred heifers, premiums for the purchase of purebred swine.

9. A direct grant of \$1,000 for those who really desire to establish themselves on a farm in order to make a living, the grant to be used for agricultural purposes.

10. A grant of 30 per cent of the purchase price of commercial fertilizers, up to a maximum of \$100 per farmer per year.

11. Subsidization of milk going into manu-

facturing plants to the extent of 17½ cents in the summer and 35 cents in the winter.

These are the main subsidization programmes of The Quebec Department of Agriculture. Needless to say, it is much more extensive than exists in Ontario. In order that farmers in this province be given the kind of help that is so desperately needed; in order that farmers in this province not be kept in a situation of competitive disadvantage with its sister province, Quebec; and in order that an attempt be made to bring the level of farm income closer to that enjoyed by other segments of the economy, I would strongly urge my hon. friend to implement with despatch the following:

1. Forgive one-third of every junior farmer loan to a maximum of \$3,000 if the borrower has kept up, within reason, his interest and principal payments for ten years, provided he is a full-time farmer.

2. Reduce the interest on junior farmer loans from 5 per cent to 3 per cent.

3. Pay up to 2 per cent of the interest on farm improvement loans with a principal forgiveness after five years of 10 per cent on the total amount of the loan up to \$500.

4. Subsidize the cost of transportation of livestock to slaughtering centres in remote areas that are far removed from markets.

5. Provide payment of a direct grant of 20 per cent of the purchase price of commercial fertilizers, up to a maximum of \$75 per farmer for a year.

May I stress again, that this is help that farmers desperately need in this province and I would ask my hon. friend to act accordingly.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce has covered the agricultural waterfront pretty completely and well.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Much of what I intended to say, he has covered, in whole or in part, and I am going to attempt to avoid, on those portions that he has covered, undue repetition. I shall borrow from his remarks, add some that I have and try to drive home the point. My basic theme will be the same as his, and this is no accident, because anybody who knows anything about agriculture knows what the basic problem of agriculture is. The basic problem of agriculture is that farmers do not have enough net income. It is as simple as that. There are very few problems in agriculture that could not be solved by the

farmers themselves, if they had sufficient income to do it, but they are in a cost price squeeze. Their costs are going up and their incomes are tending to come down, so that they are in a squeeze and they are simply not in a position to help themselves.

We have had this illustrated many times in this House in many ways, but perhaps the best one is the simple fact that agriculture represents some nine or ten per cent of our population and is getting some four, five or six per cent of our income. They are getting about half of a fair share of the national or provincial income. Now I think something has to be done about this. I was interested in my hon. friend's reference to that speech of the deputy Minister when speaking to the soil and crop improvement association. I noticed that he also reproduced some of that speech in this report from Queen's Park under the direction of Don Fairbairn and, in it, he pointed to the nub of the situation. He said:

I am advised that since 1947 beef has gone up 25 per cent to the consumers, but down 13.8 per cent to the producers. Wheat was \$2 per bushel to the farmers and bread 17 cents to the consumer. Now wheat is \$1.65 to the farmer and bread is 23 cents to the consumers. Since 1951 the prices the farmers receive have gone down 13 per cent while the farmers' costs have gone up 13 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, we need go no further than that. I know of no other business in the world where costs can go up and incomes can go down and they still stay in business. The explanation for it, of course, is a very simple one. Farmers net a wage per hour which is grossly in violation of the minimum wage of this province, if applied even to the owners of the farms, to say nothing about the hired help on the farm. They are living on their capital; they do not take out of their business what any normal businessmen would do—an adequate, fair return percentage-wise on the capital they have invested. This is the only reason that farmers are able to exist.

Now, we have to do something about this situation. I was rather interested the other day when the standing committee was considering the milk bill. One of the witnesses that came before us, a gentleman from eastern Ontario, referred to the same speech of Mr. Biggs, and said he had heard this many times before. In effect, he said: "I am getting tired of hearing about it; I want to see some action that is going to do something about correcting it." And this is going to be the whole thrust and purport of my

remarks. Not in detail, because much of the detail has already been given by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, but in the areas in which I think the government has got to move if it is going to restore agriculture to a position where it is getting a fair share of the wealth that is being produced in this province, and in this nation.

One way that it has to be done, Mr. Chairman, is to have a planned economic development. That means there has got to be some conscious decisions made by this government. It has to be willing to pump back into the farm sector of the economy some of the wealth that experience has proven that the farm sector of the economy cannot get for itself through its normal marketing procedures.

Now right here, Mr. Chairman, I think we might as well face reality. This government will be very inhibited in doing this.

Second, we have got to face the fact that we live in a climate conditioned by the editorial writers in the *Globe and Mail* and the usual "city-slicker" approach to agricultural problems, which magnifies far out of proportion any subsidy that is given to agriculture. Actually these subsidies have done very little but toy with the problem of redressing the balance between agricultural income and agricultural outgo, but the whole climate is such that the public is conditioned to oppose and to think that the farmers are living on handouts.

The fact of the matter is that you can call them handouts—you can call them anything you want—but in a planned economic development, which is going to restore agriculture to its rightful place in our economy, much more money has to be put back in various ways into that agricultural sector. Obviously you will have to pick and choose to create the greatest possible incentive for the farmer to do the job himself, and I know of no group of people who will do the job for themselves, who are more independent, who are more willing to operate on a private enterprise basis and do their own job, if they have half a chance.

The problem is they are living in a capitalistic economy, where they are licked both ways. When they go to buy the things they want, they are charged whatever the person selling wants to charge them; in many instances when they go to sell, they have to take what the buyer wants to give them. They have, through their marketing schemes, been able to correct that to some degree, but not enough to redress the balance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us take a look, as

my hon. friend has pointed out, at the kind of thing that has been done in the province of Quebec. You will see both what is done and the rather spectacular results that have been produced in a short time. When I was discussing The Milk Act, I pointed out that one of the difficulties in saying to the great body of producers in this province, who might want to bring their production up to a grade A level, is that they simply have not got the means, on the net income that they are living with, to be able to improve the standard of their plant to reach grade A production.

In Quebec you find that, for example, in addition to the federal subsidies, the Quebec government has recognized that something must be done and is giving 35 cents a hundredweight subsidy for grade A milk from October to April. It is giving from 15 to 18 cents a hundredweight during the summer months in addition to the federal subsidies.

In other words, this is bolstering the income of that group of people who have not been getting a fair price for grade A milk, because they were in the manufactured milk field, enough of an income that they get up to something approaching the grade A price. In addition to that, you have direct subsidies of \$500 for building milk houses. You have subsidies for mechanical cooling, not on any uneconomic unit, but on a basis of at least four cans or more. You have general assistance in fertilizer and lime and feed grains. Now, this is pumping back into the agricultural economy something that they should have, but within our economic system, experience has proved they simply have not got the power in the marketplace to get it for themselves.

In a planned economic development, you acknowledge that it is desirable that they should have it and you make certain that they get it. The techniques you use can be as varied as you wish to make them. Once again, as I said, by giving as much incentive for the job to be done by the farmers themselves.

I was interested, for example, in looking at the results. I pointed out the other day that as a result of the kind of programme that has been launched in the province of Quebec, over the past year the dairy herds in the province of Quebec increased some 23,000. The increase in the province of Quebec is four times the decrease in all the rest of the nation, including the province of Ontario. Indeed, only one other province other than Quebec has had an increase in the dairy herd numbers over the past year,

and that is the province of P.E.I. Now, when I made that comment the other day, the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) interjected and queried as to what sort of a change this represented in terms of the absolute numbers that they had before. I was interested in checking on that. Mr. Chairman, it is rather significant.

I discovered, for example, that in the years 1960 to 1964, this is what has happened in the province of Ontario with regard to the number of milk cows on farms. In each of those succeeding years it has gone from 975,000 to 992,000 to 970,000 to 950,000 and to 954,000.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What is the production?

Mr. MacDonald: The production has gone up, I agree. But I am talking about the number in the herds.

Now, what happened in the province of Quebec in the same five-year period? It was 1,009,000; 1,006,000; 1,032,000; 1,048,000; 1,060,000. A slow, but consistent increase. In Ontario, the tendency is to a slow decrease. But in the one year, following the incentives that have been given, to try to meet the position of the dairy industry at the moment, we find that in the province of Quebec there is a jump of 23,000 in the numbers; four times the decrease in all the rest of the nation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: 1964?

Mr. MacDonald: The figures I gave you are 1964. And the ones I am giving you now, the change over the last year, are the figures as compared with last year and they are found in the latest news report from the Ontario milk producers co-ordinating board, May, 1965.

I was not able to get the exact figures as to the budget in the province of Quebec, because I think the budget figures are deceiving in that the so-called Quebec agricultural budget is a resources budget and it includes, I think, forestry and some other resources.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): It is completely separate.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it completely separate?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would not argue with you.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if it is completely separate, I have got a devastating piece of

evidence here for the hon. Minister, but I think he is wrong. The fact of the matter is, that the budget in the province of Quebec for agriculture last year was \$112.5 million. Now, if the hon. Minister cares to take his estimates out, he will find that the agricultural budget in the province of Ontario, in the same year, is approximately \$21 million. Now, I say to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, I am certain that this includes other departments that would be separate in the Ontario government.

However, the interesting thing is that if you take our agricultural estimates, the total, including the federated colleges at Guelph, was \$21,500,000. The total for Guelph is \$7,400,000. In other words, other than Guelph—which I am not minimizing, but if I can separate it for a moment—the total agricultural budget is \$14 million. Quebec's assistance to their dairy industry is precisely that figure, Mr. Chairman.

The government in the province of Quebec hopes that by 1975 they will have increased the economic units by 100 per cent. If I may give these exact figures: Last year there were 90,000 farms in the province of Quebec, of which only 20,000 were considered economic units. By 1975 Quebec hopes to increase those 20,000 to 40,000 economic units by its assistance programme. And subsidies—if I may use that horrible term in the presence of a Tory government and the editorial writers and how they will use it and misrepresent it—to the dairy industry alone in the province of Quebec are \$14 million a year, which is the total budget of this Department of Agriculture, other than the federated colleges at Guelph.

Now, without going into any more detail, the simple point I am making is that there is no point in lamenting, as Mr. Biggs has done most eloquently across the province of Ontario, the position of agriculture; the unfair position in relationship to the rest of the economy. There is no point in lamenting about it any further, if the government is willing to start to plan an economic development which will redress that situation. That means pumping back into the agricultural sector of the economy millions of dollars so that they will get their fair share. Now I know the hon. Minister will say that he is doing some of these things. He introduced, for example, a housing programme which he announced a few weeks ago. I am glad we have gotten to the stage where we can frankly say that there are houses in the rural areas that are equivalent to a slum and we want to do something about it. Up until now if you said that, you usually offended the

rural folk so that you would defeat your purpose, politically at least.

We have the hon. Minister, for example, announcing that he is now going to have a contest in which they are going to give a prize in each county for the best homestead, for the best farm. Now all of this is very fine, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not getting at the root of the problem. The root of the problem is to get money back into the agricultural sector of the economy so that they can do something about improving their farms. You may perchance, with some little assistance that you are giving or you may give with this tantalizing prospect of a prize, encourage them to do something. However, farmers cannot do something if they do not have the money. And there is no point in setting up a contest if the farmers basically lack the means to be able to improve their farms so they can meaningfully enter the contest.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You are telling a farmer.

Mr. MacDonald: Look, my good friend, you have sold cars all your life, I was raised on a farm.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You are telling a farmer.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, I am telling a farmer but I am telling a Tory farmer who is opposed to economic planning.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I have been much closer to farming in the last 20 years than you have. If you do not believe me, come on down and I can prove it.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Aren't the farmers raising enough produce now? What is your beef?

Mr. MacDonald: You know, Mr. Chairman, that comment is—it is good these two are together, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I am telling the truth.

Mr. MacDonald: That comment is about on the level of those made when we discussed the plight and the social problems of the Indians, when our friend the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management said that the Indians were happy living in their tents.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: I did not say tents.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have dealt with one aspect of what I think has to

be done—planning the economic development and pumping back income into the agricultural economy.

There is a second thing that I want to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister, and that is the whole ARDA programme. My hon. friend from Huron Bruce once again has touched on it, and I do not want to repeat what he said, but let me try to illustrate my point this way. I have here the report and digest of the ARDA projects at the end of the first full operational year, June, 1964.

Again, if it does not become too irksome I want to compare Quebec and Ontario. I do so because these are the only two provinces that are really comparable in terms of the nature of our agriculture, the size of the province and everything else. If you look through this book you will find on page 19 the report for the province of Quebec and what it has done in ARDA. There were 100 projects approved, there were 22 projects withdrawn or not approved, one project is under discussion with the provincial government, and four projects were recommended—a total of 127 projects and a total sharable cost of \$6.8 million, with a federal share of \$3.4 million. This is at the end of the first operational year, June, 1964. And then you go through this book and there are literally ten pages of the details of the projects.

When you get to the end of those ten pages, you come next to the province of Ontario. And what is the position? Not 100 projects as in Quebec, but only 21 projects. Not a total amount involved of \$6.8 million as in Quebec, but a total amount of only \$3.4 million. Not a federal contribution, as there was in the province of Quebec, of \$3.4 million, but in Ontario only \$1.8 million.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I think two things have to be pointed out. I said this before but I think in the context of what we are considering here tonight it should be repeated. This government has taken a narrow, purely agricultural approach to ARDA. In the province of Quebec and in most of the other provinces across this country, they recognize that ARDA seeks rural area development.

One thing that becomes more and more apparent to anybody who takes a look at our rural area is that agriculture is becoming a smaller and smaller sector of the economy within that rural area. You have to diversify the economy. In the terminology that we picked up when we attended the regional development conference, you have to find the "growth points." Some of the growth points may be logical, they may be obvious,

and you encourage their development. In some other rural areas, they may not be obvious, therefore you have to go into intensive research.

Here again is where you get a striking contrast between what goes on in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario. Leonard O. Gertler, in the conference at Queen's on areas of economic stress in Canada, pointed out about that first year, and just let me quote this paragraph:

One of the most striking demonstrations of the difference between the Quebec-type approach to the problems of economic development and the Ontario-type is the relative importance placed by each on research into their ARDA programmes. In the figures released by the federal ARDA this past summer on projects, at the end of the first full operational year of the federal-provincial programme, Quebec's projects are shown to include an amount of \$1,200,000 in round numbers, or about 23 per cent of the total, for research, while the amount for that purpose in Ontario was a measly—

that is my adjective, it is not in the report: —\$187,405, or about six per cent of the total ARDA expenditures in the province.

Not only are we spending much less on ARDA because of our narrow approach, but only six per cent of the very small amount that we are spending is going on research; Quebec is spending much more, and 23 per cent of that much bigger figure is being spent on research.

In other words, they are not playing around on the surface; they are going into an area such as they have done in that eastern Quebec development area, with a team of 80 experts—economists, sociologists, and all of the various modern disciplines, and they study the economy, and they discover what can be done to improve the economic position. Furthermore, as we all, I think, will acknowledge, you cannot develop one ARDA programme if you have not the participation of the people in the area, so that they feel that they are part of it and it is their project.

Another thing that is done in the province of Quebec, you will find, is that of 80 experts, a significant proportion of those experts is going to be what you might call adult educationists, people—

Mr. Letherby: Deadwood!

Mr. MacDonald: Not deadwood.

Mr. Letherby: Nitwits!

Mr. MacDonald:—people in radio and TV and various forms of adult education who, in effect, are taking these projects out and holding literally, not just scores, but hundreds of study groups with the people, to have them brought in, to study the problem and what they are planning to do, to get them to understand it and to get them to participate. All of this is part of modern economic development. I do not know but I would hope, for the benefit of the rural areas of the province of Ontario toward which ARDA can make such a real contribution, that it is not beyond the capacity of a good, old Tory government—

Mr. Letherby: We will not go for it.

Mr. MacDonald:—to face up to what is required in modern terms and to tackle the job. I repeat, ARDA is the second important item and it is one in which you can tap the resources that are available on the federal level to a far greater extent than you are doing. I wish, for example, this government were tapping the resources available at the federal level from ARDA in half as effective a fashion as we have done on technical and vocational assistance training in the building of our technical schools across this province. The money was there and we have gone after it to meet an obvious need in the province. The only conclusion I can come to is that the government is not persuaded of the need. If it were persuaded of the need in ARDA, it would go and get that money and put it to work to try to solve some of these problems.

Mr. Chairman, there is a third area that has been touched on in various aspects by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce and that, of course, is the whole question of marketing. One of the best ways to help farmers help themselves is to assist them in building more effective collective bargaining procedures through our marketing legislation. I must say that the last year has proved pretty conclusively that farmers in the province of Ontario have got over a stage of non-confidence as far as marketing boards are concerned. I doubt whether there has ever been a year in the history of the province of Ontario where the results of votes in marketing have been as spectacular. Indeed, the latest issue of the *Rural Co-operator* which came to my desk just this morning, headlines a front-page story "Newmarket plans near—" and reports still others that are emerging and on which they are hoping to have quick votes, in the Niagara peninsula.

Let us take a look for a moment at what

has happened in the last year. You had the tender fruit vote—90 per cent “yes”; the largest vote that has ever been held, I understand, in any plan in the history of the province of Ontario. What interests me, Mr. Chairman, is this: This vote was held to give the marketing board the power to fix prices. I want this good Tory government to pause for a moment and contemplate this horrible manifestation of socialism—or something of that nature—emerging in their midst; and presumably it must have been with your approval or with the approval of the Ontario farm products marketing board.

In other words, a group of farmers discovered that in the very difficult circumstances of marketing perishable fruit, tender fruit, negotiating prices did not give adequate power to get the necessary returns. Apparently they got permission from the marketing board, they held a vote and they have 90 per cent endorsement and are now armed with the right to go out and say that the price for this product is going to be this. Where is your free enterprise now? Out the window, and quite rightly so.

Indeed, the interesting thing here, Mr. Chairman, if we are dealing with the philosophic aspects of the things, is that for years we have lived on the continent where economists have assured us that something in excess of 50 per cent of the prices on this continent are managed prices. Almost ten years ago the economists of President Eisenhower—this has stuck in my mind and I repeat it to make my point—studied it and said that 52 per cent of the prices in the United States were managed prices. In other words, the market demand and supply had nothing to do at all with the prices. When General Motors decides what it is going to do, for example, this year, it decides that the price of a car is going to be X number of dollars, and it fixes that price because it comes to the conclusion in advance that it is going to make X number of hundreds of millions of dollars profit, and it works back to the prices it has decided on. There is no play between the forces of supply and demand.

Here you have a very extraordinary situation, and I commend it. I think it is very heartwarming to discover that a group of lowly producers, who are in a relatively defenceless position in the markets, have finally—I trust not unwittingly, not unknowledgeably—been given the power by this government to fix their own prices so that they can have a greater hope of getting a return for their products that would match their costs of production.

There was the first vote. There was another vote, for instance, in the broiler industry, and here, of course, I should let the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) take over, because he knows more about broilers than I ever could. For years he has had a surplus and he has to have a Tory feed every now and again—a barbecue—to get rid of his surplus. But the rest of them do not have that means of disposing of their surpluses and they were going bankrupt. So this year they had a vote and what was the result? Eighty-five per cent said “yes”—the largest-ever recorded vote for a new board in the province of Ontario, and they are going to go out fixing quotas to try to cope with this surplus. Here you have a board faced with surpluses, the problem that had wrecked the stability of their markets, which is now going to have the power to fix the quotas and try to get some orderly marketing established.

The wheat board, one of our old established boards, during this last year set a record. It bought some 5,000,000 bushels of wheat—all the surpluses have been disposed of. They had a plebiscite during the last year; they sought a major increase in their check-off; from ten cents up to 16.5 cents, and there were a lot of doubting Thomases who said, “Oh, the farmers in the secrecy of a ballot box when they have only to mark an X are not going to agree to this additional check-off. They will not have the wisdom to strengthen their collective position to market even more effectively in the future.” But the fact of the matter is that they had a 70 per cent “yes” vote. In this area they recognized what they needed.

You have a turkey vote set for June—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce was applauding in his “farmer” capacity, rather than his “professional” capacity as a member of the Legislature.

We have the bean problem. Again, my hon. friend has done me the service of spelling out most of the detail, but, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that really puzzles me in relation to the bean board. Here is a board which has set up its own company to buy and cope with its surpluses in this particular fashion and this company has been in existence for some years. It has lost money consistently; indeed, it lost something in excess of \$400,000 down through the years, up until three years ago, and all the time it was losing money, the independent dealers did not object. Three years

ago, it started to make money. For the last three years it has consistently made money.

The additional fact that I draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), in his new and intense interest in agriculture, is that the bean company has control of ten to 12 per cent of the beans—that is all—so it is only a small part of the market. Yet suddenly, Mr. Chairman, when the trade had no objection to the farmers strengthening their position and stabilizing the market all down through the years, it changed its mind, and you have great protests. Suddenly, the government begins to lend an ear to the protesters—those who were marketing 90 per cent of the product. Suddenly we have comments—rightly or wrongly I do not know, because I understand that some of the comments that got into the press were inaccurate—but you have comments from spokesmen of the Ontario farm products marketing board saying that the operations of the bean board were unethical.

The government suggested that they should separate the company from the marketing board. They had their annual meeting and the growers said in effect, "No, we have no intention of separating our company from the marketing board, unless we are ordered to by the government and then, in effect, under the law of the land." So what did the government do then? It brought in Price Waterhouse, and Price Waterhouse, of course, brought in a report which was precisely what the government wanted.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Are you suggesting that we dictated the report?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know whether you dictated it, but I can tell you that if you were to take what you were saying before Price Waterhouse went in to study the matter and just elaborate on it, you would have an accurate prophecy of what was in the report.

But my point is simply this: I suggest to the hon. Minister that Price Waterhouse does not know anything about farm marketing.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): It knows something about accounting.

Mr. MacDonald: It may know something about accounting. I am not denying that it knows something about accounting, but Price Waterhouse does not know anything about farm marketing. This is where I get these interesting contrasts in the marketing scheme.

The hon. Minister, as late as last week, praised the record of the Ontario cheese producers marketing board. Let us not argue about little legal differences, but what, in essence, is the difference between the approach of the Ontario cheese producers marketing board—in which a co-op that it set up, handles its surpluses and if it at any time the board is not going to get an adequate price on the market, the co-op will step in and take the product off the market. What is the difference, in essence, between that kind of approach and what the bean board is attempting to do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All the difference in the world.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggest to you that "all the difference in the world" is merely on legal technicalities, and the government—in my view, quite wrongly—is willing to hang its hat on these legal technicalities. The result is that you are going to weaken the position of a group of farmers.

Let me state it in general terms, in the philosophic terms that seem to be becoming part of the whole considerations of this House, and this is really my basic point, that farmers have the right to develop their marketing procedures; farmers should have the right to accumulate money collectively by a democratic decision through a check-off so that they have the assets to develop a stable marketing. If stable marketing requires that they have to go into processing or that they have to have a separate company or a co-op to be able to cope with the surpluses, I think that farmers are entitled to do this kind of thing. If the law, at the moment, makes it illegal for them, I say the mistake is in the law, not in what the farmers are doing.

Let us be blunt about the situation, the bean board is under attack today because a well-known Tory in southwestern Ontario, W. G. Thompson—one of the bag men, the fund raisers for the Tory Party in southwestern Ontario, and the biggest dealer in the area—who did not object when the bean board was losing money, is objecting to it now that it is getting in and becoming more and more effective. Just as this government was willing to lend its ear to the packers in the hog-producing battle a few years ago so the government takes a stand today in which it is going to weaken the position of the bean marketing board and the company that the board has set up to strengthen its position in the marketing field.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: It is political influence. Indeed, I am interested in all the varied arguments about getting into the export market. The fact of the matter is that not only does W. G. Thompson dominate the market here domestically, but W. G. Thompson dominates the Canadian export market in Britain. When representatives of the bean marketing board went over to see about the marketing they found that all of the Canadian beans were handled through one or two brokers—the buddies, the business buddies of W. G. Thompson. And what, of course, angered W. G. Thompson—and the anger has been picked up by the whole Tory machine, the farm products marketing board and now Price Waterhouse; they are all converging on the board—is that the board went over and found other brokers who were willing to market some of the beans. In other words, they were willing to break the monopoly position that W. G. Thompson had in the British market.

This is the kind of thing that angers farmers; when they see other farmers who are more politicians than they are farmers willing to work with the government—forgetting what their basic interests and the basic needs of agriculture are. So I come back to my basic proposition that farmers are entitled to build their marketing schemes, to develop their collective bargaining procedures. They should have the right to raise money by a democratic decision, their own money, so that they can build the necessary machinery, including processing, if it is their desire to move into the processing field to cope with a proportion of the product which may become a surplus and wreck the stability of the market.

This government would not think for one moment of stepping in, for example, to the operations of W. G. Thompson and saying: "Look now, we are not going to permit you to use some of your own money to develop a new aspect of your marketing because that is going to give you an unfair competitive advantage!" But this government does not hesitate to step in with a group of farmers and say: "You cannot use your own money to develop your own marketing position so that you will be in a better competitive position." This is what baffles me when I watch Tories in action, and they have to make a choice between the producer and the middlemen or the processors in the field. When the chips are down and the processors crack the whip, this government goes along with them whether it was the packers in the hog deal, or whether it is W. G. Thompson and the dealers in the bean marketing situation at the present time.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Tell us about the hog deal now, how is it working?

An hon. member: What about FAME?

Mr. MacDonald: I will come to FAME in one moment.

Mr. McNeil: Tell us about the hog deal now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What you have just said is categorically untrue.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Categorically untrue.

An hon. member: What is?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What he just said about one man. Absolute nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will say to the hon. Minister of Highways that if it is categorically untrue, you will have to talk very fast to persuade a lot of the farmers in—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Now, I have listed three things: Planned economic development and pumping more money into the agricultural sector of the economy; the whole ARDA programme and a really full development of the ARDA programme; and the whole question of marketing, as three of the ways and means by which you can improve the position of agriculture—improve it at the net income level—give the farmer adequate money so that from that point on he is in a better position to look after his own problems.

I want, finally, Mr. Chairman, to deal with two isolated incidents or problems in the same general context. The first one I want to deal with is the question which I raised briefly during the consideration of the estimates of Hydro, namely, a small group of farmers—half-a-dozen farmers up in northern Ontario led by Carl W. Moore in Cochrane.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, why worry about that?

Mr. MacDonald: Why worry about him? I will tell you why I am going to worry about him, because all you Tories have washed your hands of him and now I will explain why.

I have read the pile of correspondence. Sure he has had letters from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and letters from the hon. Minister of Agriculture and he has a file of letters from the hon. member for

Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle). He ought to publish a book—"My Correspondence with Queen's Park."

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): If he listens to you he will get no place.

Mr. MacDonald: He has given up trying to get some assistance from the Conservatives, and I do not blame him. The essential point is this, if I may just tidy away one little item in which the hon. Minister and I had a little difference of opinion. When I quoted the hon. Minister as saying, during a meeting up there, to the effect that it required five to six units to be able to run a beef farm in that area, the hon. Minister bounded to his feet like a missile off the launching pad at Cape Kennedy—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Do not flatter me!

Mr. MacDonald:—and said that simply was not the case! Well, I have written to Mr. Moore and this is what he says:

You mentioned that Mr. Stewart denied ever saying that a farmer needs from five to six units in this area to beef farm. On the 28th day of April, 1965, I spoke to a number of farmers at an agricultural meeting in Cochrane, Ontario, and most persons were not sure whether Mr. Stewart said four to five or five to six, but he did state one or the other. One farmer, a Mr. Clarence Wilson, where Mr. Stewart and Mr. Biggs and associates had dinner, said that Mr. Stewart was stressing at the dinner that the farmer in this area needs four to five hundred acres to beef farm. As far as written documentation I cannot obtain this as it was mentioned in a verbal speech at a banquet held in Mr. Stewart's honour at the Commando Hall in Cochrane in June, 1964—the approximate date, I believe, was the 14th of June.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What does that prove?

Mr. MacDonald: All it proves is that I think Mr. Moore was correct and it slipped the mind of the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you not think the Minister was correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Can I explain what happened?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: At the time that you raised the point I think that you said I had advised Mr. Moore by letter or had said this

to him directly. Now, I said, I had not done that and I did not. I did make that statement, and I cannot remember where it was because I have said it quite often, that large units were required for a successful farm operation in northern Ontario.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): So who was right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not deny that at all, but I did not say what you said at the time and I think, if you check *Hansard* which I have not done, you would find that is where I disagree—not in what I said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Woodbine is correct. In other words, when the hon. Minister got up he was not denying the substance of what I said, he was quibbling over a technicality and implying the substance was wrong. Now he concedes the substance was right.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who is right there, you or the hon. Minister?

An hon. member: It is pretty obvious.

Mr. MacDonald: I was.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I withdraw my interjection!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The Minister is right in what he said, and you know nothing about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the problem here is a simple problem, but it is a problem which is illustrative of many of the difficulties that agriculture faces. Here is a group of farmers who rightly or wrongly got into an area where they have not got hydro.

Mr. McNeil: How many farmers are there?

Mr. MacDonald: I do not know how many there are.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): There is just one.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no, there are more than one. You go back and look at your files, there are more than one but at the moment I cannot tell you exactly how many. Just let me make my point.

The farmers got into this area, they have established themselves in beef farming. The rules of Hydro are that you cannot go more than two-thirds of a mile for each farm in lining up the poles to be able to take electricity to the farm. When we debated

this with Hydro in the Hydro estimates, I said this figure of two-thirds in various contexts has been changed many times down through the years.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Only once!

Mr. MacDonald: All right, only once. Let us change it once more to meet these particular circumstances.

Now, the answer of Hydro—and this is taking sort of a narrow, businesslike approach as far as Hydro is concerned—Hydro said we cannot within the framework of our law and the regulations do more than that. If there is anything more to be done there should be a development fund. Indeed, the hon. member for Cochrane North two years ago assured Mr. Moore that this was the answer and he was going to push for it. Indeed the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources wrote a letter to Mr. Moore in which he said this:

I fully appreciate your need and desire for hydro service, but under existing regulations this can only be supplied under certain definite conditions which compare favourably with those in any other province in Canada.

Now, let me pause right there: "T ain't true"—in the vernacular, "T ain't true." Because Mr. Moore wrote a letter to the *Toronto Daily Star* in which he spelled out his problem and unsolicited there came back to the *Toronto Daily Star*, all the way from Pilot Butte, Saskatchewan, a letter from one Mrs. Alice Ellis, who says:

As a resident of Saskatchewan visiting Toronto I was amazed to read Carl Moore's letter and the cost of getting power to his farm in Cochrane.

Which, incidentally, is going to be \$14,000.

I own a farm in Saskatchewan $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the nearest hamlet and 35 miles from the closest town.

I have had power on my farm for seven years. At that time the distance between outlets was $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles. We paid \$100 down and the balance of \$500 in six payments with interest. A neighbour of mine who is $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the closest line has had hydro extended to his farm at some extra cost but nothing like \$14,000. We are charged the same amount if we are $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles away or if the line goes directly over the farm.

We have very little hydro power until the Saskatchewan dam is finished. Cost per power averages about \$10 to \$12 a month. This was all planned by the CCF administration under the direction of David

Cass Hayes, manager of the Saskatchewan power corporation, who was fired by the Liberals.

Let me go back to the point I was making. The hon. Minister's letter is simply in error.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member for York South would mind if I make this comparison between the province of Ontario and the province of Saskatchewan, that naturally construction costs on the prairies are going to be a great deal less than they are in the province of Ontario with the type of terrain that we have here. It does cost a great deal more to build a mile of line in the province of Ontario than it does in Saskatchewan. Furthermore, the type of line that is built, with the greater security of service in this province than I understand is the case in many of the rural areas in Saskatchewan, such matters naturally increase the cost of lines that are built throughout the rural areas, and particularly in the north, in Ontario.

I have not at hand further comparisons with Saskatchewan except to say this, that my understanding is that there will be a payment required of a group of people in a community, in what we here might call a township, and everybody pays in a certain amount of money to get the line built. This is not quite comparable with the system that we have in Ontario.

I think the hon. member might go into this a bit further and satisfy himself that conditions between our province and between the province of Saskatchewan in the matter of rural electrification are very different and Ontario is far ahead of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: If the conscience of the hon. member for Muskoka drove him to stand up and give such a weak case that he underlined the validity of what I was saying, I welcome his interjection. There may be differences in costs but let us get down to the point, let us not be sidetracked on this. Why cannot we get the electricity to the farmers?

Mr. Boyer: There are few farmers in Ontario who are not served by our rural electric system.

Mr. MacDonald: All the hon. member has to do, Mr. Chairman, is to change his regulations, the same as he has already changed them to meet the changing conditions. If Hydro is so hidebound that it cannot change them, let us come back to the proposition which the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management put in his letter to Mr. Moore, and which has been suggested in

many other quarters—namely, to have a development fund to assist in the development of the north. Indeed, let me give you a voice from the north and this is going to get pretty close to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the *Daily Press*, Timmins, of January 12, 1965, an article headed, "Farmers need electricity," says:

The farmers complain they cannot encourage more farmers to settle within an area that would conform to Hydro requirements for electric service because much of the land is tied up by absentee landlords or by The Department of Lands and Forests. The department administers Crown lands and can refuse to sell if it considers the property better suited to other uses.

This is actually in the best interests of the farmer since he does not become burdened with land that may have no value for farming but could be good for other development such as pulpwood production. Since the law permits anyone to buy land if he can negotiate the sale and can afford it, expropriating land from the absentee landlord would not please everyone and it would not guarantee the development of new farms.

What the government should do through its own hydro-electric commission is to subsidize the farmers to the extent that electrical power is brought to their property. This would mean meeting the initial cost of line installation plus whatever extra expense is met in keeping up the service until sufficient settlement ensures a paying proposition.

And later on in the editorial:

More areas of the north are going to have to be electrified to promote development. Coal oil lamps have disappeared in the towns and they should have gone from the farms also.

In other words, if within the framework of Hydro this government does not seem to understand what economic planning is, as it has had difficulty in conceiving of how it can use an agency of the Crown such as the ONR or Hydro as a genuine development agency to take amenities to the people who deserve to have these things, then let it set up a separate development fund, because you see, Mr. Chairman, this is the interesting thing.

I trust Mr. Moore has not been led up the garden path on this, but he has been assured by the hon. member for Cochrane North that this summer, if he will just bide his time and be a quiet boy, the men from ARDA

will come in and talk to him and ARDA will move him elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Wouldn't that be sensible?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not certain it would be.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: The hon. member does not know anything about it, though.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute with "he does not know anything about it." Just do not toss off statements like this.

They will move Mr. Moore to another area at a cost, and I venture the prediction that the cost may be more than to get the hydro in to Mr. Moore and the farmers—who are happy with the farm, which is a good farm except that it does not happen to have electricity.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Wait until the hon. Minister tells us about the farm.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is going to get up and say it is a bad farm, is he?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: He is not going to say that at all. There are other considerations. It is not just a question of getting hydro lights to Mr. Moore. There are many other considerations in the north country and I suggest with very great respect that the hon. member knows little about it.

Mr. MacDonald: I suggest with just as great respect that I have visited the north more than any other hon. member of this House, certainly more than—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, yes, I have, and when this session is over I will be back to the north again. When I visited the north this was precisely the kind of thing that was in an editorial in the *Sudbury Star*, to the effect that I know something about the problems of the north because I go and see them at first hand. So I am not interested in this rather cheap effort to draw a red herring across the trail.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that we are talking about an area, we are talking about Carl Moore's farm which the ONR track runs through; and there is a railway station on the farm. It is not miles and miles out in the bush. All I am suggesting is a little bit more flexibility, a little bit more willingness to use these agencies of the Crown to assist to develop northern Ontario, would meet the problems of northern Ontario

and you would not get them so excited when you suddenly have news stories about bringing all the Italians over and getting them established in northern Ontario, when you were not doing anything for the farmers themselves there. Indeed, Mr. Moore rather caustically said he thought he would emigrate to Italy so that he could come along with the Italian immigrants for the new beef farms in the north, and get all the subsidies you would likely give them to establish a new venture.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, you would say that, you never think of who will pay for all these subsidies.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if it were not the hon. Minister of Mines, who is impervious to a new idea, I would be most discouraged at this point. I spent the earlier part of my remarks trying to prove to a Tory government that if they were going to fulfill something of the preaching of the deputy Minister for redressing the imbalance of income and outgo for agriculture, there will have to be subsidies. Now he says there are going to be no subsidies. In other words, they are going to do nothing about the farm problem. Perhaps he knows nothing about it, and silence would be more appropriate.

I want to deal, finally, with a very delicate issue; to a degree, it is sub judice, if you will, because it is an issue that is being investigated. I am referring to FAME.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is sub judice.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not really sub judice. I say in a fashion it is, but it really is not sub judice.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How can it be in a fashion something? It either is or it is not.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not before the courts.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is before a commission. Who is splitting hairs now?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to say this also at the outset. I proclaim a conflict of interest. I hold two shares in FAME; I am proud to hold two shares in FAME. At least I put my money in a project, along with 13,000 farmers, to try to develop something. I did not, like some people whom I cannot see because I have not got eyes in the back of my head, put it in some fast-buck mining stock down on the stock exchange and lost their shirt on it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Never mind. They are not here tonight.

Mr. MacDonald: They are not here tonight? Seriously, Mr. Chairman, there are many hon. members in this House who are shareholders in FAME and therefore they all have conflicts of interest. I am not going to be inhibited, because I never had any idea when I bought the shares that I was going to make money on them, I am less certain that I shall at this point than I was originally. But I want to speak on behalf of this project.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You talk like a regular NDP'er. You invest money in the hope of losing it.

Mr. MacDonald: If you are accusing me of talking like Mr. Wintermeyer, your point is well taken.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to be serious about this, because this is an extremely serious matter.

I concede that until the report comes down, this government is not in a position to act. My hope would be that when this report comes down, it will do something to rebuild confidence, not only among the shareholders of FAME, but among the public in general and the farming community in the feasibility of this project, so that you can rescue a group of 13,000 farmers in the province of Ontario who have put some \$2.5 million of their money in the project that I think is very worthwhile. I think it should be saved.

As far back as last December, after I had the privilege of attending the York county shareholders' meeting, and reflected carefully on what was happening on this issue—the kind of issue about which one could be tossing press releases once a week, but I did not want to follow up the situation—I made a public statement. I made three points, which I think are still valid, and I reiterate them for the hon. Minister's consideration—indeed, for the whole government's consideration. One is that when farmers are seeking to build this kind of project, and they have shown evidence of good faith to the extent of putting up \$2.5 million of their own money, I think they are entitled to assistance from the government by way of extension of credit. I make that statement confidently, because it is a pattern that can be documented elsewhere. If you go, for example, to Nova Scotia, where the farmers sought, through co-operatives, to build hog slaughtering plants, the government of Nova Scotia has matched at least dollar for dollar; I even

heard \$2 for \$1. And they have never lost a single dollar, notwithstanding arguments to the contrary sometimes from government spokesmen.

In other words, here is another Tory government that is willing to go into partnership with the farmers in building their own slaughtering establishments, their own packing plants.

Secondly, in this province a year or so ago, when the tobacco producers had a problem of marketing their product and how they were going to store it, and even were considering processing, this government was willing to advance, and ultimately advanced, \$11 million. Indeed, on this I think they lost something.

I think if the hon. Minister were really honest and above board, this is not really a secret of his. I think everybody is entitled to know what the loss is.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Are you suggesting I am not being above board?

Mr. MacDonald: Efforts were made a year ago to find out how much had been lost.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I said I would tell you when the tobacco sales were completed, and you will be told. I resent being told that I am not acting above board.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. The hon. Minister has made his initial statement, when he had an opportunity to tell us. I think the tobacco has been sold.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not the case, it will be made when the tobacco sales have been completed. I have nothing to hide—

Mr. MacDonald: On the sales of two or three years ago they have not been completed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, sir. They are sold on conditional basis, and when the tobacco is all sold the report will be tabled. I have nothing whatever to hide, but until we know how much tobacco is in those warehouses and the weight of that tobacco and the grade of it as it comes out of those warehouses, we cannot yet determine how much tobacco is being sold and for what dollars.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we will look forward to hearing from the hon. Minister. But my point is that the hon. Minister has been willing—this government has been willing—to advance \$11 million to this group of farmers when they were faced with a serious problem. I am not objecting to it, but I wonder why the double yardstick? Why,

when another group of farmers was seeking assistance, was the government so hesitant?

Thirdly, this government, two or three years ago, under the direction of the dynamic Robert Macaulay, set up the Ontario development agency. We have been informed already this year of quite a number of the companies for whom this government has underwritten credit needs that have actually gone bankrupt, and you have lost money. I would suggest that if anybody takes a look at, for example, the project up in Owen Sound, if you want to get a shaky project, this one was shaky right from the outset. Why is the government willing to assist marginal projects in the industry, when they were not willing to assist even a project that they might consider to be marginal?

In other words, all I am saying at the moment is that the case is pretty solid for the government assisting a group of farmers who have given such evidence of good faith on their part. However, I will add that clearly one of the problems involved in this whole project is that there was some deficiency in managerial know-how, if I may put it as kindly as that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: It may well be that when the report has come down, some means may have to be sought in conjunction with farm organizations, or conceivably with co-ops in the field, to get an assurance of the degree of managerial know-how and, at the same time, protect the interests of the shareholders, and now the bondholders of FAME. But I hope that the tendency to almost a personality conflict—let us be frank about it—that existed in an earlier stage of FAME, between certain personalities in FAME and this government, that the government will be big enough to let bygones be bygones. Because if the hon. Minister has a genuine concern for agriculture—and I know he has—and if the hon. Minister has a genuine concern for the future of co-operatives in this province—and I know he has—he cannot stand idly by and let one of the biggest projects, involving 13,000 farmers, collapse completely. You will not only destroy and lose the money that has been invested in the project, and destroy the confidence, you are going to undermine the whole approach and the whole attitude towards co-operatives. As my friend, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce said, because co-operatives tend more and more to operate within the confines of the free enterprise system as though they were just another business, big business, with profits being their

main incentive, and even though they import and compete with the turkeys produced in Ontario, I think that we have got to a pretty dangerous stage in terms of confidence in co-operatives in this province. There is widespread concern as to whether or not we are losing sight of the original objectives of co-operatives. And I think you would add further to this rather alarming and disturbing situation if you let this go down.

I repeat, before I sit down, that having set up a commission you have to wait for the report, but I hope the government will be able to be big about this, and will be willing to underwrite credit needs. You are not handing them money; you are only underwriting credit needs, as has been done by ODA. Assure yourself, if you must, in co-operation with the directors of FAME, that you get the necessary managerial know-how, but get this project on so that the farmers in this field can gain a greater collective strength in the marketing, power in the marketplace, because this is what they need if they are going to increase their net income.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon and this evening we have been treated to many ideas and a review of ideas, policies and programmes on agriculture in the province of Ontario.

There are certain things that I think should be set straight on the record. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce, to my mind, made quite a detailed and lengthy talk on the status of agriculture in the province of Ontario. No one could agree more than I with his philosophy concerning the undesirability of having the continuance of a cheap food philosophy in the province of Ontario at the expense of our farm people. I have said this on the public platform; indeed, my deputy Minister quoted from the speech I have made, the one to which he referred. And I make no apologies for this whatsoever.

But as I said this afternoon, one of the reasons why we have a cheap food philosophy in Canada—and I could enlarge that to include the United States—is because we on this continent have never been short of food; we have never known what it was to have anything but a surplus of food. On the contrary, there are those countries in the world where a shortage of food is a perennial problem and where the governments of those countries feel that it is in the public interest to subsidize, out of the public treasury, food production in order to provide it for their own people. Now this does not for a moment suggest that we have not to face this kind of problem in this country, because I would

be the first to say that the farm people of Canada—and certainly this includes Ontario, where one-third of the total agricultural production of all Canada takes place—should not have to bear the burden of this kind of subsidization at their own expense.

But I want to point out one further thing, and this has to do with the remarks made by the hon. member for York South. When we talk about planned economic development, and we acknowledge the fact that farmers are in a cost-price squeeze and we say that we should pump money into the farm price structure, we must take into consideration the fact that as soon as this is done surpluses will inevitably occur.

And I think back to the days in 1939 when I attended a conference on agricultural marketing in Montreal, when one of the leading agricultural economists of Canada of that day said that a thimbleful of surplus was controlling a tubful of product. And that statement is as true today as it was then.

Now, then, this brings me to one other conclusion. I think, following as naturally as day follows night, that if we are to avoid this kind of a problem then we must, as agriculturalists, be prepared to have production controls on all food produced in Canada. But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, are the farmers of Canada ready for that kind of controlled production?

Mr. MacDonald: The burley tobacco farmers did not even grow a crop one year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am referring to food production in this country. And I will say to the hon. members of this House, Mr. Chairman, that the farm people of Canada—and in particular Ontario—will not buy food production controls today. I do say this: We must—and I think this applies to us as Canadian citizens of the province of Ontario—recognize our responsibility to nations of the world where food is needed. I think that it is wrong for us to talk about production controls and the enforcement of production controls to create artificial scarcities on our own markets in order to bring up a price structure that will be more remunerative to the producers. I frankly believe that this is unnecessary when we know that there are all kinds of needs for food throughout the world.

Some people may say to me: "Well, this is a cloud nine philosophy." I do not think it is, frankly, because I think we have a responsibility to people other than for our own interests. How we accomplish this, to me, is not the responsibility of provincial governments but of federal governments.

with all of us participating in that programme at all levels of our economic society.

This afternoon the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, and again tonight the hon. member for York South, referred to ARDA and compared it with ARDA projects in Quebec. I am not here for one moment, Mr. Chairman, to debate the merits of The Department of Agriculture either in Ontario or in Quebec, because I have a high regard for the agricultural programme in the province of Quebec and for the Minister of Agriculture in that province. What they do in Quebec, as far as agriculture is concerned, is their business and their affair. But I think it is only fair to point out that when our ARDA programmes were being discussed at the federal level—and I have attended every conference where ARDA has been discussed since it was first inaugurated—the province of Ontario has been used as a blueprint for the national policy on ARDA. These things that have been mentioned today about the natural resources of the province of Quebec being dealt with under the ARDA programme have been dealt with in the province of Ontario for 40 years under policies of this government, and of other governments within our province, Mr. Chairman.

I refer to farm drainage, for instance, as a typical illustration of this. I refer to our water conservation programmes. All of these things are being done under ARDA in Quebec today, but they were done under the auspices of this government for years and years and years. The county reforestation projects we have in Ontario today, projects that have been going on for years within this province, are now being duplicated in other provinces—using ARDA funds to do it. But this province paid its own way long before anybody else ever thought of it.

And we talked about projects being carried on in other areas, and reference was made to the research projects that are in operation in the province of Quebec. I admire these research projects; they are necessary. In fact, I was the first one in the province of Ontario to suggest that we should have research on the various projects before they were initiated. There is no use in plunging into the stream and starting to swim unless you know where you are going and whether or not the project is going to meet a need in that community.

But I want to say to the hon. members in this House through you, Mr. Chairman, that the province of Ontario has been continuing, and has carried out, research on these various types of projects for years. The data is now

available and all we have to do is to use it and employ it, and this we are doing.

Now then, about local involvement, and I could not help but agree that we should have local involvement of our people. To have a successful project it must involve local people. And what did we do in Ontario? A year ago in co-operation with my friend, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, we called a meeting of the wardens and the chairmen of the county council agricultural committees of every county in this province, and brought them to one of the downtown hotels in order that we could have a full-scale meeting on the involvement of local people in ARDA projects. We suggested to them that they set up, in each county and district of this province, an ARDA committee; comprised, or headed up I should say, by the county council agricultural committee chairman—drawing into the service of that ARDA committee the various responsible farm organizations within the county borders in order that we could have complete involvement. And we said: "Make your scope as wide as you will." We suggested they should include the soil and crop improvement association, the conservation authorities, the county forest groups, the women's institutes, the junior farmers, the chambers of commerce—any organization—in order that they could all be brought in to make it a full-scale community project.

The result has been that, in many counties, these committees have been set up and formed. We have now the closest co-ordination between these county groups and our own ARDA directors.

Now I was dismayed this afternoon, in fact I was shocked, that my friend, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, for whom I have a high regard, was not fully aware of the co-ordination that exists within the department and within this government of Ontario as far as ARDA is concerned. I would like to refer to him, and surely he must have known this, that the ARDA directors of this province—and I want to take the time, Mr. Chairman, to read the names of the ARDA directors as presently comprised. It has as its chairman Mr. H. F. Crown, who is director of our ARDA branch in our Department of Agriculture. The vice-chairman is Mr. Ken Lantz, assistant deputy Minister in charge of services of our Department of Agriculture. It includes Mr. T. R. Hilliard, deputy Minister, The Department of Energy and Resources Management; Mr. A. S. Bray, deputy Minister, The Department of Tourism and Information; Dr. H. L. Patterson, director of our

economics branch in The Ontario Department of Agriculture; Mr. Orville Schnick, director of special research and surveys branch, The Department of Economics and Development; Professor N. R. Richards, Dean of Agriculture, the University of Guelph; Mr. A. L. S. Nash, The Department of Municipal Affairs, retained for special research and assistance on the ARDA project; Mr. F. A. MacDougall, deputy Minister of Lands and Forests; and Mr. Hugh E. Brown, deputy Treasurer.

This is the ARDA directorate, their task is the co-ordination of Ontario government activity in ARDA projects within this province. When I went to the ARDA meetings, the national ARDA meetings, and advised the national ARDA people of the co-ordination that we had between our departments in the Ontario government on ARDA projects, they held it up as a model and asked me for a copy of the outline that they could take home to their own provinces and implement. This is what we are doing in Ontario.

I am disturbed to know that my hon. friend referred this afternoon to the Ontario federation of agriculture brief when he referred to the supposed barriers that exist.

Mr. Letherby: He did not know what he was talking about.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He referred to the OFA brief and the barriers that are supposed to exist between departments, and in fact went so far as to say, quoting from this OFA brief, that there seemed to be barriers between various branches of our own department.

Mr. Gaunt: I was just quoting them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He was quoting this brief. Well now, I have the brief right here and I had the brief the day that this group from the federation of agriculture came to the Cabinet council and presented this brief. During the presentation of the brief, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) will recall that I turned to him and said "Mr. Prime Minister, I would like to ask these people just what they mean by what they have said here, because I think that we must recognize the fact that if we are going to have an effective government it has to be a government that works together and this is what this government does."

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I have a question mark right beside that and I have it underlined. When we came to that, I stopped at that question mark and referred to the hon. Prime Minister and he allowed me to

ask them that question. I said, "Can you name me, sir, one instance where there has been a barrier between departments of this government relating to these matters that you have referred to here?" There was not one single instance that could be referred to, not one.

An hon. member: Not one, that is right! I was there.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I asked them again, what do they mean by the barriers that might exist between the branches of our department and they could not give me an illustration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to put this on the record.

I would like to return to the last paragraph of the federation of agriculture brief, because I think it should be read into the record of this House today. The conclusion of the federation of agriculture brief:

It might seem to those who are unfamiliar with the tenor of presentations to Cabinet or with relations between the farm organizations and the government, that this brief has offered rather large amounts of complaint and criticism and but little praise. The true situation is that the prevailing climate in which government departments, especially The Department of Agriculture, and the farm organizations work together is cordial and co-operative. In the interest of brevity, we have omitted reference to the highly satisfactory and progressive efforts, say, of The Department of Agriculture in such fields as farm management, extension, marketing, disease control and so forth. The government may be assured that the OFA and farmers generally are warmly appreciative of the several programmes which work towards the improvement of agriculture.

Respectfully submitted.

The Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Just like saying, "Yours sincerely."

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Indeed it is. I think they would have been pleased to add that; I am sure they would, because I am convinced of the sincerity of the OFA brief.

The hon. members for Huron-Bruce and York South today referred to farm marketing and to the bean board investigation. I would like to say just a word about that to set the record straight, because I am as much interested in a successful marketing plan in the province of Ontario as anybody else, in fact I think perhaps even more so. It alarms

me no little to think that there are people who feel, and it has been said in this House today or inferred in this House, that I would stoop to political pressure to do something that would destroy the power of a commodity marketing board, especially one that means so very much to the farmers of the riding which I have the honour to represent. Nothing could be further from the truth that I have, under political pressure, instituted anything that might be construed as having anything to do with the wrecking of the bean board and the company.

The hon. member for York South referred to the dealers suddenly protesting and the government lending an ear, and there was reference to the fact that Price Waterhouse does not know anything about bean marketing. He said the farmers should have a right to market them, to handle their own products. No one could agree more than we in the Ontario government who support farm marketing legislation and who are pleased to note the support that has been given the farm marketing legislation by the various groups that have voted on plans this year.

But when he talks about Price Waterhouse mouthing the words that I have said, I think it is well for us to look back over the record and see an extract that is taken from the report of the agricultural marketing inquiry committee of Ontario in June of 1961. This report was submitted in June of 1961, after, I believe, what, two years, of study or something like that.

I would like to read part of this report, but first of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell you who is on the committee, because I think this is important. Fred W. P. Jones, dean of the school of business administration, University of Western Ontario, London; Professor Ralph Campbell, head of the farm economics department, Ontario agricultural college, Guelph; Dr. Frank Palmer of Vineland experimental station; Gordon Greer, president of the Ontario federation of agriculture, Ottawa; and Gordon Hill, president of the Ontario farmers' union of Varna.

That was the committee that comprised the agriculture marketing inquiry committee of that year; and this is what they had to say:

The tendency over the period in which marketing boards have operated in Ontario has been for them to extend themselves further into the marketing process. It has been claimed that it is not enough for them to negotiate prices and establish conditions of sale, but they must also have exclusive assembly and selling powers and acquire and operate marketing facilities.

Should all this become an accepted practice, it would become a bitter area of conflict with co-operatives. Furthermore, it would evoke strong resentment from other business members of the marketing chain, whose goodwill is needed for producer welfare. There is the possibility that proceeds from compulsory producer levies might be used by a marketing board to make up losses from uneconomic agency operations.

Most important, it is a principle of democratic government that an organization to which have been delegated special selling powers by the Legislature, cannot be permitted also to enter the market as a buyer in competition with regular buyers who are not so privileged.

That was in June of 1961.

Mr. MacDonald: I just do not agree with that reasoning.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, maybe not, maybe not, but why are you saying that I and the Tory government of Ontario are the ones who are opposed to all this? This is the point I am trying to make. The farm products marketing board has said the same thing, and has said this for a good many years.

I would like to quote what has happened in the Ontario bean growers marketing board. I have the history of the whole organization right here. Back as far as 1960 there had been continuing discussions with the bean board regarding the operation of the company. Now, these are the kind of things that have been going on. How ridiculous can anyone get by saying that it is because of political pressure that this government is moving on a situation that has been under discussion for years and is directly associated with a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, handed down in 1957? This is the thing that we cannot understand. For goodness' sake why should people say the like of things that the hon. member for York South has said here tonight?

I want to report what the Price Waterhouse committee said:

We believe that the foremost objective of the growers board should be to ensure that a market is found for all beans produced at the best possible return to the grower.

Naturally, this must be their price.

We do not believe that the company has been influential in establishing a firm price in the marketplace.

This is what Price Waterhouse has to say. They go on to make recommendations here, and I think this is very important and pertinent to what we have said.

We have concluded that it is completely impractical for the growers board to carry out its broadest useful function in promoting the marketing of beans in Canada and abroad at a reasonable and stable price as long as it owns the company. We have come to this conclusion because of the obviously bitter feeling among dealers toward the growers company, and it is our belief that it is essential to have good relationship between the growers board and licensed dealers if the best and most flexible marketing arrangements are to be worked out.

And they go on to recommend various things that should be done.

Mr. MacDonald: Will the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I will permit a question.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Supreme Court decision directed to the fact that the farmers cannot, in effect, have a levy—which was deemed to be an indirect tax—and use that to build the marketing scheme? The supreme court did not say that they could not go into the field—merely, that they could not go in by using money that was raised in what they deemed to be an unconstitutional manner. Am I not correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The supreme court decision, as I understand it, said that the levy, the licence fee, could not be used to offset losses of a company that was purchasing the product in competition with the private trade.

Mr. MacDonald: A federal levy?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, a federal levy. But this federal levy is given on the extension of power recommended by the farm products marketing board of Ontario to any commodity group. This is how they all operate on products that are marketed outside of Ontario. The company and the levy fee can be used to construct the warehouse in which the beans can be stored, and marketing facilities, but not to offset losses of the company. This was in the supreme court decision, and this is one of the legal technicalities. There is no question about that.

Reference has been made here tonight as well, to things that I have said concerning the pricing of beans, and the hon. member

for Huron-Bruce quoted from a speech that I had made concerning the marketing of white beans at Ilderton. I thought it was, too, because they were the facts of the whole matter as I saw them.

We went to Great Britain last fall and came back from there after having talked to importers of white beans in Britain, completely convinced that there was an enormous opportunity to expand the sale of beans in Britain. The hon. member quoted from me, saying:

There appears to be a ready market for Ontario white beans, of canned baked beans and tomato sauce.

They are very popular in Great Britain—one of the most popular canned vegetables there is. They are being bought and used by 68 per cent of all the housewives, according to a recent survey.

I want to quote the following figures and put them on the record because I think they indicate something that happened that should not have happened in Canada. In 1953 the total value of the baked bean market in the United Kingdom was £12 million sterling; in 1963 it was £26 million sterling, an increase in sales of well over 100 per cent achieved in 11 years. From figures we obtained, we were interested to note that, during this period of expansion in the white bean industry in Great Britain, Canadian exports of white beans have increased in varying amounts: From 10.3 per cent of the United Kingdom white bean imports in 1953 to 17.9 per cent in 1963, an increase of 7.6 per cent; while the proportion of white beans imported from the United States by the same United Kingdom market increased from 13.5 per cent in 1953 to 69.4 per cent in 1962, an increase of 56 per cent. This in spite of the fact that we had an eight per cent tariff on United States beans compared to no tariff on beans from Canada, and in spite of the fact that we enjoyed a 7.5 per cent difference in the Canadian and American dollar—15.5 per cent advantage thrown our way and what were we doing?

I would think that when I talked about this matter of establishing forward pricing of beans, that I was only outlining a programme, a method of sale of farm commodities that is as old as agricultural trading itself—it has been carried on for years. My friend, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, who was one of the largest exporters of seed in Canada, has been doing this for years and years, until he got into the government service. There is no reason in the world why this could not be done and why it cannot

continue to be done if they would only sit down and do it.

My hon. friend referred to our friend, Hammerschlag, from Michigan. Now who is Mr. Hammerschlag? He is a Michigan bean dealer, exporting beans from Michigan to Great Britain—one of the largest exporters of the United States. And what service does he provide for the bean dealers of Ontario? He is their export broker. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, can a man serve two masters? And I leave it at that, and will say no more.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister permit a question? As far as I am concerned, I would be happy to concede the point that if we can, in this province, sign a conditional sales contract with the United Kingdom, or any European country, then this is fine. I was simply pointing out that the United States does not do it. If we can do it, fine, by all means, go ahead and do it. I was simply pointing out that they do not do it in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend, I have a copy of the letter that he read right here in the file, and I have a copy of the letter that was sent by the man who asked for that letter to be sent, right here in this file. So there is the story, and I do not think my hon. friend knew just what was behind that letter, or he probably would not have read it into the records of this House tonight; but this is the other side of the coin.

I would suggest, in reply to what my hon. friend from York South has said about the bean board having sent people over to Great Britain and having found dealers willing to handle beans—dealers who were not getting beans from Ontario—why did not the bean board see they got the beans to sell? This is something I would like to know.

Here we are bombarded by the farm organizations coming to us saying, "Look, why do you not expand the sale of Ontario-produced agricultural food products?" and this government has done everything possible in its power to do just that, and we shall continue to do that. But you have a farm organization, a commodity group, that goes out and says to the farmers from the public platform, "Look boys, do not grow too many beans, now look, do not grow them too much, just keep this production down here, because we do not want too many beans grown." This is what is happening right across this province by the bean board, and then I am faced with the federation of agriculture saying to me: "Let us expand the opportunities for the growth and sale of Ontario farm products."

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): How about the cherry crop?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now just where does this work in? I would like to know.

Mr. MacDonald: It has expanded over the years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Sure; has it not indeed expanded this year? It expanded this year because the farm people would not listen to the request of the bean board itself not to expand production. That is why it expanded.

Mr. MacDonald: The old problem of trying to separate the leaders from the rank and file.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Here you have this group saying to me, through you, that we have not even been using the dealers that want to handle our beans overseas. Why were we not selling beans to these people overseas when we let the Americans increase their sale to the United Kingdom by 56 per cent, while ours increased seven per cent? These are the questions that remain unanswered. These are the things with which we are concerned.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question with regard to the bean situation?

There are many factors connected with this increased production of beans. The hon. Minister knows, I believe quite well, that if soy beans are up to a certain price and corn is up to a certain price, the farmers are going to grow soy beans and corn instead of beans, because there is not such a great risk.

Another factor, Mr. Minister, is that of setting a price in April. If they set the price too high here in Ontario or in Canada, would not the American beans come in here and saturate our market if we raised it too high in the spring?

I wonder if the hon. Minister could answer those questions?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The first question my friend has referred to is the natural inclination of a farmer to plant, bearing in mind the price of the commodity after harvest in relation to the risk involved in the growing and the harvesting of the crop. This has no relationship to anything I have said whatever; I have not even referred to that. Farmers, being good businessmen, will grow the crop that they can harvest and market to the best advantage. That will always be the case.

This is why white bean production in the

hon. member's part of the country is decreasing; soy bean production is increasing and corn production is increasing. But white bean production is increasing up through the north end of Huron county. It is expanding over into Wellington, into Perth, and will probably go into Dufferin this year. This is a trend of cash crop production.

As far as the pricing of beans influencing the import of beans from the United States is concerned, this, of course, is a possibility. But we do not have to set the price so high that it will attract beans in from the United States. Bear in mind that we have that 7.5 per cent difference on the money, and this has a very great deal to do with controlling importation of beans into this country.

But the point I was making, and it was a very valid point, is one that is completely substantiated by the Price Waterhouse report. It was said tonight that they do not know anything about marketing. Those men have put people on this report who understand the whole implications of marketing farm commodities to prepare this report. And they completely substantiate the theory that we advanced—that they should be priced in the spring. This is why it is so simple, so basic and so reasonable that I do not see how anyone could not buy the theory that whenever the Americans set the price of beans in the early spring, that price is immediately relayed to the importers in Great Britain. Those import brokers go to the various processing companies and they say, "Here is the price, laid down in Britain." They take the American price and add on whatever costs are necessary, and that is the price laid down in Britain. So they get the signed orders and the beans flow in.

It could be next fall's beans; it could be beans that are in storage. That is the price of beans.

Now what happens to us? We set our price after the bean harvest, in some instances, has started. As the import brokers told us in Great Britain last fall, what chance have we got to go out and compete for the market the Americans have already been exploiting all through the summer months? All they ask is an even break of time on this price, and I think this is reasonable. I see no reason why it cannot be done.

Of course, we understand, as my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce, being a reasonable man, suggested today that these are conditional contracts—that when something happens weather-wise you cannot deliver the beans. We recognize these things. But what could happen is that when that product was

sold in Great Britain, shipping space could be booked, arrangements could be made to move the product right through and get it onto the boats and away and not have us waiting, as we were last year, for weeks and months, to get shipping space to move beans out of the province of Ontario.

This is the problem that I think we have to face. These are all reasonable, sound, commonsense projects that can be dealt with. I say to you that there is nothing in this whole misunderstanding that cannot be resolved by people sitting down around the same table, all interested in the betterment of this commodity marketing plan for the farmers of Ontario—not just for the few that are growing beans today, but for the countless hundreds of farmers who should, and could be growing beans in this province and marketing them at an advantage. I say that there is no reason why we cannot do this, if we sit down in good faith and attempt it. But we will not do it by running around backbiting against one another, and by doing the things that have created these misunderstandings and have perpetuated them through the years.

That is about all I have to say on the beans. The situation must be resolved, and it will have to be resolved. As the Minister of Agriculture, and as a member for Middlesex North, in whose riding countless hundreds of tons of beans are growing, and in whose very area the bean board company exists and operates, do you think I personally want to see that bean plant closed up? I was interested in what my friend from Huron-Bruce said about turning this plant into a co-operative. I made this proposal to the bean board myself and suggested to them that it should be done. On that bean board is the vice-president of United Farmers Co-operatives of Ontario, and he would not buy the idea. Now, what more reasonable suggestion could one make than to turn that plant into a co-operative? Owned by the farmers who are using it? I suggest that it should be used for much more than just white beans. I would like to see the plant used for the storing of wheat and corn; soy beans, if necessary. Let us make it an efficient, effective instrument of the farmers in that area. This is what I want to see done.

Does this sound like the things that have been said about me, trying to wreck the bean board and the bean company of this province? I rest my case on that.

One more point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, and that has to do with reference that was made to my good friend Carl Moore. I cannot let this go by without saying that I

would have greatly appreciated it if Carl Moore had gone to our agricultural representative in Cochrane when he came from Windsor to the north country to start farming.

I well recall the first time I met him. I went into the agricultural representative's office in Cochrane with our deputy Minister and others from our department. When I went in, I met Mr. Raoul Portelance, who was the representative there—one of the outstanding agricultural representatives in the province of Ontario, in my opinion. And he said: "Mr. Stewart, I would like you to meet a farmer of the district, Mr. Carl Moore, who has a hydro problem. He cannot get hydro to his farm." I sat down in the office and chatted with him for, I suppose, half an hour. I said: "Mr. Moore, I would like to go out to your farm." We got into his truck and drove out to his place, two and a half miles off the highway, and saw the farm. The railroad does run through the place. I did not see the station—probably it is there, I do not know. I walked over his farm, I saw the cattle on the farm, I saw the land and the potential. I think I know something about farming, and I said something to the man to this effect: "Tell me, why did you come away back in here to buy this property? Did you go to the agricultural representative and ask his advice about the availability of farms that were in service areas? By service areas I mean where there is hydro, where there is a paved road, where there is school bus service by the gate and the general amenities that can be expected in a rural community?" And he said: "No, I did not." I said: "Well, with great respect I find it strange why you did not do this, because I am sure that our agricultural representative could have found farms for you that were in locations that were much more satisfactory, certainly from my standpoint, than what you have found for yourself."

Now he admitted to me that this might have been a good idea, but he did not do it. You see he went up there and got this land—and I assume paid for it—then he went to the agricultural representative and then he went to Ontario Hydro and he went to the municipal council and he said, "Look, I have this land; now I want these services." I may be wrong, but to my knowledge he is the only farmer living on that two and a half miles of road who wants Hydro. There are other farms there; but I must confess that I could not find any other farmers there. I cannot recall any other farmers living on that road.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sure there are a few others.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There may be, I cannot recall. I refer back to the Angus Hill report on Glackmeyer township that was published back in 1957, 1958 or 1959, somewhere in there.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: About 1959 or 1960, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: About 1959 or 1960! In this Glackmeyer report—and I read it, as a matter of fact I have a copy of it in the office right now—it advised no more farm development in the unsettled areas of Glackmeyer township until the presently serviced land which was then vacant was inhabited. I think that was pretty sound common sense and logic.

I think we have to judge these cases on their own merits. This man wants Hydro put in there. Fifty per cent of the Hydro costs are now paid, as I understand it, in northern Ontario; but the costs are so much greater to provide service to this one man that Ontario Hydro feel they cannot go along with this proposal.

I know he is greatly distressed. Frankly I feel sorry for him. I feel sorrier for his family, quite frankly, because here is a young wife with a small family living back there two and a half miles off the main road without Hydro. I ask the question: Should the public Treasury of Ontario subsidize Hydro to that farm when there were farms on a paved road, along which a school bus passed every day, along which there were hydro lines and telephone service and all of the other delivery services that go with rural living today that could have been bought, and perhaps bought as reasonably as that farm was bought?

Now these are the things I think we have to ask ourselves and answer.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs suggests—and this is news to me—that the ARDA boys are supposed to go up there and buy Mr. Moore out. Is the hon. member suggesting they should not do this?

Mr. MacDonald: Not necessarily—but it may cost even more to move him elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This amounts to the same thing. I would think that would be a very reasonable thing to do, but my hon. friend seems to oppose that kind of a suggestion.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I do not oppose it; but you would spend more money that way than getting the Hydro in to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is the one that is under discussion anyway, Mr. Chairman. So much for the Carl Moore case. Believe me, I hold no personal animosity towards Carl Moore. He has my complete and whole-hearted sympathy, but I think we have to be reasonable in the administration of the public Treasury.

Now then, as far as the FAME thing is concerned I just want to point this out to my hon. friend. He referred to the great packing plant in Nova Scotia. I can say to him that if he is holding up the packing plant in Nova Scotia as an example of efficiency to the farmers of Ontario, he just does not know the facts, because that plant has lost money ever since the day it was opened and it is costing the government of Nova Scotia \$500,000 a year today to keep it open. This to me is completely ridiculous.

Mr. MacDonald: I rise on a point of order. I do not happen to have the documents here today, but I can get them. I was assured earlier today that the hon. Minister had made the same kind of statement earlier, and it is not true. I repeat, I have not the evidence now, but I have been told by people who should be in a position to know and who have letters from Nova Scotia to vouch for it, that the government of Nova Scotia has not lost a single red cent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All I can do is report the Nova Scotia Minister's word, and I take his word.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Will the hon. member resign if he is wrong?

Mr. MacDonald: Will the hon. Minister of Labour jump in the lake if he is wrong?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have nothing more to say about it than that. I leave it on that ground. But I would like to say to my hon. friend that all that glitters is not gold.

Mr. Chairman, I will be quite prepared to discuss the estimates of my department and to go through them item by item and I hope we will be able to resolve them with dispatch.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I was going to rise, just before the hon. Minister got up, on the question of marketing the commodities.

I seriously want to get an answer to the question of the cherry crop. I understand last year there was great concern about the

sale of the cherry crop in the Niagara peninsula. Apparently the processors were taking 50 per cent less in some cases and in some cases were not taking the crop in at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We have had the three introductory speeches and the Minister has replied. We must now deal with the items in order and the item the member is now speaking on can be dealt with under that particular vote.

On vote 101:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like first to ask the hon. Minister a question dealing with one of the items under No. 4, the agricultural economics research council, \$7,500. Much has been said tonight about the need for infusing the farm section of our economy with prosperity. I wonder if he is aware of a project that is being carried on by the ministry of agriculture, or whatever its proper title is in the state of Michigan, which is referred to as "project 80."

This name is based upon the fact that all farmers are aware of the great changes that have taken place in our industry in the past 15 years and they want to know what the best statistical evidence indicates will happen in the next 15 years. In other words they want to know what the state of the industry will be by 1980. Now the hon. Minister himself has said that under his ARDA programme and some others, he has the capability at his disposal to send teams of experts into certain areas to give concrete recommendations where difficulties arise in a certain part of the agricultural industry. I think what we need, and I hope that he would agree with me, is an overall plan on a statistical prediction of what the industry is going to face in the 15 years that lie immediately ahead.

If it is going to continue as it has in the past 15 years, a good many farmers want to know about it so that they can get out of it right now. If it is true that farm size is going to change, as some people with partial knowledge predict, if farm investment is going to go up at the rate that has been necessary in the past, if difficulties associated with the thimbleful of surplus that the hon. Minister refers to are going to continue to plague our market, then surely it is within the competence of the hon. Minister to set up some sort of a commission, or committee—I hesitate to suggest this to him, in those words—that would be able, in co-operation with the farmers and the farmers' organizations, to give a competent prediction of what

the industry faces in the 15 years that lie ahead.

Now I would like the hon. Minister to comment on the state of research in his department, with my suggestions specifically in mind.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I must confess I do not flatter myself with the wisdom of being able to predict 15 years in the future, but I would say that we are very much aware of the necessity of trying to foresee, insofar as it is humanly possible to do through research, the things that may come about in agriculture; not only in Ontario but throughout Canada, because what happens across Canada affects Ontario.

It is for this reason that we in the government of Ontario agreed to co-operate on this agricultural economics research council project, to which we make an annual contribution of \$7,500, in order that we could have these far-reaching policies discussed and researched at federal level, and their findings relayed to us in order that we might best determine how we should gauge our activities in The Ontario Department of Agriculture.

Our research institute here in Ontario, to which I referred this afternoon, comprised of successful farmers and successful businessmen, is dealing with a budget of about \$6 million or \$6.5 million, something like that last year, and is dealing with things that I feel are essential to the every-day up-to-date farm management necessities and requirements of the modern farmer. I do not see how one can do more than that, really. If one is to launch out into something that is liable to happen 20 years from now, or even 15 and suggest carrying research projects on that, I think one is getting so far away from the problems that concern Ontario farmers today that one might be criticized for having gone too far too fast.

Mr. Nixon: I do not think we would ever criticize you for that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I certainly think that one should, in every way possible, get the answers, and this we are attempting to do. We felt that a co-ordinated approach through the federal programme, on a Canada-wide basis, with all the provinces and the federal government participating in this agricultural economics research council was the way to do just that.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the hon. Minister's views on this. I am aware of the good work done by the applied researches that are controlled by his depart-

ment. They have largely to do with the improvement of production. Unfortunately, our farmers have proved themselves as really more efficient than they may be for their own good. I was impressed and pleased with the hon. Minister's comments about production in general, and the fact that our responsibilities are broader than those we see within the confines of the province. I was a little less than impressed that once the hon. Minister stated this general altruistic purpose of helping to feed the world, he immediately shifted the problem to the federal level.

Primarily, I suppose it does lie there, but I fail to see how he can, in this House, take unto himself the aura that accompanies this sort of a statement without also taking the steps to solve the problems that are before us at the same time. I think it is great that he is able to say our farmers must not limit their production, but surely it is within the responsibility of this hon. Minister to tell the farmers what they do face, if not in the 15 years that lie ahead, in the five years that lie ahead, so that their planning can be made appropriate to this.

I feel that the administration of the department is based on a seat-of-the-pants philosophy—a crisis arises, so appoint a committee. Then, as you have done, and as you have shown in this session, having to do with the milk industry, the hon. Minister has taken the action he saw fit. This has not always been the case, and I feel that there is a patchwork approach to the problem of agriculture that cannot be solved by the committees that have been presently advising the hon. Minister. He has made a statement on this, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister, specifically having to do with these committees, and this may have been asked on some other occasion, to what extent the two major committees that have reported to the hon. Minister in the past two years have been a financial burden on the province. I refer to the tobacco committee and the milk committee. I wonder if we could have a statement on that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have them here. Costs of the milk committee were \$162,000, over the whole period, and that includes the printing of the report.

Mr. Nixon: And the Stinson committee?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Stinson committee, I think, was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$56,000. I do not think this applies in this particular vote.

Mr. Nixon: Was money provided for that committee in, let us say, the dairy branch, or farm products marketing branch?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Market development branch.

Mr. Nixon: Then I would ask my hon. friend, Mr. Chairman, a question concerning the farm labour service. If you will permit me, I would like to make a few remarks associated with farm labour, because it appears that this is the only place in the estimates where the government is attempting to alleviate the situation of the shortage of farm labour in Ontario.

It is interesting to note that we are asked to make available \$24,000 for the operation of a farm labour service office, and that two years ago, looking in the last public accounts available to us, \$25,000 was allotted, of which \$17,000 was left unspent. Now I realize that the responsibilities of this office are somewhat limited. I suppose it involves searching out those in other areas of Canada, and perhaps overseas, and giving some assistance, I suppose, to having these people come to Ontario. But the problem is really taking on acute proportions, and this applies not only to those parts of the agricultural industry that have crops that require a lot of labour and seasonal labour, but even in the milk industry and beef-raising industry, where even the most advanced mechanization does not cut down labour requirements sufficiently so that proper help can be found.

I would say that the hon. Minister's decision, in collaboration with the labour department, taken at this session to extend workmen's compensation to the farm workers was a good decision. It has been criticized by some groups that the hon. Minister of Labour has had an opportunity to speak to—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes, I have heard of one or two.

Mr. Nixon: —but in general, it is the sort of thing that is going to upgrade farm labour to the point where people are going to consider this as at least a possibility.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, we are glad to hear you say that. This is why it was advanced.

Mr. Nixon: And we certainly supported it, in the House and in committee.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Your earlier remarks in the session did not indicate what you are saying now.

Mr. MacDonald: He was just speaking on behalf of some constituents.

Mr. Nixon: Not so. Certainly we voted in favour of the government's proposal, and we have been presented with objections from many groups, just as I am sure the government has been presented with objections.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The decision was right.

Mr. Nixon: My point here, Mr. Chairman, is that this is a step in a direction that will upgrade farm labour. I submit to you, Mr. House Leader, since you are taking an interest in this particular aspect of the debate, that there are other steps that should be considered in the immediate future.

I have heard the federal Minister of Agriculture deal with this and some of the hon. members, not present tonight, criticize him for this. He has a very colourful way of describing these situations, and he says that, in general in Canada, and I suppose that this applies in Ontario, there is a tendency to look down on anybody who takes part in agriculture at the labouring level. As Mr. Hays says, "we do not have them in to Sunday dinner." He is making the point that they are still regarded as third- or fourth-class citizens.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not by this government.

Mr. Nixon: I certainly hope not. I wonder why the policies of this government have allowed the farm labour force to descend to this level? It seems to me that if agriculture is going to progress we have to have people with some training in agriculture, and who have an eagerness to take part in this industry.

I would say that there are many things associated with this, and bad housing is perhaps one of the most important. When we were discussing the housing responsibilities of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) I brought to his attention that the slums of Ontario are found in other areas than Metropolitan Toronto. He has only to travel through some of the less frequented areas of the province in order to find that this is true.

Now here is one problem. Wages are another, but certainly supply and demand, in this case, are bringing the wages of farm labour somewhere near what their efforts are worth. A good many farmers are recognizing the value of the help that is available by, on their own account, providing them

with hospitalization, medical insurance, proper housing, workmen's compensation long before it is made compulsory by the government; and other amenities that have made the position attractive. But in general, the proposals that have been put to the government to make available the farm labour that we need have not been acted upon with any despatch, and I would say that this is one of the immediate emergencies that we are going to have to do something about.

Last summer I believe it was, when the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Agriculture were touring Europe, there were reports that indicated that they were trying to deal with this in some manner so that immigrants to the country would be able to fill these requirements. I feel that there is something wrong, if we are going to look on this as sort of the lowest possible level of employment, where you have to bring people in from a lesser society who will begin their life in Ontario at the low level to which this work has descended under the enlightened regulations of this government. We should have an overall plan to upgrade farm employment and there should be some definite initiative on the part of the government to assist the farm community in this.

I think that if \$24,000 is appropriated again this year there is every expectation, if we are to go by what the government has done in the last few years, that over half of this will be left unspent. Perhaps the government has no plan in this, but I would ask the hon. Minister if he would care to comment on it and tell us what the government intends to do.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that if the hon. member had been here this afternoon he would have heard me say what the government has been doing, and it is a very creditable record, in farm labour procurement.

Mr. Bryden: According to your impartial judgment.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course, but I did not hear you object to it. I think we have a very strong and a very favourable record as far as this government is concerned. I would point out to my hon. friend that it was at my insistence that a farm labour conference was called last December 18 in Ottawa. I advanced the idea of a national conference of the Ministers and their deputies at Ottawa. It was accepted and the meeting was called for December 18. This was a direct result

of our request. We recognize the importance of farm labour in this province of Ontario.

I think we have a creditable record. Last year, working with our federal-provincial farm labour relations committee headed up by our assistant deputy Minister Gordon Bennett, we had 30,340 placements in agriculture from April 1 to the end of October, 1964. You cannot say that we are doing hardly anything as far as farm labour placements in Ontario are concerned.

Mr. Nixon: I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It certainly was implied.

Mr. Nixon: I certainly did not say that. All I said was that you asked us for \$24,000 and there is every reason to expect that you will not spend half of it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would like to point out to my hon. friend that the federal government provides a like amount; it is not quite so insignificant as he would have us believe.

Mr. Bryden: Why do you ask for it if you do not intend to spend it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We certainly intend to spend it, if it is necessary to spend it. But I am not going to go out and throw money off the rooftops if it is not necessary just to please the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. Nixon: Why would you ask us to appropriate the money if it is not necessary?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not always possible to gauge every vote to the last dollar. If my hon. friend feels we are spending too much on farm labour, then of course, we will have to reduce the vote. Is this what he wants us to do?

We feel that it is important to put it in there and do everything possible to try to help the farm labour situation in this province. And I would say this: If we could get as much co-operation on every angle as we are trying to give in the province of Ontario, I think probably we would be much more successful in the procurement of farm help throughout Canada, and from other areas as well.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister for providing us with this information. Finally, I would like to ask him a question under item 12, the \$8,000 we are asked to appropriate in connection with the historical publications. It appears that it is a general policy now in the Cabinet to have an historical review of what the department

has done for some years past. I know that we have had one from the hon. Minister of Highways and I understand that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) has undertaken a similar project. I do not believe that any announcement has been made about this, although there may have been one this afternoon, and I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain this for us.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would be pleased to do this, and very happy to do it as a matter of fact. We think this is an excellent idea. Approaching the anniversary of Confederation, in 1967, we think it is important that there should be an historical record of The Department of Agriculture, since its early beginning up to the present time. We have employed the services of W. K. Riddell, retired agricultural representative of Middlesex county for this job. Along with him will be a committee comprised of Mr. J. A. Carroll, Mr. Frank Perkin and Mr. A. H. Martin, all three of them now retired from The Department of Agriculture. Mr. Moff Cockburn, also retired, will assist Mr. Riddell in the procurement of the historical information and compiling the report. We look forward to this and I think it will be something that we will all treasure and be very proud of.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the farm labour situation, the hon. Minister has given assistance to farmers who will build accommodation for seasonal farm labour. It seems to me that there are some complaints that The Department of Agriculture is going to hold some strings on this accommodation, that the farmer builds with assistance from your department, for ten years. Would the hon. Minister enlighten us as to what strings are attached to the building if the farmer gets assistance from The Department of Agriculture for housing for seasonal farm labour?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that there are no formal legal strings attached but we will certainly do everything we possibly can to make sure the buildings that are erected with these grants are used for the purpose for which they were intended. I do not think we can go much further than that.

Mr. Spence: Suppose that they sell the farm, Mr. Chairman, has the department any strings on that farm?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He is at perfect liberty to sell the farm, but the cabins must be used for farm labour.

Mr. Spence: There is another question I would like to ask the hon. Minister. We hear quite a few complaints from the processors that farmers who grow cash crops such as tomatoes and others, are going to have help and the processor is not. Some of them feel the farmers will be in a bad position, because they cannot take their produce. I wonder if the hon. Minister has heard complaints, no doubt you have, from processors along that line such as I have.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is a technical matter. Our federal-provincial agreement only covers the grant being made to bona fide farmers as such. Now, I admit that there may be a problem in the southern areas. However, I think with the public relations contacts, and the public relations that most of the canning companies have, they will be able to do the same as they have done in other years; and that is in some areas provide housing accommodation for help they have brought in and used in their plant or sent out to farms, as the case may be. Some of them, of course, have vertically integrated operations and they employ the same labour wherever it is possible to do this. But our grant only applies to actual farmers.

Mr. Spence: Another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, I do not know whether it comes under this vote or not, Mr. Chairman, but we have in the province of Ontario a number of mink farmers. Of course, the mink farmers come under The Department of Lands and Forests. I have no bitterness, or any regrets, or anything to indicate that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has not been very fair in assisting these mink farmers, but, of course, last year the mink farmers had a great loss with their young. Some of them have come to me to say that they would be far better off under The Department of Agriculture rather than under The Department of Lands and Forests, because they could make use of the junior farmers' loan board, they can make use of other branches of The Department of Agriculture. This is not anything bitter against the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I wish he was in the House tonight. But I have had some requests that these fur farmers would like to be taken under The Department of Agriculture, and make use of some of the loans to assist this industry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there is a co-ordinated programme at the Ontario veterinary college insofar as research on wildlife, and we work with The Department of Lands and Forests on this. I have no comment to

make on the administration of this type of farming coming under The Department of Agriculture. I suppose it has merit. I assume it must have been placed under The Department of Lands and Forests since it deals with fur production in the province, and we have nothing to do with that in our department. I would think for administrative purposes it is probably in a good position where it is, but there may be good merit to what my hon. friend has said.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I have one or two comments to make concerning the farm labour problem. First of all, I would like to comment on the farmstead improvement competition, as announced by the hon. Minister this afternoon. I assume that this would fall under the main office.

I might draw to the hon. Minister's attention that Essex county ran a forerunner of this same type of competition some three to four years ago; I am sure that the local agricultural representative can give the hon. Minister a great deal of information in this regard. This, initially, was sponsored by the Essex county tourist association—working through the women's institute of the county and the county council. I think this is a very commendable announcement of the hon. Minister today, for we who are interested in the tourist industry and especially in the gateway to the province of Ontario—the garden gateway to Canada, the Essex county area—like to see our farm buildings and farm lands upgraded and made attractive to our many visitors, and we certainly wish you well in this project. Unfortunately, we were only able to carry on in this project for two years. There was a lack of interest on the part of our farm folk to get into this competition, but we hope that your advertising and work through your officers will be successful.

In regard to the farm labour service, item six, the hon. member for Kent East was referring to the shared ownership by the farm labour committee for the period of ten years. I posed this question to the assistant deputy Minister: That I had had representations made to me that should a farmer wish to put up a large building or greenhouse on an exact location he would want an assurance that he could pay off his indebtedness to this farm committee. I would just like to have the hon. Minister clarify this point. Would this be possible?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not sure that I follow what the hon. member said, Mr. Chairman. Are you suggesting that if other uses

are required for the land on which the cabin is located, that if the owner of the land paid the government back the amount of the grant originally paid there would be no strings attached?

Mr. Paterson: The grant less certain depreciation for the number of years that it had been in existence.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would think that could be worked out. It sounds like a perfectly reasonable suggestion. I see no reason why it could not be done.

Mr. Paterson: Fine, that is the assurance that I wished this evening.

The hon. Minister brought up the area of discussion that he was in Europe and I noticed a headline in one of the papers where he was seeking workers from Ireland. I have had a great number of discussions on immigrant farm labour.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Great country.

Mr. Paterson: Great country. Do we have many of those great Irish workers coming into our fair province? Have you been successful at all?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Paterson: Have you had any success in attracting any of these great Irish people to come into our fair province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, my hon. friend suggests Ireland, and, of course, with my grandmother having been born in Ireland, I have a naturally soft spot in my heart for Ireland. I would say that we have been fortunate in attracting about a dozen families to come from the United Kingdom. Not all from Ireland, but a good many from Scotland. We are very pleased with our success with this project to date.

Mr. Paterson: In many discussions on this farm labour problem there has been a certain amount of pressure, certainly in my area, and in the constituency of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch), for offshore labour to help meet our demands at this season. We realize from statements made by the federal authorities that this will not be given this year, unless the NES prove workers cannot be brought into our areas from other parts of Canada. But I just wonder if all the paper work and other necessary negotiations to allow these workers to come in on a moment's notice—should this situation arise—has been pursued by your farm labour committee; to have this all set up and prepared to swing

into action should the disaster hit the market gardening areas.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Essex South well knows that he has the wholehearted support and co-operation of the government of Ontario to bring in all the immigrants that are necessary to do the job that has to be done in harvesting Ontario's crops. I think he has a copy of a letter that I addressed, under date of April 1, to the hon. federal Minister of Agriculture, bearing this out; a letter that was given wide circulation, I understand.

We are disappointed to know that the request was not favourably regarded by the Immigration Department at Ottawa, or whoever had to make the decision at Ottawa, but we have taken the necessary steps to do everything possible to encourage the immigration of necessary farm labour should the national employment service not be able to meet the requirements of the respective areas.

Mr. Paterson: I thank the hon. Minister very much. I would just like to thank the hon. Minister for all his efforts, particularly in Essex county, and the deputy and his assistant in the area for all the work they have done specifically for our area. I do have a file some inches thick, but I could possibly make the major address on farm labour problems.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are just waiting on the federal government to do—

Mr. Paterson: I believe the federal government is doing its share, Mr. House Leader but I do wish to compliment the assistant deputy Minister for the co-operation he has extended to my farmers.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, item 13 in this vote asks for \$360,000 for student bursaries and scholarships. Apparently this is a new item in the department. Is this to assist students in furthering their agricultural education?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. This is to make available bursaries and entrance scholarships to the students attending the Ontario agricultural college, the veterinary college and Macdonald institute because the fee structure of the new university has been raised to come more closely in line with other universities throughout Ontario. Those students who are now there—in the agricultural courses, the veterinary course and Macdonald institute—will pay the difference between

what they entered at and what the costs will now be, providing they meet their grade requirements.

Mr. Newman: So this does not actually supply any additional scholarships?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, yes. I want to say that, because we feel that one of the ways to get the best brains in agriculture in the future—as my hon. friend from Brant was talking about a few moments ago—is to try to entice these young people into the field of agriculture. So we are providing bursaries for these young students, scholarships in the amount of \$600 a year for a student who achieves in one year 75 per cent in grade 13 subjects.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is there any provision at all in this for exchange students, or for students from foreign countries—say, the African continent?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: These bursaries and scholarships are available to Ontario students but, like all universities, I fancy the University of Guelph would be extending the opportunity to students from other countries to come in, just as we have done at the agricultural college, the veterinary college and Macdonald institute through the years of their existence.

Mr. Newman: This does not provide any assistance to a student who might want to further his agricultural education by attending a foreign university?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No.

Mr. Newman: No. Thank you.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister has examined Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on consumers of tobacco? We see that there is one cent per ounce or part thereof of any tobacco purchased by him other than cigarettes and cigars. But on any purchase under this clause the minimum tax payable is one cent, and every fraction of a cent shall be considered as one cent.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, might I point out to the hon. member that the effect of the tax to which he makes reference has no effect on either the producer or the consumer? It has to do with an exchange of the tax from one area to another to simplify the merchandising of the product. It will not affect either the producer or the consumer.

Mr. Spence: I quite understand that, Mr. Chairman, but it looks to me as if we are paying five per cent on domestic tobacco—tobacco grown here—and on tobacco that is imported we are only paying two per cent. So where is this “Buy Canadian” deal?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think the hon. member is raising a question which embraces several factors. This, I think, is not the time to go into it.

Mr. Bryden: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are now on the use of tobacco, and if the hon. member is suggesting that we advance or restrict the matter, then the debate would take on some other aspects. The point here is that this does not affect the present status quo; the matter of tariffs and the import of tobacco from the United States or other countries is a matter for the federal government.

Mr. Spence: I thought, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Minister had looked the bill over he would see that we have a five per cent tax on domestic tobacco, whereas we have only two per cent on imported tobacco.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I fancy I received the same kind of a note as did the hon. member, concerning this very matter; this is likely why he raised it. I find it difficult to understand why it has been raised by the hon. member in this particular estimate when it passed second reading of the House and is now in committee of the whole House stage. I would think, with great respect, Mr. Chairman, that the time to debate that issue is when the bill is in committee of the whole House.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in connection with the Royal winter fair as it applies to 4-H clubs. Of course, we all know that part of the Royal winter fair and part of the 4-H show is part and parcel of the Royal winter fair as such, and the Queen's Guineas class has become well known across the province over the years. I understand that this year there were a number of complaints in connection with the catering services. I understand—and I think it is the same system under which we are operating now as was the case when I was a 4-H member—that the catering system is paid by the government, and the 4-H members are actually given little tickets which they present at the door. I am working from memory, but I think that a breakfast is worth \$1, and dinner and

supper are worth something like \$2.25. The reason I raise the matter is on the principle of quality of the food. I have had a number of 4-H leaders who have come to me this past year and said that last fall at the Royal winter fair the quality of the food put up by the catering service was not of the highest quality; they optioned out and went downtown rather than eating at the Royal winter fair building. This certainly cost The Department of Agriculture a considerable amount of money—I would not know how much, but it certainly cost them a considerable amount—and I am wondering if the hon. Minister knows about this. If he does, I am wondering if he would consider doing something about changing the catering services, or telling the people that they had better improve the quality of the food that they put up.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I know my hon. friend, having been a former Queen's Guineas winner, would know what we are talking about, but I suppose when he was in that group he may have objected to the standardization of the menu even at that time, although I do not suppose he did. But I think that the complaint he has raised is one that is probably quite logical, but I do not think it is too valid or of too great importance. There may have been objections raised to the fact that everybody gets the same meal; where you are serving 200 youngsters or more, they all get the same meal. But I have never heard a word of criticism concerning the quality of the food, and I have been out there on numerous occasions. The same catering service is provided for the young people in the 4-H club who are attending as for anyone else. However, I would be very happy to look into this, but I cannot see any reason nor have I heard of any real problem in connection with this.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, may I say to my hon. friend that I have heard complaints over the past number of years about the quality of the food? I have also heard complaints about the standardization of the menus. Some people do not like it, and I suppose it is a personal preference. You cannot please all the people of the province—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Pheasants' tongues under glass?

Mr. Gaunt: May I say, Mr. Chairman, to the House Leader, that the department has not gone in for pheasants under glass, nor have they gone in for anything in the way

of a good turkey feed. They have not seen fit to do that. But, in any case—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are not thinking of making an election issue out of this, are you?

Mr. Gaunt: No, really I am not. In any case, I would suggest that my hon. friend take a look at it and see if the quality of the food is such that the complaint is justified.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, one year ago I brought up the grant situation with this department. I think it has some merit from the fact that before any of these grants are actually given to the organization, a financial statement be presented to the department to show that there is a need for the grant. If the association has sufficient moneys, I do not see why a grant should be made to the association. The grant should be given to associations where need is shown rather than just given. Does the department require a financial statement from an association before giving a grant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We examine, very closely, the structure of these various organizations. They budget very closely. They depend upon this grant, which is provided by this government, and they are in need of these various types of assistance in order to carry on their routine programmes.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if any of the funds provided under item 13 are made available to the students at the University of Guelph who would be entering, say, in a coming year? There is no thought of maintaining the status quo as far as fees are concerned, is there?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is the honour students you are talking about. Commencing September 1, 1965, all students from the province of Ontario who enrol and are accepted at the Ontario agricultural college—wishing to work toward a Bachelor of Science in agriculture degree—will receive \$125 for each of the years after the completion of their course, paid toward their next year's tuition. That is the students who will be coming in, not the ones who are now enrolled.

Mr. Nixon: Do they have to maintain 75 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, they just have to pass. We want to be sure that they pass. If a student fails, he just does not get paid.

Mr. Nixon: In this connection, does the milk and so on provided there at the residences mean that there is an advantage to attending that university in the way of cheaper board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The milk that is provided there is paid for by the commercial company that is providing the catering, and it is paid at the market price.

Mr. Nixon: I was interested in the bill that passed the Legislature some weeks ago having to do with brucellosis testing, and I believe that one of the clauses in it allows a veterinarian to assign the responsibility for doing some of the routine work of testing to a person who is not a veterinarian. It seems to me that people who have this amount of special skill are hard to come by, and it is true that you cannot expect a qualified veterinarian to do all of the jobs that would come under the jurisdiction of this department. Is there any thought that some sort of a technical course could be provided for young people who might want to take part in what you might call paraveterinarian services, and would there be any discussion between the hon. Minister and his colleague, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), in having this form part of, let us say, the new community colleges?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that is an excellent suggestion, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, we have a committee working on it right now. We have already had some meetings concerning it and we think that there is a real opportunity here to provide a service, and we intend to do so.

Mr. Nixon: I would say that as well as the assistance to veterinarians, there is every indication that in the dairy branch, or whatever it eventually becomes under the new Act, that a large number of people with semi-professional backgrounds for inspection and quality control are going to be required. I believe that Professor Hennessey, in his report, indicated that there was some shortage of qualified staff in the branch for that very purpose and I would say that a course that would be provided for young people, particularly from agricultural areas, along these lines, would be most useful.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is being considered.

Mr. W. E. Johnston (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, while we are on vote 101, I notice a grant of \$15,000 to the Ottawa winter fair. I wonder if any consideration might be given

to increasing that grant. I am sure you are familiar with the Ottawa winter fair because I know you have been there on one or two occasions, and it seems to me that a delegation has been to see you regarding this very matter of an increased grant.

I also notice that the Royal winter fair gets a grant of \$50,000. I do not want to suggest that anything should be taken away from the Royal winter fair, but I want to say that I believe that the Ottawa winter fair serves as an exhibition in a local area to a lesser extent commercial than does the Royal winter fair. I think you will agree with me that the 4-H show at the Ottawa winter fair is second to none, not only in Ontario, but on the continent. This is a recognized show for the juniors and a recognized show for the breeders and I would suggest, Mr. Minister, that you would think very carefully and consider increasing that grant to the Ottawa winter fair.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments about the sheep industry and also about the—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Which vote is this?

Mr. Gaunt: This is 101.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is also competition between you and the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I may say I was not aware of any competition.

Mr. Chairman, my comments on the sheep industry are in connection with the fact that, as I understand it, there are no designated brands for mutton in the retail trade. I am thinking of designated brands as we have in beef—red and blue brand and so on. This makes it rather difficult for the consumer who goes into the store to buy mutton, because she has no way of telling what the quality is unless she is a real connoisseur of mutton herself. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that I do not see anything wrong with establishing brands. Perhaps they could use the same brands—the red and the blue brands, and so on, that are used for beef cattle, because it seems to me that this would be a way to encourage and increase the consumption of mutton. I saw an article in the paper the other day where the per capita consumption of mutton had slipped and slipped rather badly. I put it down to this reason; perhaps it is something else, I do not know, but in any case the people of the province and the people of Canada are not eating as much mutton. I am just wondering if this is not one of the reasons at any rate.

The other thing is that—and I am sure my hon. friend from Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney) is interested in this, because he is in the sheep business—I understand that in this country the wool manufacturers are not able to get enough wool. As a matter of fact, some members of the industry have indicated to the breeders of sheep in this country that they could handle 8,000,000 more sheep than we have at the present time in order to supply the demands for wool. I believe, at present, something like 90 per cent of our wool needs are met by importation and it seems to me that a great deal of encouragement could be given to this industry if the hon. Minister would take up the challenge.

The other thing I wanted to talk about is the beef cattle industry, and the fact that for a number of years we have had what I might term two rather distinct types in the beef cattle industry. Let me explain. First of all, the purebred breeder has gone and has stuck with the low-set blocky animal that has a nice appearance in the show ring and looks well when dressed up. He has more or less shied away from the large animal, the animal with a great deal of size and bone and scale, as we call it in the industry. Because of this, because of the two standards, it seems to me that the beef industry has suffered.

I say this because first of all artificial insemination came in a number of years ago and certainly cut the sales, cut the bull sales, of the purebred breeders to the commercial men. That was the one thing. Then the other thing is the fact that we have the double standard. The purebred man breeds and actually carries on with a breed and a type of animal that is smaller, that is actually in terms of the industry a pony in some cases. They are smaller, they are not the large, rugged type; and the commercial man is just not interested in this kind of animal for breeding purposes.

As a result the commercial men have tended to shy away and have gone to cross with a Holstein perhaps, or something with much more size and scale, in order to get: First of all a crossbred hybrid, vigour; and second, to breed into their crossbreds the size and scale needed for them to make money in a commercial operation.

So I say to my hon. friend that I think it would be a good idea if in some way—and perhaps this could be done with the agricultural representative service, I do not know. There are ways, I am sure my hon. friend could work it out. But I feel that the standards of type in the beef breeds should be made well known to all the beef breeders

—the breeders of Hereford cattle, the Aberdeen Angus cattle and the Shorthorn cattle.

The standards in the show ring should be exactly the same as the standards commercially, or very closely allied to them, so we get away from this kind of thing where you have a double standard. In the long run, in my opinion, it certainly hurts the industry. I would be interested in the comments of the hon. Minister in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the hon. member for Carleton, first in his request for increased grants for the Ottawa winter fair. I would like to say that I would agree with him that the Ottawa winter fair provides a very useful function in the Ottawa valley, and I would certainly endorse the commendation which he has made concerning the 4-H show there. It is a sight to behold, that 4-H show.

In this connection I would like to say that we make, in addition to the regular \$15,000 regular grant as itemized here under this vote, an additional \$6,000 grant in connection with the 4-H show, so the total grant to the Ottawa winter fair is \$21,000 instead of \$15,000.

In connection with what the hon. member for Huron-Bruce said in regard to, first of all, the sheep industry and the grading of mutton: Grading standards, of course, are established and provided by the federal Department of Agriculture inspection services. He mentioned the fact that mutton consumption was dropping. I can understand that because there are less sheep in Canada than there have been for a number of years, this automatically follows.

On the other hand, lamb consumption has gone up. The per capita consumption of lamb has increased, and along with this we have the importation of New Zealand lamb. As a farmer myself, a few years ago I must confess I had great reservations about the introduction of New Zealand lamb to Canadian markets, but there appears to have developed an appetite for lamb among Canadian people that has driven the price of domestic lamb to the highest record figure in the history of the lamb business in Canada to my knowledge, pertaining to these last few months.

I would agree that there is an excellent opportunity for large flocks of sheep in Canada, but like all types of farm enterprise, perhaps, sheep in particular must be kept in numbers larger than we have been used to keeping them in the past. The sheep man of the Ontario Legislature, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox, would agree, I

think, that you must have a sizeable flock of sheep to make it a worthwhile venture. As a matter of fact, the federal Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Mr. Hays, on a programme just last Sunday, I believe, mentioned this very point, and he used that as an illustration of the number that must be kept to make it an economic unit. So I would agree that the opportunity does exist. As far as the beef industry is concerned, he makes a very valid point in connection with certain types of beef animals not meeting, I believe he said, the requirements of the commercial cattlemen. This, I think, is something that is a responsibility of the individual breeder concerned.

If he chooses to breed that type of an animal for a specific market, then that is his business, we cannot force him not to do it. But we have introduced, through The Department of Agriculture livestock branch, the performance registry international, which is really an ROP, a record of performance of the gaining hereditary characteristics of beef animals. This has, we think, served a very useful purpose in providing an indicator to a commercial cattleman wanting to buy beef herd sires so that he has some idea of the gainability of that animal and the potential possibilities of his transmitting that characteristic to his offspring. This to me is the answer that has been provided and is being very well accepted by a great many commercial cattlemen.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment. I will certainly readily admit that the form of testing of beef bulls has a lot of merit and I am glad to see the department carrying it on. One thing in which I am interested in that connection is the fact that when a performance-tested bull is put up for sale at the Ontario bull sale here in Toronto, the government gives a grant—I think it is 75 per cent up to a maximum of \$150, something like that in any case! But the point I am trying to make is that the department gives that grant if the farmer enters the bull in the bull sale; but if a performance-tested bull is taken back to the farm and sold to a farmer, a neighbour or anyone who might purchase the bull, there is no grant given.

What I am saying is, that I think it should apply on what might be called a private treaty deal, as well as a bull that is put through the Ontario bull sale. I would ask my hon. friend to consider this, because I think it is a valid point. There is no reason why, when a man puts his bull through the Ontario bull sale, the buyer gets a premium, a

subsidy from the government; and when the farmer goes in, drives in the farmer's yard and buys a performance-tested bull in the farmer's yard, he does not get the subsidy from the Ontario government, even though the two bulls, in terms of performance, were perhaps equal.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. member for that suggestion. It is one to which we will give consideration.

Vote 101 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will proceed with the committee of the whole House, and thereafter estimates.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.40 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, May 28, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Friday, May 28, 1965

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	3371
Establishment and operation of commuter services, bill to provide for, Mr. Robarts, second reading	3375
University of Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	3383
York University Act, 1965, bill intituled, Mr. Davis, second reading	3383
Lakehead University, bill respecting, Mr. Davis, second reading	3383
Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	3386
Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill intituled, Mr. Robarts, second reading	3386
University of Guelph Act, 1964, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading ..	3390
Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, continued	3390
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3394

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Franklin Horner public school, Etobicoke; and in the east gallery, Power Glen public school, St. Catharines.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that, beginning Monday, May 31, this House will meet at 2 p.m., Monday to Thursday, inclusive.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 146, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in a general way, the main components of this bill indicate a desire on the part of the department to place greater authority and responsibility in the hands of the local municipal councils. A number of other items are to give greater explanation to certain functions of the local municipal councils with respect to the publication of the auditor's annual report. Then we have developed what we think may be a new method of dealing with the council representation in townships where a number of hamlets, or what I sometimes call police villages, exist. After a hearing by the municipal board, the board may, by its order, divide the townships into wards of varying sizes, bearing in mind the representation that may be required to satisfy the needs of the residents of the area.

Other amendments deal with the question of the qualification of candidates who qualify as tenants of property and who qualify for a position, as councillors, as tenants of property instead of as owners of property.

A new section has been added dealing with the matter of the situation which may exist where there is an equality of votes. After a recount by a county judge, it was never thought that a situation would exist where there would be an equality of votes after a recount, and we are taking care of that situation. It has not occurred in the past; it has occurred in the case of election to a school board.

Then we have provided also for something we think is desirable with respect to the matter of the constitution of boards of control. At the present time, this is permitted only in cities. We have amended the Act to provide that boards of control may be instituted in cities and towns of not less than 45,000 population, and in other municipalities of not less than 100,000.

The question of the destruction of records is also authorized by this amendment. I think it is quite clear in the amending bill. We have also provided for the clarification of the problem of the transfer of pension funds. There are also a number of other sections of this bill dealing with methods of obtaining the assent of electors to county bylaws, corrections to certain references that are in the Act at the present time, the matter of the establishment of landing grounds, and the question of the operation of lands that are dedicated for parks purposes, where the council wishes to operate this feature, a project by a council committee instead of through a parks board.

Hon. members may remember, sir, that we, I think it was last year or the year before, placed an amendment before the House dealing with the establishment of parking lots in certain defined areas. We are now amending this legislation to provide that where the commercial area is extended beyond the original area, a reallocation of the costs of these special charges could be charged to be levied on the extended area.

Another amendment provides for the licensing and regulating of lodging houses, and we

have clarified the section to indicate that lodging house means a nursing home as well. We are providing that the licensing of nursing homes and lodging houses generally may be by bylaw, if there is no bylaw of the local municipality.

Another section deals with the keeping of domestic animals within a municipality.

One of the important amendments in this bill deals with the authority of a municipality to acquire either by negotiation, by purchase or by expropriation, industrial sites and thereafter any sale or disposition of the land so acquired. I believe that this is a matter now that can be handled by the local municipal councils without the permission of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and councils have for quite a number of years been acquiring land for industrial purposes. I do not think that there have been any instances where the municipal taxpayers who have an investment in these projects have not had good results. I would think that, at the present time, it is desirable that this authority should be entirely in the hands of the municipal council and that the council may proceed to acquire and dispose of sites without the permission of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

A question which has created some problems in the past has been the matter of racing and speeding on privately owned parking lots and in this amendment, we provide the authority for the municipality—with the permission and consent of the owner of the parking lot—to undertake certain controls.

One of the important amendments to the Act is contained in section 28 of the amending bill and it deals with the matter of store closing hours. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in studying this subject, we have had the benefit of the advice of the large number of persons interested in store closing hours and we also have had representations from merchants' associations and others of similar interests. We believe that this amendment will provide the municipalities with the authority which, unfortunately, in the past has been found to be not quite as strong as it should be.

Another important part of this Act, sir, is contained in section 29 and deals with the matter of special charges required to provide additional sewer or water supply capacities. This section will now authorize municipalities to pass bylaws making special charges with relation to buildings that impose or may impose a heavier than ordinary load on the services of the municipality; and this relates to what are commonly called high-rise buildings or high-rise apartments.

At present, highways in a municipality may be stopped for purposes of the municipality. We wish to broaden this somewhat by providing that the municipality may stop off a highway for a limited period or for various periods of time.

We have deleted from The Municipal Act the sections which relate to the formation of police villages. It is the opinion of the department and myself that police villages, today, are not required. We think that those that are in existence now may continue, unless the township council or the citizens themselves make application under the new section of the Act dealing with the division of the township into wards. However, we believe that, at the present time, with transportation facilities as they exist within the province generally and all of the other features that have become involved in municipal administration, that police villages today are no longer required—that is any new ones.

There are a number of other correcting sections of the Act, sir, but I think these are the main and important sections.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, this is as comprehensive an amendment of The Municipal Act as we have had in some time. It takes the scatter-gun approach; there is no real theory that comes out of this at all. The hon. Minister has listened over the years to complaints and, every now and then, he plugs the odd gap.

Here is one obvious instance of plugging one—and that is with the licensing of assessors. It sounds great, as it is written in the statute, but how serious is the government about using the machinery that it has now given itself? It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note comments that were attributed to the hon. Minister after he gave this Act first reading. If he is going to be as tough as the newspapers indicated he said he was going to be, I think that is good; and it is important. But I think we should hear, as he embarks upon this new procedure, the licensing of assessors, just how he is going to go about it. What is the training programme going to be? What are the conditions for the licence? What is he going to do with those people who are not able to bring themselves up to the standard? How frequently are courses going to be given to all of the assessors over the province, in this and that region, and so on?

Are we in fact, with this step, beginning to move toward a regional type of government and where—I do not suppose we will find it in this Act; we have been pressing each indi-

vidual Minister—are we going to get the co-ordination of regionality that the government apparently appears to believe in? In isolated little pockets? Now these are things I think we should begin to get. I do not hesitate to compliment this hon. Minister on the fact that he is, for the first time, beginning to pay attention to some of the criticisms that have been addressed to his department and coming before government for many, many years. He is beginning to listen, and for that I give him credit, but it is not enough. There is no plan; there is no method; we do a bit here and a bit there and the municipality will be able to say that you need not have two horses in your backyard—you can have one horse. I think that is in here. That is a great advance in municipal procedure. It might be hard on the horses and the cattle, but it is an important thing.

He says that there will be no new police villages. This is fine, and I think it has been recognized by those people who think they are students of municipal law that the institution of a police village is perhaps outdated. What are you going to do about the ones that are still there? Instead of taking the initiative himself, he says that the local municipalities can deal with that, if they want to. What is he going to do about improvement districts? He does not mention that at all. Not too many years ago, his present deputy sent out a letter to many improvement districts suggesting that it was high time that they stood on their own feet and, by and large, the letter was ignored and the improvement districts are still carrying on.

Substantially, Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that we see so much of the responsibility continue to be shuffled off on the municipalities. This government is here to lead. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has the substantial responsibility by statute for municipal organization and, instead of leading, he is throwing the ball back to the municipalities.

The store-closing hour section is in here. It is very interesting. It cleans up a lot of loose talk in the law and perhaps now a municipality is going to be able to pass a bylaw that the courts will uphold. But he has not really approached the problem, because he knows, and I know and we all know, that insofar as closing hours are concerned, if a municipality has an enforceable bylaw, the merchants who want to stay open later hours would just move across the municipal border. If he is serious about making available the ability to enforce store-closing hours, then it is obvious that we can no longer stick to municipal boundaries. He avoids

this. Hamilton had great difficulty, for instance, in enforcing its bylaws because of the peculiar wording of the statute, which has now been cleaned up. But the merchants who are interested in keeping their establishments open later hours than Hamilton will allow them to do are just going to move across the Hamilton municipal border and set up operations in a township on the outskirts of it. So is the hon. Minister really tackling these problems? I suggest that he is not. It is a delaying action; it is a shuffling off action.

Then he talks about the ability to be given now to municipalities to be able to levy special sewer charges on apartment buildings and I am wondering how, with a completely straight face, he can stand up and say this—because he and I and his legal adviser have argued for half a dozen years in committee that what was in the Act was fine.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There was a court case—

Mr. Singer: Yes, but we argued that what was there was fine and there was enough power—and now we have changed it. This is fine, too, but Mr. Speaker, there is such a lack of consistency and such a lack of planning that we wonder if The Department of Municipal Affairs is moving in any direction. It is very hard to find the direction it is moving in from reading this Act.

We will support the Act because what is here is better than what is in the statute, but he is only nibbling at the most serious problem that is facing the province of Ontario and, at this moment still, there is no indication that the government is willing to take on the problem of municipal organization of regional government and the general improvement of our administrative procedures in the province of Ontario.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have one or two comments with regard to this bill. Like my friend, the hon. member for Downsview, I take the view that this is a bill designed to patch the leaks in the roof rather than to rebuild the structure. It is perhaps too much to expect that at this session the hon. Minister would be in a position to bring in legislation to act upon the recommendations of the select committee that inquired into The Municipal Act and related legislation, or to act upon the studies that his own department has been conducting. I would not criticize him for not moving forward immediately. I hope that he has in mind some sort of action that will attack the

problems of municipal government at a more fundamental level in the next session of this House. We can only wait and see about that.

I think the bill itself indicates the inadequacy of our whole municipal organization and underlines once again the need for a new approach to a municipal organization, as has been recommended in the select committees' report. The question of the store hours is an outstanding case in point. Some of us may remember a battle royal that took place in one of the standing committees a few years ago—on the question of the regulation of store hours—when it was proposed, and ultimately enacted, that this would be a matter that would be dealt with in The Municipal Act. It had previously been dealt with in what was then, I think, called The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act. It was a matter of responsibility of The Department of Labour. I argued the point at the time, and I still think that the move to put it under The Municipal Act was a retrograde step. I think experience has demonstrated that.

It is a matter that simply cannot be regulated adequately by municipalities under our present municipal organization. Now, if the hon. Minister is going to proceed with a large-scale reorganization of municipal boundaries, then this matter might very well be left to the municipalities or at any rate, to the senior level municipalities, if the type of plan proposed in the select committee report is undertaken.

But if the hon. Minister is not going to do that in the near future, then I suggest to him that this matter should become a matter of provincial responsibility. True, in the amendments that are now before us in the bill, a gaping loophole in the previous legislation has been plugged to a certain degree—a loophole that made the section totally unenforceable even within the boundaries of a single municipality, as experience in Hamilton demonstrated. That loophole is being plugged, but the main problem is not being faced—that in this day and age a municipality simply does not have a wide enough geographic jurisdiction to be able to handle the regulation of store hours adequately. We can see that every day in the city of Toronto, where the city may have a bylaw regulating hours for stores or service stations and other cognate matters, and the next municipality, which is indistinguishable from the city of Toronto to any person driving along the street, does not have a bylaw and the stores are wide open. Thus, in the Toronto area one more serious burden has been placed upon the small businessman. We hear so

much lip service paid to the small businessman, yet our laws perpetually permit situations to exist that drive him to the wall. He is in the situation where he must be open night and day, or else lose business to stores out in the suburbs that are open night and day. This cannot be corrected by the type of legislation we now have, that gives power to regulate the store hours only to local municipalities.

You can see the problem very clearly in the service station industry. At the corner of Bathurst and St. Clair is a service station which is partly in the city of Toronto and partly in the township of York. At 7 p.m., when the city of Toronto bylaw takes effect, they simply close up the pumps that are in the city of Toronto, but keep open the ones that are in the township of York. This has been going on for a long time.

There is another service station a block away which is entirely in the city of Toronto; it must close up at 7 p.m. There is another one a block to the north that is entirely in the township of York; it stays open 24 hours a day. These three service stations, within a quarter of a mile of each other, demonstrate the futility of trying to regulate hours by municipal bylaw.

I know there are people who claim to be great champions of free enterprise—we had a great raft of them at the committee session of a few years ago, to which I referred—who take the position that if a man wants to work himself to death he should be entitled to do so. Well, perhaps he should. But I do not think he should force other people into the position where they have to work themselves to death, too. I think there should be reason in all things, and it is reasonable that people who run small shops, probably without employees, should have some opportunity for rest and recreation. They cannot get that if competitors relatively close at hand are open night and day. What the small merchant, of course, is up against is the discount store, the department store, and so on, which in the suburbs, on the basis of what I would consider exploited labour, stays open for intolerable hours. This forces the little man into the position where either he must work these intolerable hours himself, or else lose business.

The tragedy of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that if they all stay open 24 hours a day, they do not really get any more business, the business is just spread over a larger period. The only way a merchant gets an advantage by staying open longer hours is if the other fellows do not stay open the longer hours. But, of

course, as soon as one does it, the others are slowly forced into the same position. All of them find themselves working under what could only be described as inhuman hours, and none of them really get any increase in business—indeed, they probably lose money, because their overhead is greater. They have greater expenses in keeping their places of business open for longer hours.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that if he is not planning in the near future to create municipal units that can regulate this problem rationally, then he should, in agreement with his colleague, remove the whole matter from the area of municipal jurisdiction and make it a provincial matter, so that it can be regulated on a zone basis rather than on the basis of antiquated municipal boundaries.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Speaker, speaking to this bill, I would like to make a few comments after listening to the hon. member for Downsview and the hon. member for Woodbine. I would suggest that this bill, and this government in projecting it, is entirely right. It is high time we started to stop whittling the rights and authority away from the municipalities. I believe it is the right of the municipality and the police village to settle their differences. This government should not wield the big stick over all small municipalities.

Relative to closing hours, I believe the municipalities should have the right in their area to decide when they wish to open and when they wish to close. The small man has the same privilege. The small man's business and success was built up on hours that were convenient to the public to purchase his merchandise. I support this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this bill be forwarded to the committee on municipal law. It will be heard Tuesday next at 9.30 a.m.

COMMUTER SERVICES

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves second reading of Bill No. 147, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make comments on this bill, I would like to commend the government in setting up such commuter services, but at the same time to remind them

that there are other areas in the province that would like similar consideration. This government could, at this time, show that consideration, possibly by eliminating the diesel fuel tax, so that the municipal transportation systems would have some advantage and be able to provide better services to the residents of that community. My own local paper editorialized quite strongly concerning the subsidy given to this type of transportation system; by the same token, they recommended that other areas of the province receive similar treatment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would say that this bill is the most constructive and intelligent step that the provincial government has taken in the field of transportation in living memory; I suppose at any time. Apparently the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs disagrees with me, but I still stick by my statement.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I am happy to note that the government is slowly, but I hope surely, getting over its predilection for highway and expressway transportation. I am not suggesting that highways and expressways do not have a role to play in the total transportation picture of the province, or of metropolitan and urban areas. I do suggest—as I have many times in the past—that the government was giving an undue emphasis to that particular form of transportation, and was thereby distorting the total transportation situation in a way that is bound to create difficulties in the future.

Its first hesitant and tentative move away from that antiquated position came in the exigencies of the last election campaign, when it agreed to provide a subsidy—an inadequate subsidy, I may say—for the construction of the east-west subway in the Toronto area. It did not adopt a general policy of assistance to rapid transit transportation, as it has had for a long time in regard to highway transportation and expressways, but it did give grudging acceptance to the integral role that rapid transit necessarily has to play in a developed and congested urban area.

This bill is another step in the same direction. It is just a step, but it does provide the basis whereby the government can provide assistance in the establishment of an alternative to highway transportation. I believe, if I understand the bill correctly, that it would make it possible for the government to do this in areas other than the Metropolitan

Toronto area. The first experimental step that it is undertaking relates to this area, but I think the bill is broad enough that the government can undertake further steps in this area and also extend the principle to other areas, if it deems it advisable to do so.

I certainly think this is a step to be commended. I would say it is long overdue. The problem of congestion in the Metro Toronto area has been obvious, in fact has been of crisis dimensions, for about ten years. It is rather melancholy to think that it takes a Tory government ten years to deal with a critical problem. However, one can be thankful that even Tories act ultimately, and they are acting in this case.

I would suggest to the government—and it may already have this in mind but I think it may be worthwhile putting the suggestion forward in any case—that it is going to have to undertake quite an extensive educational campaign in conjunction with its experiment relating to the commuter service along the lakeshore area centering on Toronto. People have become accustomed to using their cars to get downtown and I think it is essential, in terms of public need and public welfare, that they be persuaded that this is not in either their own best interest or the best interest of the community at large.

It will not be easy; there is no doubt that it is very handy to be able to jump into your car at your own door and get downtown. I suppose you have to pay about \$25 a month for parking, but a parking place that may be within a block or two of your place of business is handy. The only trouble is that if this continues, and it is bound to unless we provide alternative methods of transportation, the downtown area of Toronto will ultimately become nothing but a vast parking lot. The people will not be very close to their places of business because the places of business will be driven out by the parking lots.

I think people have to understand that, they have to recognize a certain public interest in this matter and undertake to leave their cars at home if they are going to go downtown into the Toronto area, particularly at the periods of heavy congestion. However, they will not do that unless a large-scale campaign is undertaken to persuade them to do it, and the basic factor is to provide them with reasonable alternative transportation.

This bill, if it is fully implemented and full advantage is taken of it, will provide that alternative service. There then should be an advertising campaign to persuade the people of the desirability of using the service and of the advantages to themselves in using it.

The service itself, of course, should be made as efficient and attractive as possible so as to attract custom. Above all, I would suggest to the government that it should ensure that there are adequate parking facilities in the immediate vicinity of the stations on the commuter service. This is one of the great problems of the Toronto subway. The parking is very poor in the vicinity of the subway stations. If a man wants to come in from Oakville, shall we say, and if he lives a mile from the commuter station, and knowing what public transportation is in Oakville, he is not going to walk a mile to get the commuter train. He is going to get in his car, ride along the Queen Elizabeth and the Gardiner expressway and clog them up as they are at present clogged up, and then try to put his car into the downtown area of Toronto which is already incapable of accommodating all the cars that want to go there.

So the answer obviously is to provide parking facilities at the Oakville station so that he can drive his car to that station, park it for a reasonable rate, get on the train to downtown and thereby relieve the congestion downtown. I think that fares on the commuter service should be offered on the basis of combined parking and transportation for those who want it. If that type of programme is undertaken, I feel certain that the government's experiment will succeed.

I have no doubt that it will be necessary to subsidize the service, as the government apparently envisages will be necessary. This, however, will be an economy in the long run in terms of public expenditure, because the degree of subsidization necessary to make this service successful will be very much less than the degree of public spending that will be required to build still more expressways and still more parking areas with the ultimate result of destroying the core of the city of Toronto.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the bill. I consider it a step in the right direction, even though overdue. I hope that now that the government has seen the light on this matter and has abandoned its previous one-sided policy, it will really get wholeheartedly behind this idea and make a special effort to persuade the people to use the service so that it will be successful and will accomplish the purpose which the government and the Legislature in general has in mind.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this bill has been long awaited by the people who reside in Metropolitan Toronto. I can recall that several years ago the leader of the Liberal Party

of that day, Mr. Wintermeyer, laying forth a plan of study that should be embarked upon and suggesting several actions that could and should be taken in regard to providing some sort of commuter service. The government moves slowly in these things, Mr. Speaker. It took a great deal of effort on behalf of the Opposition to shame and embarrass the Toronto members of the Cabinet—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: It is getting to them, Mr. Speaker, you can see that. I can remember the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) saying that we did not know how difficult it was being just one member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, the government moves very slowly. They set up this committee; the committee sat for some three years and then they discovered that there was a man named Donald Gordon around and he had something to do with railways. I suspect that Donald Gordon had a great deal to do with setting up the planning and organizing the method of procedure in it. I think he should receive some very substantial credit for this work that has gone on.

I think, however, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that these remarks of mine bring forth so many comments from my hon. friends over there. They are very sensitive this morning.

Mr. Speaker, close attention should be paid to the remarks of my friend, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. We should not have to get to the point where the government legislates only in time of crisis. We had the crisis that brought about the organization of Metropolitan Toronto; we had the transportation crisis that finally brought about the study programme, and then this bill. It seems to me that the only time this government moves is when the administrative system in any field you want to name seems to be on the verge of collapse.

There has not been the same sort of pressure, perhaps, or criticism addressed to the government from the rest of the area of Ontario, insofar as their very serious problems are concerned. There should really be, without the pressure that has to be brought forward, apparently, a series of studies going forward as to how to help all of the other municipalities.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Singer: And I do not think that the government should have to wait—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): It is being done.

Mr. Singer: I know. Everything is done in the fullness of time—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Right now these studies are being done.

Mr. Singer: I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister has interjected here, because when his colleague, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, in the introduction of his estimates, listed 10 to 12 municipalities in which studies were going to be undertaken, he admitted that perhaps only two or three could be done this year because there are not enough people available.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I did not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. Singer: I think if we refer to *Hansard*, I can get you the exact quotation.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I tell you this, if *Hansard* states that it is incorrect because that is not my contention at all.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself and my opinion is that the hon. Minister is still faltering.

To my mind, the government should be prepared, and should have been prepared for many years to say to the whole of Ontario that they are interested in problems of transportation, sewers and water, and financing. But it is only when the situation boils up into a crisis, when it becomes emergent, that finally we get some sort of action.

This is a good step. It is a good bill, but it is long overdue and I am glad that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions finally got his way in the Cabinet meeting and impressed his colleagues that this sort of action was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the note I want to sound this morning is this: Let the government get off its comfortable chairs and get into action to help all of the municipalities of the province of Ontario, in addition to Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of commendation on this significant step that has been taken in the field of commuter service. I would like to say, coming from an area where commuter service is of the utmost emergency and importance, that the Opposition has missed the point as to how the

government arrived at this step. Very often in this Legislature we have heard the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) stand up and ask that more research be done; that we have research projects in this field and in that field. This was what was done in this field. No one said: "I think we should have a commuter service line," or "perhaps it is needed." A committee was set up. This committee did not just meet and listen to briefs. This committee, living in this 20th century, took the scientific tools of research and found out if there was a need for a commuter service by public opinion testing in the various communities and areas, by working out the numbers and potential numbers of customers and so forth. By this research they figured out where a line should run, how it should be operated, and so forth, and I think that this is a significant thing.

This step is based upon sound research and that makes it an even more significant step.

I think we should pay tribute to Canadian National Railways for their co-operation. After this government had worked out the plan they agreed to co-operate, and I think this will make this a significant project. I am sure that when it becomes operative and we see how well it works, there will be a sound basis to extend it into other areas of Ontario where research proves that this is necessary and feasible.

I would hope—and I pay tribute to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) for his leadership in this matter because I know that he as chairman of the committee gave great leadership—that this committee, as it studies on, will not only consider other areas of Ontario, but also other areas of this metropolitan area, because this line still does not reach up into the Agincourt area where commuters' transportation has been a pressing problem for many years, and one which has prompted the establishment of committees for this purpose. But I still think that this is a milestone in this province and another act of a progressive government.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to argue today about who was responsible or not responsible for the action which has taken place. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is, I understand, responsible; that the gadfly of the Cabinet is responsible for this. This was established by the hon. member for Downsview, so we will leave it at that.

I am interested in what the hon. member for Scarborough North has just said, because I think fundamentally, when we are looking at a transportation problem and the develop-

ment of a transportation system, we are looking at the direction in which we want communities to develop.

Unfortunately, while it is true that this has been based upon research—and research is going forward in other communities—the fact is that that research likely came ten years too late. That is par for the Tory course.

The fact is that we ought to be looking forward right now and saying: "How do we want our communities to develop in this, the Golden Horseshoe area? Where do we want development to take place? Where do we want industry? Where do we want high-rise apartments? Where do we want single family homes? Where do we want green belt and park areas? Where do we want to preserve our river valleys?" When we make up our minds and lay down, as I have said before in this House, a comprehensive land use plan for at least this part of the province, then we know what transportation is going to be needed to see that those plans are carried forward; then we should be planning for transportation over the next ten, 15, 20 years.

I could give you as an illustration this one point. Within this bill there is provision for this corporation to enter into agreement with Metropolitan Toronto and other municipalities or individuals. In the west end of Metropolitan Toronto there is an exploding situation right now. The hump yard of Canadian National Railways was just opened a few days ago. York University is being built there, which will house 20,000 students before too long. An industrial area is developing along Highway 400. Housing units are going up there by the thousands right now. It is a fantastic, exploding residential situation. But there is no provision for rapid transit for all that complex as far as we can see at the moment. Metropolitan Toronto says it has not got the money. The Spadina expressway would be the natural spine for that kind of transportation, but the plans for this development are a long piece away. So it seems rational and reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that this bill should look forward to entering into an agreement with Metropolitan Toronto to speed up the development of rapid transit to serve that area, so that the new York University and the great industrial complex being developed there will develop with the right kind of housing. If we depend upon the kind of transportation that is there now we may find ourselves with single families and a limited number of apartments going up, whereas if we could say now we are going to have rapid transit lines up in this place over these next few years, and put a

timetable there, then the municipalities concerned can develop the kind of housing which will make the rapid transit a paying proposition.

If we wait and the pattern is established, then the rapid transit goes in and people become used to driving their motor cars. We spread our housing out in the urban sprawl, without concentrating it around the areas where the rapid transit stations might be, and then are faced with a very rapid deterioration of the present pattern and a redevelopment before that redevelopment should logically take place.

And so I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we should be thinking in these terms of planning our urban development around the kind of commuter transportation which this bill envisages, so it should not just be from Oakville almost to Oshawa, not quite. The hon. member who is just going to speak will not be able to use it without driving to it, and I suppose after the next election he will not need it anyway.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Do not worry about that.

Mr. Young: But in any case, that should not be envisaged as the complete pattern, and I hope it will not be. And I hope that as this pattern emerges, it will be a pattern not only for the railway commuter system, but a pattern which will tie in the kind of rapid transit that is needed north and south, as well as east and west; and then it will proceed to look into the Hamilton, the London, the Oshawa complexes, and others, so that in the future this can result in a thorough transport system for this province and for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to express my appreciation to the hon. member for Yorkview for his interest in the great city of Oshawa. I have noted during the past few weeks that he seems to be having a great interest in our city, but I can assure him that I am quite capable of looking after that area, either now or in the future.

Mr. Young: I was invited down there to speak.

Mr. Walker: Well, they do, to the hospital at Whitby, I notice.

I am not particularly concerned today, Mr. Speaker, on who is responsible for the introduction of the commuter service, but on behalf of a great many of the people that I represent, I would like to express appreciation

to the government for the job that is being done.

Immediately to the east of Metro Toronto, we find very large subdivisions, in West Rouge and Bay Ridges, with hundreds of people coming into the city of Toronto from that area every day. These areas might be referred to as dormitory areas for Metropolitan Toronto. I think a recent survey, which was carried out by the people themselves in the subdivision of Bay Ridges, showed that 97 per cent of all the workers in that tremendous area travelled completely outside the township of Pickering to go to work each day; and, of course, a very great many of them are coming to the city of Toronto. This new station, which will be located at Dunbarton, will be within a mile or two miles, possibly closer in some cases, of these very great subdivision areas.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we cannot always be satisfied with what goes on, as far as the government is concerned, and I do know that the commuter survey—when it was originally taken—encompassed the area of Oshawa. There has been some feeling since this area commuter service was announced, with the idea that it is stopping at the area of Dunbarton, as to why it was not extended further east to take in the tremendous city of Oshawa, in which there are also a great many people travelling to Toronto—either to work, or on business of various kinds—each day. I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister in his reply to some of the statements that have been made, would give some indication as to what the survey showed as far as the city of Oshawa is concerned, and possibly what the thinking of the government is as to why this commuter service was not extended as far east as the city of Oshawa.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, certainly I think the hon. member for Woodbine put the case for this very important piece of legislation on the record for all hon. members of the House.

It is certainly one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been brought in for a long time. And of course, I am one who thinks that when we are going to take this kind of an experiment, the government is right in taking it carefully. We must remember, as has been stated in the statement by the hon. Prime Minister in introducing this piece of legislation, that it would necessitate a great deal of understanding, because of the injection of public moneys to get the thing started.

When this kind of a programme is in its completed form in this province, a lot of

people will not have use of it, because of the type of business they are in and their environment, so we cannot spend a lot of public money in one area without a lot of care.

I think the second point the hon. member for Woodbine made that is highly important is the need for a real educational job in regard to transportation; getting people away from the habit of driving their cars to using public transportation. He also made the point that they will not get out of the habit of using their cars for every little trip, until governments of all levels provide the kind of transportation that will fit in with the ever-progressing need in the days of higher speeds.

I do not think there is any room for political jealousy in regard to this subject. I notice that in Hamilton, the same night this bill was introduced, the papers carried it and there were comments from one or two municipal politicians, particularly the ambitious mayor of Hamilton, His Worship Mayor Cops. Right away he was going to fight with the government to see that the project was expanded from Burlington to Hamilton. Well, I cannot agree with the mayor. I think the mayor of Hamilton would do better by bettering the transportation system in Hamilton; move it from its horse and buggy days into something that will be conducive with this kind of a programme.

If we were convinced that we should extend the experimental project from Burlington to Hamilton, you could never satisfy the people in Hamilton because of its geographical situation—sitting on the south of the harbour—and the very poor transportation system. I would give, for example, my position. Living in the east end of Hamilton, I am never going to get used to using a commuter service that starts from uptown Hamilton when I can drive to Toronto in a faster time than I can go up to the station and get on the train.

To make this kind of a programme conducive to the city of Hamilton, there would have to be a lot of changes and a new look at the transportation system in Hamilton; to find a central point to connect a rapid transit system from Hamilton to Toronto and then east. So I think it needs a lot of support, a lot of co-operative co-ordination with the municipalities if we are going to make this experiment effective. In the last word, a real educational job. But certainly in Hamilton, if we start from Burlington, I am sure it will be accepted and be of benefit to many of the Hamilton commuters inasmuch as they can cross the Skyway bridge and get their trans-

portation from Burlington. It will not be very much help to the people in the west end of Hamilton unless the transportation system is improved in the city of Hamilton to reach a central point.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part in this debate and I would like to go back to the day that it came about; when the hon. Prime Minister stood in this House and made the statement to the hon. members here, who apparently this morning are all happy. I have not heard a dissenting vote as yet.

Now to put this into perspective as I see it, I might read just a small portion of the statement of the hon. Prime Minister:

There is, of course, a very distinct possibility that the expenditure of funds in establishing these acceptable rail commuter services where they are possible will result in considerable savings on highways and highway construction, and this in turn can bring about a more extensive use of transportation funds saved here to be used in other parts of the province.

Now, if you are going to build this elaborate and very good system between Toronto, and east and west of us, and save money also, and then take that money and spend it in other parts of the province—how can anyone object?

I can think, Mr. Speaker, of a good place to start this programme of theirs when they save this money, it would be so easy to distribute. Toronto gets, for their Gardiner expressway, I understand, 50 cents on each dollar that they have spent on that particular unit. Other cities in the province of Ontario get only 33⅓ per cent. So the government does not have to do anything more than adjust that figure to the 50 per cent for other cities. This would be treating other parts of the province—

Mr. Bryden: Only Metro Toronto can get that!

Mr. Bukator: Only Metro Toronto? Well, then, they could extend it to other portions of the province also, or wherever it happens to be; but I am thinking naturally of the area from which I come.

I am going to go along with the hon. Minister because he too boasted of this diversion from their way of doing business on highways and going into the railroad business. I think when the time comes that they get to Burlington they can continue that track right down to the city of Niagara Falls and we would be happy to welcome them there. We always do that.

I believe in the first instance, if they are going to save money and are going to treat the rest of the province right, according to what the hon. Prime Minister himself said, that the first thing they should do is give other cities the 50 per cent, the same as Metro Toronto.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to what has been said with regard to this bill which brings about a commuter system of transportation in the city of Toronto. I welcome it and I congratulate the hon. Minister for the leadership he has given.

I think it is very good that there has been a co-operative feeling set up between the Canadian National and the government. I think possibly the hon. Minister should go a little further and use his influence in having CNR and CPR maintain a reasonable service on some of their branch lines.

This affects all parts of Ontario. There is a tendency to cut off branch lines. Somebody said they are trying to cut off the routes and have the whole system die, which is what happens to a plant.

However, I do think that a little pressure put on by our government might influence the railroads a bit to maintain this service to which I think every part of the country is entitled. After all, the railways were given their charter—the Canadian Pacific brought about Confederation—to give a service to all parts of Canada. I think we are entitled to this service. If the CNR is \$60,000,000 in the red, well, pay part of those taxes toward this. We are all entitled to a reasonable service with the branch lines.

Now, this is about transportation. I have a few other thoughts that are not necessarily in connection with this bill but I would like just to bring them up at this time.

In connection with using pressure from our government on the railways to keep an adequate service on each line, I would just like to point out that in some of these branch lines now they run a Sunday night service down and then there is no service until Tuesday morning. Then when there is a holiday in the week there is no train at all on the Sunday, it is on the Monday night. That means there is no train going north from Saturday night until the Tuesday night. Now, if that is giving service, it seems the railways want only the cream.

These branch lines all paid money years ago. Through some of their inadequate operations and improper management they have lost this revenue; now they want to cut these

branch line trains off to carry passengers because they say it does not pay.

First they lost the mail; then they lost a big part of the express; and now they are putting down the cost of operation to just carrying the passengers. I maintain that they cannot have just the cream, they have to take a bit of the skim milk, too. It is only reasonable to expect them to.

In connection with transportation, I quite agree with what the hon. member for Niagara Falls said with regard to subsidies on roads and cities and separated municipalities. I think it is perfectly right. In fact I would go further than that. I think in all these municipalities, separated towns and cities, the highways through there, which are provincial highways, should be taken over lock, stock and barrel.

In connection with traffic on our highways: We have seen the large expansion in trucks, which by the way are too large, I would point out to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). They are like travelling box cars on our highways. It is my humble opinion that cement, steel and heavy merchandise should be on the rails which were built to carry them, not our highways.

Another thing is the speed of trucks on our highways. How often do we drive on our highways and who is the first man to pass you? A truck doing 70 miles an hour.

Then what about inflammables? We read last year about the accident at Aylmer, we read about one at Chatham not too many months ago; these things happen. Explosives should not be on our highways, they should be carried adequately protected in their proper kind of equipment on our rails.

These are just a few thoughts which occurred to me having to do with transportation, although not particularly with this bill. But I do think they are worthy of some thought by the government.

I also was one who believed that this study should have gone a bit further. I believe the day when it was first introduced I suggested that it should take in Guelph and Stratford; Kitchener would be all right, too. I would hope in the future that this will be taken into account and possibly the study extended that way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I do not have very many comments to make. The debate this morning has spoken rather well for itself, I do believe. I would like to make one observation with respect to the words of wisdom imparted, shall we say, by the hon. member

for Woodbine. I thought they were highly commendatory and sensible, even to the extent that I suggest he has probably been reading our mail, because most of the things he proposed are already well underway and fairly thoroughly attended to. But he did provide one nice little theme, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to repeat. He said "slowly and surely," and in this I could not agree more.

Mr. Bryden: I said I hope surely.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It may appear to be slowly, but I will guarantee to you, Mr. Speaker, and guarantee to the House, that it will be surely.

Mr. Bryden: Not too slowly!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think that characterizes the difference between the way the government of the day and the government of the last 20 years does things, rather than some of the suggestions and proposals that are passed to us from time to time. We do propose to do things surely and this involves a little time. That is the way it is going to be done. No 60 days of decision here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bryden: No decision, that is the trouble.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister cannot make up his mind.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, now, Mr. Speaker, to proceed a little further, I think I will just resort to a comment that has been made by the hon. Prime Minister from time to time. I am going to repeat it again. For heaven's sake look around. Take a look at our own province. Just look around, that is all.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That comment got the approval of the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it is a good comment anyway. It is a good comment whoever made it. I think it was the hon. Prime Minister and he makes nothing but sensible comments.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is beginning to believe in his own comments now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, all right. Now for the information of the hon. member for Oshawa, I simply repeat what has been said a number of times. The study area undertaken by the region transportation study

was defined as bounded by Oshawa, Hamilton and Barrie for study purposes.

The reason that the proposed experimental commuter service facilities are not going into Oshawa are simply technical. There is not the trackage or the track capacity east of Dunbarton to undertake an efficient operation. I would say next, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member, that the same applies in Hamilton, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Wentworth East. It would require there the construction of some 20 miles of new track facilities to extend a similar service into Hamilton. Most people are aware of the geography of Hamilton. Trains now have to back in or out, and it simply does not lend itself to this type of operation, nor is it necessary for the purpose of the experiment that is to be undertaken. The experiment can be undertaken satisfactorily and well in the 52 miles in the corridor that has been defined to the House, for all practical purposes. Of course, the matter of education that was referred to by the hon. member for Woodbine is important; there is no question about this. We propose to have a programme of education. I do not know how to describe it. We certainly propose to inform the public as to the extent we will develop the greater use and the greater patronage of this experimental service. But the educational feature goes further than that. Of course, from the experimental undertaking, we also will learn very much. It is from a combination of this, then, that I think we will, at the conclusion of the experimental period, know what requires to be done in terms of final implementation of a service that will meet the needs of the people.

We think this is sensible in character, and it is the way we propose to proceed. To conclude my brief observations, I think it would be of interest to you, Mr. Speaker, and certainly of interest to the hon. members of the House, to tell them that the commuter service alone is only one phase. The study is continuing. The work of the Metropolitan Toronto region transportation study is continuing in a very broad and thoroughgoing manner and it is the further nature of study that will provide some of the answers to questions raised by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, and others, who sensibly look at the whole broad problem of transportation, not only in this region, but in the province. It is from the continuing nature of the study that I am convinced that some of the answers will come forward and be considered, developed and acted upon in the same solid, sensible manner in which this particular effort has been pursued, and

which, I am happy to say, has been so widely accepted and even acclaimed.

For the information of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and the House, I would tell you that the study itself proposes, in late summer or early autumn, to undertake a series of meetings—hearings, I guess, would be a better word—throughout the entire study area. Letters will be going out this weekend from myself to all representatives in the study area—heads of municipalities, heads of planning boards. In other words, the broad cross-section of people who are bound to have a sensible interest in transportation. The meetings will be advertised and notices will be printed in the area media, at which time we hope to receive briefs from these people and take their advice and direction as part of our overall study process.

Mr. Bryden: When will there be another report?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There should be another one early in 1966. I think that is what I said to the House not too many weeks ago; if I remember correctly, we anticipate another report on a continuing phase or phases of the study in 1966. Presently, I tell the House, we are shooting at a target date of January 1, 1967, for completion. That may be difficult or impossible of attainment, but we have set this target date, Mr. Speaker. So we are trying to move this thing along, trying to develop it and indicate to the people of the province—not only the Toronto area—what this matter of transportation involves.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 148, An Act to amend The University of Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill

THE YORK UNIVERSITY ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 149, The York University Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill No. 150, An Act respecting Lakehead University.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before passing this bill, I would like to make a few remarks.

Mr. Singer: You are opposed to it, are you?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am a little embarrassed this morning to again congratulate this government with a worthy tribute on establishing this great institution of learning as a university, known in the future as the Lakehead University—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): That kind of embarrassment is easy to take.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: —in addition to all the praises that have been heaped on it this morning by the Opposition.

This Act, respecting the Lakehead University, is the culmination of a great many years of work and help from this government, because first it was the Lakehead college of arts, science and technology. Now it is Lakehead University, located on a beautiful 300-acre campus, between the cities of Fort William and Port Arthur. It is housed, Mr. Speaker, in over \$3 million worth of modern buildings overlooking Lake Superior. A library, which was estimated to cost \$1,400,000, is currently under construction, scheduled for completion before the end of the year. I had the opportunity of being present the day before yesterday—May 26th—when the plaque was unveiled by the Governor-General of Canada, His Excellency the Rt. Hon. George P. Vanier and a large crowd attended that ceremony. It certainly has added to the prestige of the Lakehead.

Extended facilities in science and technology are next on the expansion programme. Senator N. M. Patterson, LL.D., KG, prominent Fort William businessman and philanthropist, was installed as the first chancellor at the convocation on May 6. He granted degrees—that is, BA's and BSc's—to some 50 graduates in the university division, and some 40 diplomas to graduates in the technology division.

Dr. Claude Bissell, president of the University of Toronto, brought greetings on behalf of the Ontario university and addressed the graduates. At the same time, **Mr. W. G. Tamblyn**, chairman of the board of governors, was installed as the first president. Mr. Tamblyn has been an extremely active member of the board, and has played a leading role in the development of the university. He brings with him broad experience in business, industry and community affairs.

The early history of this institute of learning, Mr. Speaker, is very important. Lakehead college was first established as the Lakehead technical institute in 1948, under the principalship of Dr. M. W. Barclay. It was housed in an old army hut, brought from British Columbia on a flat car and re-assembled on a vacant lot in downtown Port Arthur. The roof consisted of two long V's joined at the bottom. Each spring, ice stands formed and the roof leaked in dozens of places. The problem was solved by drilling holes in the floor and letting the water run down into the basement. During the winter time, the thermostat consisted of a pipe wrench used to control the radiator inlet valves; it was stored in the principal's office.

In 1952, Dr. Harold S. Braun, CD, BA, LL.B., was appointed principal when Dr. Barclay retired to private practice as a consulting geologist. He still holds that office today. Under his leadership, the Lakehead technical institute, as it was then known, had less than 100 full-time students. It has developed into a degree-granting institution serving over 1,000 students.

In the 1950s a committee was formed to raise funds toward the establishment of a college in permanent quarters. After some initial difficulties arising out of inter-city rivalry, to avoid prejudice the first meeting was held in a field on the boundary between Fort William and Port Arthur. The present site was then selected and the city of Port Arthur donated 80 acres of land and the committee raised \$175,000 as the nucleus for the first building fund.

The first building was formally opened by the Hon. W. J. Dunlop, Minister of Education in 1957. Classes were already under way. Grants from the province of Ontario, the Canada Council, the municipalities of Fort William and Port Arthur, as well as generous contributions by local corporations and individuals, provided funds for additional construction. A temporary library was added in 1960, additional lecture rooms and laboratories in 1961 and a men's residence in 1962.

A second building fund campaign was launched in 1963 and over \$800,000 was raised. A university centre building was completed in 1963 and additional land for future expansion was purchased.

The temporary library is now filled to overflowing with 40,000 volumes, and the new library, costing \$1,400,000, will be completed before the end of the year. That was the one that the Governor General unveiled the plaque on last Wednesday.

In the next five years over \$5 million of

additional building will be required to provide the facilities for necessary expansion.

The Lakehead University serves a vast area of northwestern Ontario with a population of nearly 300,000 people. The nearest Canadian universities are the University of Manitoba, 400 miles west, and Laurentian University, 600 miles east.

It is unique, Mr. Speaker, in that it combines a university programme and a technology programme which is similar to Ryerson. The classes are separate, but students use the same library, laboratory, lecture room, residence and cafeteria facilities.

Some faculty members lecture only in the university division or the technology division, while others have responsibilities in both. This efficient use of faculty and facilities has made it possible to provide a much broader and more intensive programme than would otherwise have been possible. The technology programme will continue to play an important role in Lakehead University.

Up until 1960 the college offered only the first year, post-grade 13 courses, in the university division. Students received credit for this year when they went on to complete their degree at various Canadian universities. Hundreds of students took advantage of this opportunity and they gave a good account of themselves wherever they went.

This liaison with other universities played a very important role in helping to establish the high standards that have been maintained.

Second year arts courses were added in 1960 and 1961 and additional expansion has taken place in succeeding years, culminating in the granting of its first degrees in 1965.

Lakehead University, sir, has a large extension programme. Over 500 students—the majority are elementary school teachers—are currently taking university credit courses for a BA degree. Members of the regular faculty travel each week to Kenora, Dryden and Atikokan to the west, and to Nipigon and Geraldton to the east, a radius of 500 miles, to give lectures and to conduct seminars.

Lakehead residents take courses from 4:30 to 6 p.m. in the evenings. Over 100 student nurses from the three Lakehead hospitals take special courses at the college. Further expansion is being planned in this field.

Our summer school has been in operation for several years. Over 300 registrations are anticipated in the coming session.

The forestry technology programme attracts the largest number of students in the technology division. Over 60 students are currently registered in this two-year diploma course and it is encouraging to note, Mr. Speaker,

that all of them have already obtained employment for the coming summer, a good indication of how well the course is received by industry and the government services. Students come from all over Ontario and from other provinces as well.

Diploma courses in engineering and technology and in business administration are also well-established and expanding rapidly.

For the future the Lakehead University has 1,100 students in the current session; 465 full time and the remainder part time. Enrollment has doubled since 1962 and is expected to double again in the next two years. It should reach 1,500 students by 1970 and 2,500 by 1975. Almost all of the university division students are in the three-year general courses.

A limited number of honours courses are available and immediate expansion is anticipated in this field. The addition of master's degrees in some fields should follow.

The forest technology programme has been established on a sound basis and the addition of a degree programme in forestry should follow soon. Other developments include a degree in nursing science and in commerce, as well as further expansion in applied science.

Lakehead University has already established a reputation for sound scholarship and no effort has been spared to attract faculty of the highest calibre. It is now ready, Mr. Speaker, to expand rapidly to take its place among the universities of this province. It has been built with the confidence and support of this government, industries and individuals to serve primarily the young people in the vast area of northwestern Ontario. This confidence will be repaid a hundredfold in the years ahead through the contributions that the Lakehead University graduates will make, not only to this area but to all of Canada.

I want, on behalf of the people of the Lakehead area and northwestern Ontario, to thank the hon. Minister and thank this government and this House for this very important installation of a university in our area. I am sure that they will receive during the years the great gratitude of all our people in that area. I see the hon. leader of the NDP Party (Mr. MacDonald) smiling. I am sure that his colleague, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman) would join me fully in these remarks that you have allowed me to give this morning.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to inform the hon. Minister of Mines for the one thousand

and first time that it is not the NDP party, the "P" is redundant.

Mr. Singer: The whole party is redundant.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there are just two comments that I would like to make. One, that I welcome this bill; not that it really alters the situation greatly at the Lakehead, I think it is really a change in name more than anything else. It did give the hon. Minister of Mines an opportunity to ooze his confidence in the fashion that he is so capable of.

I rise, however, because I have in the past in this House expressed, because it was my conviction, that this was the one institution of higher learning with which I was a little concerned as to the slow start that it had made—that it did not seem to be getting the necessary degree of support. It perhaps lacked the kind of base and ancillary factors in the community that, for example, Carleton did when it started in a building—not quite as primitive as the one that the hon. Minister of Mines described this morning, I do not think they punched holes in the floor to let the rain run through when it had come through the roof—but it was a pretty old building that was bulging at the seams for a while.

But Ottawa had, if I may make my point this way, other factors in terms of people on whom they could draw, senior civil servants and others, to help to build an institution of higher learning.

I do not say this at all disparagingly, I think it has been more difficult to build an institution out in the hinterland of the province. I rise particularly to say that I think that there is growing evidence that, if there was a slow start—and perhaps I was wrong—but if there was a slow start, it is now moving and that it is establishing itself as a genuine institution with the kind of standards that we would like to have in an institution of higher learning in this province.

My second point is rather a brief and somewhat irrelevant one, but I think the hon. Minister in introducing the bill said that he wanted to get this bill through so that the first graduates could be graduated as graduates of Lakehead University. This is one little technicality: I think they graduated a month ago, as the graduates of Lakehead University. They sort of beat the gun.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Always ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I would not put it that way. Technically this had been done

in an illegal fashion because this Lakehead University has not as yet been authorized in the House. It raises the question of why the bill could not have been in some months ago and all been done according to Hoyle.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, at the committee stage we can make a small amendment to legitimize the position of the graduates.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, if there is any point going to be made of it, let us do so.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF ONTARIO ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves second reading of Bill No. 151, An Act to amend The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves second reading of Bill No. 157, The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it necessary to deal at length with the second reading of this bill. It is essentially a rehash, with minor improvements, of a bill that was debated at considerable length in this House a year or two ago, and that bill in turn was a rehash of part of an earlier bill which was also the subject of considerable debate.

I believe, however, that some comments are in order. The government has stated in its introductory note that the bill is a revision of The Pension Benefits Act in the light of experience gained in the operation of that Act since August, 1963; furthermore, that there is now a provision contained in the Act to, shall we say, enter into reciprocal arrangements with other provinces so that legislation of this type may become applicable on a more or less uniform basis all across the country.

I am in favour of the principle of uniformity in this field. There is no question that if we are talking about portable pensions—and that is what we are talking about here—it is desirable that they should be portable across the country. I am certainly in favour of the principle of public regulation of private pension plans, both to ensure portability and also to ensure solvency. Such regulation has been

lacking in the past, very much to the detriment of some people who thought they were covered by pension plans and would get some benefit out of them.

Even though we are now moving forward, as I believe is right, to a great extension of public activity in the pension field, the fact remains that there will continue to be private plans which will undertake to supplement the pension benefits available in public plans; and it is desirable that the benefits in those private plans should be portable. The problem, however, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill does not really establish any significant degree of portability. In this respect, of course, it follows the pattern of its predecessors, which also failed to establish any significant degree of portability. Even though it is desirable to have uniformity of legislation in this field, if possible all across the country, I do not think uniformity that accomplishes very little has much to be said for it.

If we can get uniformity across the country only on the basis of the lowest common denominator, which this bill represents, then I would say: let us forget about uniformity and go ahead to achieve real portability at least in Ontario. Essentially what the bill provides is what the previous legislation provided and we have had two different Acts on this subject in the past half dozen years; that pensions under private plans will be portable where an employee has worked for the same employer for 10 years and has reached the age of 45. Now, I realize that this bill makes one minor change in those two conditions. It provides that the 10 years will apply either to his period of service with the employer or to a period under the same plan. The purpose of this, as I understand, is to ensure that the benefits will be portable if an employee works for the same company in different provinces. In other words, if he works for a couple of years for a certain company in this province then goes to another province for a few years—where he is still covered by their pension plan—and then comes back to Ontario, there will be no question that his 10 years under that plan will qualify him for such benefits as the Act provides.

But how much portability does this involve, Mr. Speaker? Many employees will go through most of their working lives and will really have very little in the way of the pension benefits vested in them under various plans under which they may serve. Take a man who starts employment at the age of 21—and that is not an unusual age for starting employment. He could work 15 years

for a certain company under a certain pension plan, but if he left, it would then mean he would get no benefits as far as this legislation is concerned. He would get benefits only if the plan in itself provided for them; because even though he had worked more than ten years with the company, he would still not have reached the age of 45. And then suppose he went to another company and worked nearly nine years—leaving at the age of 44. He would still get no benefits. He would have put in 23 years of employment and the legislation would have done him no good at all.

Then he may start at age 45 with another company and, perhaps at this point—since when one reaches that advanced age one's opportunities for employment decline, he may stick with the employer, if he can, for the rest of his working life. Of course he may also be laid off, because employers have great tendencies to get rid of some of their older workers. Sometimes, of course, they reorganize; they change their places of employment; and so on. He may or may not get in the ten years required that would qualify him for some benefit under this Act.

But even if he does, the pension contributions made on his behalf over his working life would be vested only to a very limited degree. He might get the benefit of 10 or 15 years of pension contributions over the whole 45 years of his working life.

I am suggesting to the government, as I have suggested before, that contributions made into a pension plan by an employer on behalf of an employee, are in fact a form of deferred wages. They should be vested in the employee in full from the day they are first made. I do not agree that an employer should be allowed, after making contributions for many years in the name of an employee, to deprive him of the benefit of these contributions when he leaves. That is possible under this Act. In fact, I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, that it will be the normal situation, unless we want to really freeze people to their jobs. Surely that is the last thing in the world we want to do. The whole purpose of providing for portability of pensions is to prevent employees being frozen to their jobs by pension plans. In this day and age it is most undesirable in the economic interests of the country to restrict mobility of labour in this way. I noticed on the financial page of the paper this morning a speech by Dr. Deutsch once again emphasizing the importance of encouraging mobility of labour, and pointing out the failure of public policy in this direction in Canada until now.

The Act that we now have before us is supposed to introduce a small degree of mobility, but it is so slight as to be pretty close to useless, Mr. Speaker. This bill, and the legislation that preceded it, is a nice piece of window dressing; it makes it possible for the government, at election time and at other times, to make fine speeches to the effect that we in Ontario have pioneered in the field of portability of pensions and we now have legislation that makes pensions portable. Well, it does not do any such thing. It will provide for a limited degree of portability for a limited number of employees—for those who continue to work for the same employers for long periods of time.

I do not wish to suggest that such employees should not be fully protected, but I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it is most important, both as a matter of justice to the employed people concerned and in the economic interests of the country, to provide for genuine portability of pension plans.

Genuine portability means that contributions will be vested and locked in from the day they are made. Now if the hon. Prime Minister wants to make certain exceptions with regard to employee contributions and allow them to be withdrawn in whole or in part under certain circumstances, I would not argue with him. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the employer contributions should definitely be vested.

As I said, these are a substitute for wages. People accept lower wages in order to get a pension plan, yet if they leave the employment of their employer, they do not get any benefit. In my opinion, it is a high-class form of cheating. Employees have been promised certain benefits that they do not get. The money is used by the employer to reduce his total obligations under the pension plan, since he can then use contributions he made on behalf of employee A, who has now left, to provide agreed benefits to employees C, D, E, and F. I do not think that is reasonable. I think the contributions paid on behalf of employee A should accrue exclusively to the benefit of employee A.

I realize that this will mean that employer contributions will have to be somewhat higher than they have been in the past. They will not have to be higher in form, Mr. Speaker; they will just have to be in the amount that the employer claims to be making. In the case of a pension plan in which the employer ostensibly pays half the cost and the employees half; in fact the employer pays considerably less than half the cost, because he gets the benefit of the

contributions made on behalf of employees who have left his employ.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that in relation to a statement—I think it was the hon. Prime Minister who made it, on first reading of this bill that provisions now being made under income tax legislation in the United States to provide for a certain degree of vesting of pensions demonstrate that our great pioneering idea, as he no doubt called it, is being copied in other countries. I would point out to him that it means no such thing. I think the government of Canada has for at least 20 years provided under its income tax regulations for a certain degree of vesting of pension benefits. The degree was even less than is provided in this bill, so I can welcome the bill as at least a minor and hesitant step forward—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That federal legislation has never been enforced.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it used to be. I confess that I am not familiar with the details; it is rather a complicated and technical matter. I believe a question arose a few years ago as to its constitutional validity. The federal government backed away from it because it was not really convinced as to its validity. But for a good many years before that it had been enforced; indeed, it had resulted in a limited degree of vesting being provided in private pension plans. This bill picks up from where the federal regulations left off and improves the vesting slightly. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, not nearly enough. Not sufficient to provide for genuine—

Mr. MacDonald: That is a good definition of Tory pioneering, to pick up on something that was dropped 20 years ago.

Mr. White: You are missing the whole point. The federal legislation was inoperative.

Mr. Bryden: For a long period of time, Mr. Speaker, it was not inoperative.

Mr. White: I think it was never enforced.

Mr. Bryden: Well, whether or not it was rigidly enforced, many companies adjusted their plans to comply with it, so it was a pretty fair bluff carried out by a few officials in The Department of National Revenue. They may have been acting without authority, but they did get away with the bluff.

At any rate, the concept of using income tax regulations as a means of ensuring some portability in pension plans is not an idea that came from this bill. It is an idea that

came from federal regulations that were put into effect about 1945, or somewhere in that neighbourhood.

One last point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is this. I regret that in revising this legislation the government continues to take the position that employees covered by pension plans are not entitled to know what is happening in the administration of these plans. This is a matter that we have raised with the government in the past also. Of course, we have run up against the basic government philosophy that an employee really should be happy, grateful to his employer and should not be expected to know how even his own money is being managed. Most pension plans contain employer contributions and employee contributions. Under this legislation, neither an employee nor his duly qualified representative has any way of finding out even how his own money is being administered. It is my submission that all the money is really his own money—both the employer contribution and the employee contribution—but there is no question in the world that at least the contributions that he himself makes out of his own income are his own money. Surely there should be some procedure whereby, either directly or through an agent, he can find out what is happening to his money and how the plan is being administered. I know that the employers would squawk to high heaven if it was suggested that employees or their representatives could be able to go down to the pension commission at reasonable times and find out what is happening under their plan. The employers would object because a great many of them are not doing what they claim to be doing at all. They are not making anything like the contributions they claim to be making. They are getting the benefit of the contributions that are not vested in employees; they are also getting the benefit of rebates that insurance companies may be making. The employees cannot find out anything about these things.

I submit to the government that people have a right to know how their money is being administered; they have a right to find out. The government made a proper step forward when it provided for public regulation and scrutiny of the plans to ensure that there was no outright crookedness going on, as happened in some cases in the past, but the employees should not have to rely on the good-will of the employer or of a government agency to find out what is happening to their own money. The employers can find out what is going on in the plans; they know in any case, but why not the employees? Why

should they not be advised or be able to find out how these plans are being administered?

This is a matter that we can discuss further, Mr. Speaker, in committee of the whole House, but I raise it in a preliminary way now because I think it is time the government abandoned its antiquated master-and-servant approach to employee rights in this vitally important field.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, just before the vote is put, there are a couple of comments I would like to make.

In the first place, I do not think the government advances this bill, nor advanced the original bill, with the idea that this was, as we have had to say in other legislation, the end and be all of what might be done. On the other hand, I would point out, as I did on first reading, that there are some 4,359 pension plans which have been affected by this legislation by bringing to those plans a better protection to the employees. There are some 553,000 members of these plans in Ontario who are affected and who benefit by the Act and for the period of time in which it has already been in effect.

I would not want the hon. member for Woodbine to leave, as he is obviously attempting to do, the impression that this plan is no good and does not affect a very large number of people.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting no such thing. I think I made it perfectly clear that this bill provides minor benefits, but I am suggesting that they are far less than adequate.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: All right, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing I would like to mention about the bill is that we are attempting through this legislation to extend into the other provinces what we have done in Ontario. I think all hon. members in this House are aware this is not an easy task. It is not easy to get agreement between the provinces of Canada operating independently. It is not easy always to get agreement with the federal government, but I think we have come a long way in the three or four years we have been working on this problem. I am hopeful that the province of Quebec will pass legislation parallel to this bill. That legislation will not, of course, be exactly the same, because there are different civil codes and different laws under which they operate. But nonetheless, I have been in communication with the government of Quebec and

they are interested in what we are doing here because their intent is to do the same thing.

Here we will have achieved at least some degree of portability between the two major industrial provinces of Canada. In my view, while it may be an easy thing to stand up and say it is not enough—I would agree it is not enough—but I must make the point, and make it very firmly, that it is a beginning, and it is a beginning that would not have been accomplished had we not taken the initiative.

Mr. Bryden: The government made a beginning four years ago.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, perhaps if it takes even eight years, at least if we accomplish it we will have done what we set out to accomplish. I point this out because I think we are making a major step forward.

I am not in a position to inform the House as to what the attitude of the other provinces of Canada will be, other than to say that they have sent representatives to two conferences we have sponsored. As far as we can ascertain from the discussions and the results of those conferences, the other provinces of Canada are at least considering passing similar legislation so that we will be able to achieve uniformity in this field right across the country.

Then I would simply say—and there will be, of course, various particulars to which hon. members want some answers and which will be discussed when we are in committee stage—but I would only say that in the overall picture I think we are laying a base here upon which will be built the improvement of pension benefits for the workers of this province long after those of us who are here today are gone forever from this chamber. I am satisfied that we have a firm foundation here.

I am not satisfied with what it has achieved to date in the sense that this is the final disposition, but, after all, we have required registration under this legislation of some 8,100 separate pension plans. This, in itself, from a straight technical point of view in just handling these plans, is a very large task indeed. The majority of them have had to be changed; they have been negotiated in various ways, with different companies, under different circumstances. To do this is quite an achievement in the time that this bill has been in effect.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH ACT, 1964

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 152, An Act to amend The University of Guelph Act, 1964.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The twentieth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (continued)

On vote 102:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments and suggestions to the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart) under this vote, item 8, grants under The Community Centres Act.

Several years ago we had quite a discussion on the government's lack of appreciation of physical fitness. Under this vote the government have prided themselves in emphasizing and stressing that they were doing something in relation to fitness. Under The Community Centres Act the government pays, I understand, 25 per cent of the cost on approved construction projects with a maximum of \$10,000.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): It is \$5,000.

Mr. Newman: It is \$5,000? With today's cost of construction, \$5,000 does not seem to be a sufficiently large amount. Would the hon. Minister consider increasing that amount from \$5,000 so that communities could take more advantage of this in constructing substantial projects for the promotion of physical fitness?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I suppose one could always say that this is something that could be done. I would point out, however, that the grant as it pertains now, as he says, applies to 25 per cent of the capital cost up to a maximum cost of \$5,000 for any community centre projects.

There are four types of projects that qualify. First of all, a community hall, a skating rink, a swimming pool and an athletic field. So this means \$20,000 to a community centre project in any given community. Of course that applies to as many projects as the community feels that they want to have with-

in that municipality. There are a good many that have several.

I would feel that this is an excellent aid towards these projects, but I would point out to my hon. friend that there is always the possibility, indeed it has already occurred in some instances, where even the amount of grant that has been made available has induced the construction of community centres where the enthusiasm for the project in the initial stage of construction has soon lost its emphasis and, in effect, they have become something less than what they were originally intended to be in that community. I think we have to be careful, as guardians of the public Treasury—and that certainly applies to my hon. friends in the Opposition as well—that grants towards these projects are not made so high that they induce the spending of money with a burst of enthusiasm to accomplish a purpose, the interest in which soon wanes. I think we must be very conscious of this, because this has happened in some communities already.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the hon. Minister's concern with that, but more than likely the community that started the project looked at the possibility of receiving the 25 per cent of the proved construction costs, but did not look at the fact that there was a maximum of \$5,000. In Ontario, what can you build for \$5,000? It does not even come close to providing any type of project.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments to make under this vote, stemming from a rather personal experience that I have had. The municipality of Wingham has been attempting to build a swimming pool, and they investigated the possibility of getting grants under this particular Act. They intend to build an outdoor swimming pool, and I am told by those who are familiar with the Act that it specifically states that grants are provided for indoor pools; but it does not mention outdoor pools. The interpretation is that grants can be given for indoor pools, but not for outdoor pools. I would urge the hon. Minister to do a little housekeeping, and include outdoor pools in the Act as well.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say this is a bit of a shock to me, because I know of some outdoor pools that have qualified for grants under this Act. I cannot understand why the hon. member would be told that his particular project would not qualify. My adviser tells me that indoor pools do not qualify for schools. This is the clause in the Act. But

outdoor pools, providing they are in community centres, do qualify for grants.

Mr. Gaunt: Then it is my understanding that as long as the swimming pool is in a community centre, is part of a community centre, whether it be indoor or outdoor, it qualifies. Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes; that is right. The community centre, whether it is an indoor or an outdoor pool, does qualify. But an indoor pool in connection with a school does not qualify because there are grants otherwise available.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, if I might pursue this just for a moment. In this particular case the municipality was thinking about building the pool at the same time that the new school was going to be built, but it was going to be built on the property of the municipality and, therefore, it did not come under the grant system for The Department of Education. The municipality was actually going to build the swimming pool. The swimming pool was going to be built by the municipality of Wingham, and the intention was that in the summer time and during the weekends and so on, the swimming pool could be used by the community at large. During the school months it could be used by the pupils in the school. This was the original intention.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It sounds like a very logical suggestion, Mr. Chairman. I see no reason why it should not qualify for a grant, because from what the hon. member has said it is indeed a community centre project. If it is administered by a community centre board, built on property owned by the municipality and divorced completely from the operation of the school board, and not qualifying for grants under The Department of Education Act, I can see no reason why this should not qualify. If my hon. friend would like, I would be very happy to work with him through the department and try to get the matter straightened out.

Vote 102 agreed to.

On vote 103:

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under vote 103, item 4, projects costs, I believe the hon. Minister, in his estimates last year, set aside \$924,000. In his opening remarks he mentioned ARDA. I would like to ask the hon. Minister where this money is being spent, what projects of ARDA are being carried out, and where in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes; the \$924,000 projects were set aside. First of all, \$200,000 was spent on community pastures; alternate uses of land, \$126,000; soil and water conservation, \$440,000; rural development, \$60,000; and research, \$98,000; making a total of \$924,000.

Mr. Spence: May I ask the hon. Minister where these community pastures are being developed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think I know where most of them are, offhand. Victoria county, Timiskaming, Leeds county and Manitoulin Island are the pastures that are in operation now.

Mr. Spence: They are operating now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Spence: These community pastures are operating now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon Minister could give us any indication as to the plans for what appears to be a fairly extensive ARDA project in the making in eastern Ontario. He may recall the series of articles that were carried by the *Globe and Mail* about preliminary surveys and studies. Is there a major project involving what would appear to me from those studies to be some necessary research and drawing in of the community, and the people in the community, to enlist their participation and their support? What is the status of that emerging project?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to deal with this matter. The matter of the 11 counties of eastern Ontario have been under active consideration ever since ARDA was first discussed and started in our department. A series of meetings has been held throughout eastern Ontario with the local municipal people and with the local ARDA committees that have been set up. As recently as May 28 we had the last meeting of our ARDA directorate in Kemptville with the people involved. There were 95 people in attendance, representing all 11 counties in eastern Ontario. There is a comprehensive rural development programme being planned that will envelop the 11 county area, designating it as a rural development area and implementing certain plans that are now in the discussion stage. There are some projects that are already under way down there—the Leeds county pasture I mentioned is one of

them—and there are certain projects in Renfrew county that are already under way.

The major projects are being finalized now, and I would say that within the next few months some very real development could take place there, based on redevelopments of land drainage projects on the South Nation River, that has been such a problem for so long. These I think will lend themselves to the redevelopment and rehabilitation of a good deal of the area.

I think we must recognize the fact so well said by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Gomme) when he spoke in the Budget debate a few weeks ago. Relating his remarks to ARDA in eastern Ontario, some of the newspaper story seemed to me to be a little overdone in some respects. I do not for a minute suggest that there are not cases there where there is a real problem, but I would point out an illustration used there of a picture of a set of farm buildings that were in a deplorable state. That farm was owned by a man who had no use for those buildings whatever; they bore no relationship to the value of that farm as far as the operator was concerned, yet that picture was used as an illustration of the deplorable state of agriculture in that area—and it had no more relationship to the owner of that farm than fly.

This is something that could be illustrated in other areas of the province of Ontario. Take a drive to Windsor, down through that cash crop area of southwestern Ontario, and you will find all kinds of farm buildings that are no longer useful to that particular farm. They have just been let sit there. The farm owner has not gone to the expense of tearing them down or removing them, but he is making mighty good use of the land around them and the land on which they are located. So I do not think we can always judge farms nor community economic standards by the condition of some of the buildings that may be found on those particular farms.

I mention this just as a sidelight to this affair. I think we must recognize that it required a good deal of research work to be done in eastern Ontario—involvement with the local people; working with them or drafting with them the local project to be considered—and I would say that it is making very good progress; that ARDA is not something that you can just snap your fingers at and it will happen overnight.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, just in this regard might I ask the hon. Minister a question? He mentioned the farm buildings that have been allowed to go into

disuse, and these blot the landscape and are sometimes used by photographers to illustrate certain points which they should not illustrate. Has the hon. Minister given any serious thought to any subsidy or any assistance or any technique by which these old buildings which are past their usefulness might be removed? It might be a place perhaps where our firefighters might be trained, or perhaps emergency measures organization might come into play—I don't know. Surely there must be some way that many of these buildings which are tumbling down and blotting our landscape could be looked after and could be removed. The government should, I think, give attention to this and outline some plan for doing it.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in this regard. You realize a lot of these old log buildings are sought after by city people who want to build rustic-type homes, so you could not convince a farmer that he should dispose of them until he gets a chance to sell them. I know of one that was just built; it is a twenty thousand dollar home and the logs were from an old log barn, and it is one of the things that really looks nice down in eastern Ontario. If the farmer can get cash for them he certainly is not going to dispose of them just the way the hon. member mentions.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I might say I am not speaking of buildings that are in good enough repair that they can be moved and used by somebody. But there are buildings, of which the hon. Minister spoke, that are tumbling down and which are past all usefulness. These perhaps could be removed.

Hon. Mr. Gomme: You may be talking about that but, on the other hand, there are a lot of these old log buildings where the roof has gone; they look to be falling down but still the timber is fit for use the way I have mentioned. So why should the farmer dispose of this building unless he has a market for it, which eventually he does get?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned misleading aspects of newspaper reports concerning some of the areas of the province. In the past few weeks there was a series dealing with Norfolk county which has been brought to the attention of the House on other occasions. This did not play up pictures so much but there were some very interesting and, in fact, shocking details when one read the full account.

I understand that the warden of the county has a committee of county council set up to deal with the various levels of government to see what might be done to bring Norfolk county out of this—

Mr. MacDonald: Pocket of poverty.

Mr. Nixon: —condition that is widely described as depressed. Now I know that they have approached the ARDA administration of the province, and I wonder if he would report on the condition of these negotiations.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, there are two things I would like to deal with here. First, I would like to refer to the idea advanced by the hon. member for Yorkview. Frankly, I think the hon. member has a pretty good idea. I would completely agree with what my hon. friend from Lanark says. A good many of these log buildings should be preserved. Frankly, I think they are a link with the past and a great tradition of our heritage. As long as they can be preserved, we should preserve them.

However, the hon. member did make a suggestion here and I think it ties in pretty well with the programme we suggested yesterday of farmstead improvement and general clean-up and rural beautification—if such a word may be used. It seems to me that as the hon. member suggested that some of these old buildings are of questionable value and might very well be used for—I was going to say target practice—for some of our fire organizations around the country. I think it is something that bears a little consideration.

Now, with regard to Norfolk county and the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant. The ARDA committee—and this is really what he is referring to here—headed up by the county council agriculture committee, has met with the director, Mr. Crown, of our ARDA branch; and they are examining if there is an application of the new ARDA agreement, as it is now constituted, in the Norfolk county area. This matter is under active consideration with the committee and our directors at the moment. I do not think they have reached any conclusions as yet. They have not yet brought any proposals to our director.

Mr. Nixon: If I might just pursue that a bit. Many people who are not familiar with the details of the new agreement, and I would submit even a few who are, are under the impression that the application is broad and nebulous. It is very difficult to state

specifically what is intended for the moneys that would be made available to the programme. I wonder if the hon. Minister might give us, in the minute or two that remains, his own view of just what this money would specifically be intended for. I have heard him say that we are dealing with land and we are dealing with people. Surely at some time this level of government would do a great service to all the municipalities and the people who are concerned with ARDA if we could state more specifically and definitely just what the prime aim is in terms that are down to earth and concrete.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know how one can be more definite and concrete than by saying that when one is dealing—as I said yesterday—with people, you just cannot come up and move them from one place to another. You have to have this process of evolution take place. My hon. friend referred to these newspaper reports. I think it was pretty clearly illustrated in some of the statements that were enunciated in those newspaper reports that the local people themselves were not too interested in doing anything about co-operating with ARDA projects.

I think it is most unfortunate that newspaper stories such as these are published creating an image of rural people not being interested in helping themselves: because this is not the way rural people think and act. I would like to say that the concept of ARDA, in our opinion, as we have discussed it at federal level and now in the new ARDA agreement, seeks to provide the best use of the land and its resources for the general well-being of the people within the area, but where that land is not of a capability that will lend itself to providing a useful living to those people, then perhaps consideration should be given to the retraining or the removing of those people to areas where their services and their usefulness could be readily employed. I think that sums it up as well as one could hope to do this.

Mention was made yesterday by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce of the Gaspé project—or was it the hon. member for York South? Anyway, one of them mentioned it yesterday. He referred to the Quebec government's Gaspé project down there and yet here again, you see, there were newspaper reports that the local people themselves were not buying the idea; that 80 people had been sent in by the government of Quebec to deal with this very matter, to try to get them involved and interested in doing some of the projects that were mentioned yesterday, and

those that could not be involved in it, to see if they could be retrained and moved out and become involved in some other industry. Yet the local paper did not buy the idea overnight. Roots go pretty deep in areas as described in the newspaper article, where one's childhood has been spent and where they hope their grandchildren will spend their childhood. These are the things with which we have to deal. We are dealing with people, and I would say that the general philosophy of ARDA is to deal with the resources of the country in the best possible way. There is no greater nor more valuable resource than the people of any community.

Mr. Spence: May I ask the hon. Minister, sir, if there are any community pastures being developed; or could an Indian reservation qualify for development of a community pasture? Are there any community pastures being considered for any reservations in the province at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The answer to the first question, Mr. Chairman, is yes. Indian reservations are given the same consideration under the federal-provincial ARDA agreement as any other area. There are no Indian reserves on which community pastures are presently located in Ontario.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, if there is to be more discussion, perhaps we can leave it until later.

I move that the committee rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I would like to resume these estimates and they will be followed by the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: There will be a night session Monday night.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 31, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, May 31, 1965

Interim report, select committee on aging, Mr. Carruthers	3397
Answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts	3401
Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, continued	3403
Recess, 6 o'clock	3437
Appendix 'A'	3438
Appendix 'B'	3443

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 31, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests students from the following schools: In the west gallery, St. Martin's separate school, London; Brechin separate school, Brechin; and in the east gallery, C. W. Jefferys secondary school, Downsview.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the interim report of the select committee on aging.

Mr. Speaker, this select committee was appointed by the House on motion of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), May 8, 1964. It has already been my privilege to remark on some of the activities of this committee during the Throne Speech debate on February 9, 1965.

As chairman, I would again pay tribute to those hon. members, my colleagues, who served with me on this select committee; and, Mr. Speaker, I would also at this time like to extend a word of appreciation to the committee's consultant and secretary, Mr. Lawrence Crawford, a gerontologist in his own right. Mr. Crawford's extensive knowledge and experience in the field of gerontology have been of inestimable value in carrying out the work of this committee. Indeed, the success which has resulted from our efforts has been due in no small measure to the organizing ability of Mr. Crawford and his dedicated service on behalf of the senior citizens of this province.

I would also like to express the committee's appreciation, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) and the officials of his department for their co-operation and assistance at all times.

The committee has had the opportunity to visit and examine many of the facilities provided for our senior citizens throughout the province, facilities which in a large measure

are supported by the provincial government and which are a credit to The Department of Public Welfare and to the local municipalities where they are located.

The month of May is without a doubt a good month in which to present an interim report such as ours. First, May is the month already recognized in the United States, by proclamation of the late President John F. Kennedy, as senior citizens' month. This practice, I might add, Mr. Speaker, is being actively continued by President Johnson. Second, May leads up to a very important week in the province of Ontario, senior citizens' week, June 6 to 12, 1965, a week which was suggested and supported by the United Senior Citizens of Ontario Incorporated. On behalf of the committee I wish to extend to this organization, together with all like-minded groups in the province and all our elderly persons, our best wishes for a very successful week.

However, I hope we will all realize that the services and well-being of our older citizens are important to us not only in a designated week but throughout the year. Indeed, if I may paraphrase the theme adopted by our neighbours to the south for May, 1965, and make this more personal: "The older person's today, is tomorrow for everyone else."

Mr. Speaker, I shall not read the entire interim report, brief as it is. We feel that we have accomplished a great deal. I shall merely read those items which have particularly impressed us during our deliberations to date. All of these will receive further study by the committee as the House sees fit to reappoint us.

First, the fact that interdisciplinary developments in the whole field of gerontology are required. This was brought out most forcefully at the Ontario conference on university education related to aging.

Second, our proposed Ontario institute of gerontology would have among its objectives the co-ordination and support of all provincial activities, but primarily research and training in the field of aging.

Third, the possibility of a pilot programme of geriatric consultant clinics to serve aged persons in the community.

Fourth, the need to extend various services to aged persons in their own homes.

Fifth, the necessity of immediate action by the province in determining standards and their enforcement in proprietary nursing homes, such standards to ensure the optimum care and well-being of aged residents.

Sixth, the lack of sufficient community information and counselling services for aging men and women.

Seventh, the value of extending training courses for adjuvants and extension of their services, to restore communications in the elderly, particularly post-stroke victims.

Eighth, requirements for a more concise and workable set of definitions of types of care, particularly where these affect the aged who are chronically ill.

Ninth, more widespread public education regarding safety and the vulnerability of elderly persons to accidents of several types.

Tenth, opportunities and potentials for the greater use of mature adults to assist others, and perhaps use of older persons in this capacity to help themselves to a fuller life in later years.

These are some of the many matters which have impressed us, Mr. Speaker. A glance at the agenda set forth in the printed report will reveal that much more yet remains to be done. I am confident, however, that we have plans which, while demanding, will enable us to complete our findings in a reasonable time.

When we examine the ten items which particularly impressed our committee, Mr. Speaker, and which I have just read, it is clear that some are positive, some are negative; some reveal areas of need, gaps in available services. Others reflect sound programmes which have only to be extended. But whatever their basis, their overriding aim is to enhance opportunities for our aging men and women, to prevent onset or worsening of illness and distress and to help the elderly to help themselves to remain independent, active members of society.

Perhaps I may digress at this point and speak more personally. One of the tasks I hope we can complete is to co-ordinate, or at least start the co-ordinating process, whereby some of the many programmes already in existence can be brought together and utilized wherever possible for our senior citizens. There are bills before this House and many Acts already on the statute books which can

increase the scope of services to and opportunities for the aged in this province. There are sections of other reports presented to the House which are of more than passing interest to this select committee.

For instance, there is a proposal of increased regional government. I intend to ask my hon. colleagues on the select committee on aging to consider its implications for work with the aged. Our consultant and I last year studied the work of the United States office of aging through its regional units, serving the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Following our discussions with Mr. Louis Bennett there, we are pursuing inquiries with Dr. Clark Tibbitts, deputy director of the United States office of aging in Washington, DC.

It may be, and I speak on my own here, that regional units operating under the type of provincial centre of which we have heard could extend a wide variety of counselling and related services to older men and women in their own communities. Such regional units, under the direction of a central institute, could serve to bring together the host of public and private organizations now concerned with the field of aging.

One positive feature of such a system might be to translate into action some of our select committee's future recommendations and, to quote our official terms of reference, assist in the promotion, development and creation of opportunities for self-help, to their own satisfaction and advantage as members of society as a whole, including preparation for retirement, leisure and the benefits of educational opportunities in later life.

To accomplish all these matters the select committee will examine many more developments, legislative and otherwise, Canadian and foreign. It is my wish, and that of my hon. colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to put before you and the House a concise, readable report of our work to date. If this meets with your approval we would respectfully ask that we might continue our efforts when the third session of the 27th Legislature is prorogued and until such time as our task is finished.

We can then join with the specialists in geriatrics and gerontology and show our society not merely that years have been added to life but rather how to add life to those years.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask that the select committee to which is referred aging and the aged be reappointed with the same comprehensive terms of reference in order that we might complete our work. Thank you.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Report adopted.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would crave your indulgence to raise the question which I have discussed with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and I know that he is as concerned as I am, and indeed as are all hon. members of this House, when we read the headlines in the paper that in our quiet and lawful society there has been an eruption of mob violence, and even the appearance of a minority group—and a rowdy group—who are calling themselves the Nazi party. I think, sir, that this strikes a question with us and at the very roots of our democracy. The question is, of course, to what extent do we permit freedom of assembly and freedom of speech, and where does it go beyond freedom into licence?

We on our side—and I am sure all members of this House agree—do not want to have McCarthyism. Yet if we look at the birth and development of such parties as the Nazi party, and we realize that it could happen within an assembly of free men—in fact, within a nation high in its intellectual achievements—is of grave concern, I suspect that if such a situation as this could even happen in Ontario, I think we as a government of Ontario should be examining whether our laws are sufficient. I recognize in many cases that this is the responsibility of Ottawa, but on the other hand if we ourselves are the administrators of these laws, and we do have a responsibility, I think we should be examining the freedom of the press. We should examine whether they have the licence to tell people about this small group and where they are going to meet. There were spot announcements frequently on the radio and we should consider whether this does not veer on the irresponsible, and whether in some way this could not be controlled or pointed out to the press the responsibility they have within a democracy.

I suggest that there are a great number of questions that we should be looking at. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister to consider that because of the fundamental reasoning that would have to take place with this, whether this could be referred for study by the McRuer commission, or whether there could be a Royal commission set up, par-

ticularly with respect to a situation such as this.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I join with the hon. leader of the Opposition in expressing a very profound sense of regret, sir, that this occurred in our society. I would say—as I read the press report—it is based on very deeply held emotions arising, perhaps, from the last war. It is also involved with the whole question of “hate” literature that is being spread across Canada. It is a very wide-ranging problem, and one with which we have been concerned over some period of time.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that years ago—I forget just which one of the federal-provincial conferences—but I asked at the conference if the question of “hate” literature could be placed on the agenda—not so much that I felt anything could be done at the conference, but I felt it was a national problem that should be brought out into the open and examined in that forum, which was dealing with some of the national problems that we have in the country.

There has been representation made to the federal government over the years concerning possible amendments to the Criminal Code to take care of some of these matters.

The great difficulty, of course, is that there is an element of judgment involved in this. We have freedom of expression, and we have freedom to gather and express opinions, whether that becomes inflammatory and exceeds the bounds of commonsense in inflaming and inciting emotions that get out of control. On the other hand, those people who do become excited also have a responsibility if we are to preserve the freedoms of our community both ways—for those in this particular episode of yesterday.

I can assure the hon. member that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has discussed this area with the Hon. Guy Favreau. It is a matter that receives the constant attention of the government. It is something that is always with us and that we are looking after.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister a question in this connection. I will say at the outset that I agree with both the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition that this is a matter of deep concern to all of us, but the one thing that puzzles me is the line of argument that has emerged, that the basic reason for this is in good part the buildup that the press gave it.

Has the hon. Prime Minister or the hon. Attorney General been able to satisfy themselves on what strikes me as the most intriguing thing why somebody—the civic authorities, the police, somebody—could not have informed the public that there could not be a meeting because there had been no permit granted for a meeting? The whole buildup, presumably, was on the basis of a permit, and there was no permit.

This is one question that I would like to see answered authoritatively, and I think it is rather significant in the emergence of this particular episode—the relationship and role of the press in this delicate balance between freedom of association and freedom of the press and the protection of the public welfare.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I can only say in that regard that any licence or permission to hold a gathering would be granted by the city of Toronto. Law enforcement, on the spot where this took place is purely a matter for the Metropolitan Toronto police, unless they ask for assistance from the provincial police. So really, as a government, we are in no position to answer these questions asked. Perhaps the mere fact that they have been asked on the floor of this House will produce an answer from those who know. It simply is not within the knowledge of this government, because we do not issue these permits. They are issued by the local government here.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have four questions for the hon. Attorney General of which I have given him notice.

Would the hon. Attorney General consider the immediate creation by legislation of the civil wrong of slander of a group, so that an individual being a member of a group could, if the group were slandered, have a remedy in the courts for an injunction and damages?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, as I think the hon. member is aware, this subject is receiving consideration by the government of Canada at this time, which is being advised by a committee which was constituted to study this very matter.

We sent very capable representation before that committee some weeks ago—the committee is still sitting—and I think it would be premature and probably detrimental to introduce remedies within our own area of jurisdiction which might be detrimental to a solution which could be effective across

Canada. I think that is particularly so in view of the extension of the subject-matter of complaint throughout several provinces, where it must effectively be dealt with by national legislation, and therefore answering the question specifically, "Would the Attorney General consider the immediate creation by legislation?" I would say I would not consider the creation of this type of remedy at this particular moment.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Attorney General intend to make representations to the federal government on the question of whether or not the Criminal Code should be amended to prevent the publication of names of persons involved in court proceedings until a conviction has been obtained, and, if so, what would be the nature of the hon. Attorney General's representation?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, replying to that question, I would say that amendments to the Criminal Code are ordinarily and customarily discussed with the Attorneys General of the provinces or their representatives in order that representations may be made and considered.

Frankly, I am not aware of the details of the proposal. I read some press comment of a remark or a suggestion which had been made, I believe emanating from The Department of Justice or from the hon. Minister of Justice, but I do not know the detail of the proposal, except what I have read in the press. I am therefore not in a position to come to any conclusion as yet as to what representations I will make. I would trust that if this is proposed it certainly will be brought to our attention, our opinion requested and our consideration asked in the ordinary and customary way.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, is the province of Ontario represented at the secret conference being held at the University of Toronto, dealing with the prevention of crime? If so, who is representing the province?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the province is being represented at the national conference on the prevention of crime by the Attorney General, deputy Attorney General, the director of public prosecutions, chief magistrate for Ontario, chairman and counsel for the Ontario law reform commission, chairman of the Ontario police commission, Mr. S. A. Caldbick, QC, and the commissioner of the Ontario provincial police.

Mr. Speaker, the question is framed "Is Ontario represented at the secret confer-

ence?" I think I should like to say a word about that description and add this: The conference, of course, was arranged and is being conducted by the department of criminology of the University of Toronto. I think it is generally known to be our policy that our universities have a fair autonomy in their pursuits of research in every field of knowledge. At the conference giving papers, expressing views and assisting in this type of social research will be members of the judiciary, civil servants in various positions from various governments.

This is simply my own thinking. While we have no control over the conduct of the conference, and feel that this is proper, I would think that if persons in the judiciary and civil service are to be free to express views which, if published immediately, might be considered possibly as critical of their governments, they must not be made to feel that their positions are being jeopardized. I think in order to get the full, proper and best expression of opinion there has to be some secrecy for their protection—I believe this is their attitude, that they be protected by some secrecy.

Further, I would say this: I do understand that the press is to be admitted to certain areas of the conference; and I take it, as has happened in the past, releases will be given out of the gist of the discussions, resolutions proposed, and decisions arrived at.

The conference, however, still would not be secret. It is my understanding that all those taking part are not required to maintain secrecy individually on their own part. But I think there is some reason to protect certain officials in order that they may give the fullest expression of opinion in this very important field of research into the prevention of crime.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Surely!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the record and transcript of this conference be kept and made available in this Legislature at some future time?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer at the moment, I do not know. I know that on a similar conference in the past which came to my knowledge there was a very full, complete record made to which I had access; but I cannot answer that question specifically or categorically.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the final question: Has the insurance branch of The Department of the Attorney General approved the recently announced further increases in automobile insurance rates effective July 1 by the Canadian underwriters' association?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of insurance is not required to approve of an increase in rates of premiums. The Canadian underwriters' association is, however, required to give at least ten days notice to the superintendent of insurance of any change in the schedule of rates. This notice has not been given as of this date.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to table answers to questions Nos. 77, 83, 111 and 112.

The hon. Prime Minister tabled answers to questions on the order paper as follows:

77. Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Inquiry of the Ministry—Will the Attorney General advise: 1. If in the event of a national emergency, such as war, will the residents of Metropolitan Toronto be evacuated from said municipality? 2. If so, where will the citizens of Metropolitan Toronto be evacuated to? 3. (a) If so, have there been any arrangements for stockpiling of food for such evacuees; (b) if so, what are these arrangements? 4. (a) if so, have there been any provisions for shelter for such evacuees; (b) if so, what are these arrangements? 5. If so, what arrangements have been made for the evacuation of the following from Metropolitan Toronto: (i) school children, (ii) patients in hospitals, (iii) aged and infirm, (iv) those persons in penal institutions?

Answer by the hon. Attorney General:

1. There is no programme which will require the compulsory movement of population, except under specific Canadian army direction in areas of heavy damage and radioactive fallout. Provision for this authority is contained in the Canadian army manual of training and survival operations (Camt. 2-91, Chapter 1, Section 1, para. 102 (d) and (e)).

However, a plan is in being prepared by the Metropolitan Toronto police department to assist in voluntary movement of population. It is a matter of stated national policy that there will be no compulsory evacuation.

2. Provided for if required in the provincial reception plan for Zone 3. Reception

plans for evacuees have been developed for each of the seven zones in the province.

3. (a) There is no programme for the stockpiling of food.

(b) The provision of essential supplies is the responsibility of the federal war supplies agency.

4. (a) Yes.

(b) Provided for in the provincial reception plan for zone 3.

5. (i) Instruction re dispersal of school children is contained in the Metropolitan Toronto emergency measures organization school plan.

(ii) In accordance with the individual hospital disaster plans as required by the provincial Department of Health.

(iii) As provided for in the planning of Metropolitan Toronto homes for the aged. Others through local domestic arrangements.

(iv) In accordance with plans of The Department of Reform Institutions, as required.

83. *Mr. F. Young (Yorkview)*: Inquiry of the Ministry—1. What are the names and location of each parole officer on the staff of The Department of Reform Institutions as of January 1, 1965? 2. What was the case load carried by each parole officer on that date? 3. What are the academic and experience qualifications of each parole officer on staff as of January 1, 1965? 4. (a) Are special in-service training courses available to parole officers? (b) If so, how many officers have taken such courses, and when?

Answer by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman):

1. See Appendix A.

2. See Appendix A

3. See Appendix A.

4. (a) No. However, four training seminars have been held within the past five years. At the present time an in-service training course for rehabilitation officers is being developed.

4. (b) Not applicable.

111. *Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North)*: Inquiry of the Ministry—Will the Minister give a breakdown of an item on page K-7 of public accounts, an amount of \$6,000 to Park Plaza hotel, and an amount of \$15,000 to Westbury hotel?

Answer by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts):

Analysis of accounts for Park Plaza hotel

and Westbury hotel as they appear in the public accounts of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1964 (page K-7):

LUNCHEONS AND DINNERS

Organizations and Meetings

1. Conservation Authorities

Four meetings were held with officials of the Upper Thames, North Gray, Sauble Valley and Saugeen Valley; Catfish Creek conservation authorities and the executive of the committee of chairmen on their problems, plus one meeting with field staff.

Westbury Hotel	Park Plaza Hotel
\$1,850.48	\$344.17

2. Federal-Provincial

Discussions with federal officials on national forest products week, Indian problems, resource Ministers and marine resources.

Westbury Hotel	Park Plaza Hotel
\$3,009.79	\$1,013.96

3. Employee Relations and Training

Familiarization of timber, fish and wildlife, fire protection, parks and other functional sections of the department.

Westbury Hotel	Park Plaza Hotel
\$4,740.97	\$3,379.97

4. Provincial Associations Meetings

Conferences of commercial fishermen, forest industries, research foundation, game licensing, forest economics, junior rangers and Minister's advisory committee.

Westbury Hotel	Park Plaza Hotel
\$3,642.52	\$1,143.95

5. Field Training Conferences

District foresters, biologists, chief rangers briefing sessions on new procedures and policies.

Westbury Hotel	Park Plaza Hotel
\$2,362.14	\$604.16

Misc. (Sundry charges for meeting rooms, accommodations, etc.)

Westbury Hotel	Park Plaza Hotel
\$190.83	—

112. *Mr. Sargent:* Inquiry of the Ministry—Will the Minister give a breakdown of the item on page K-10 of public accounts “travelling expenses, an amount of \$5,144 to Mr. J. E. Hietala and party”?

Answer by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests: See Appendix “B”

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The thirteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
(continued)

On vote 103:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, while we are on vote 103, there are some questions I would like to raise with the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart).

During the course of the introductory speeches to the estimates there was considerable discussion about the need for pumping money back into the agricultural sector of the economy in an effort to redress the unfair share of the national or provincial wealth which agriculture is getting. We got into some little comparisons with the budget in the province of Quebec. At the time that I was advancing figures with regard to the province of Quebec, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) and I were wondering as to whether or not a figure that I was citing represented agriculture alone. He felt it did. I am rather glad to be able to announce to him that he is more right than I am and that makes my point even stronger than I thought in the first instance.

The fact of the matter is that the budget in the province of Quebec last year for agriculture was \$63.3 million, this year it is \$112.5 million. Now there are a few factors in there that might well be outside the jurisdiction of our Department of Agriculture for an exact comparison. I note, for example, that they have grants of \$3,659,000 for colonization; and later on they also have purchases, construction and alteration of removables, including furnishings, equipment and construction of colonization roads and bridges, \$4 million. There is another grant to facilitate the construction of new buildings; this may be like your community centres, I do not know.

But even if one were to strip out all of that, you still end up with a budget that is close to

\$100 million, including the grants that are going to the educational institution at MacDonald college; as compared with our budget of \$21 million, including the grants that are going to Guelph. I think this underlines a contrast between what we are doing and what perhaps has to be done if we are going to fulfill those objectives spelled out so eloquently both by the hon. Minister and his deputy about redressing this balance of agricultural income.

I just present that. Perhaps the hon. Minister does have some comment.

In connection with ARDA, may I ask the hon. Minister: Are moneys for ARDA purposes in Ontario channelled only through the county committees that have been set up to implement ARDA programmes, or are they channelled through other agencies including other government departments that might be related in the overall comprehensive ARDA programme?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the channelling of ARDA moneys intended for various projects throughout the province, they are not channelled specifically through the county committee unless it happens to be a particular county project. For instance, I can think of an illustration of the Leeds county pasture, which has just become operative this year. Now that was handled through the local county committee.

A property was purchased, as I understand it, through The Department of Public Works. They bought and paid for it. But the operation of the pasture itself, that is setting the rates for the cattle that will be pasturing there, the looking after them, identification and all the rest of it, the general management of the pasture will be the responsibility of the local ARDA committee.

Now, when you come to other projects, and I think of, say, the South Nation River, as one that embraces, I believe, seven counties in eastern Ontario. This is so much broader a concept that this becomes something that will be co-ordinated with the various county committees that are there. I mentioned last week we had a meeting with them there on April 28, trying to get the ground rules laid out to proceed with the projects of priority.

So there is no clear cut established way by which this money can be relegated out. I think it depends on the project, as to what it is intended to do, and where it is used, and for what purpose.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, can I explore another area for a moment? Has there been any

marriage of ARDA and our regional development associations? During the estimates of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), we had a pretty lengthy discussion on the role of our regional development associations, and the fact that they are tending to wither on the vine, that they seem to be losing a sense of real purpose and direction because we have not really mapped out a meaningful project for them.

Many of these associations take in areas—take the eastern Ontario regional development association, which is made up of 11 counties. Or if you go up to northwestern Ontario. I remember when that association began, there was quite a little drive made among the early organizing group to get recognition of the fact that agriculture is an important aspect of the economy of northwestern Ontario, even though it may be pocketed in areas such as Fort Francis through to Rainy River, or up around Kenora and so on.

Has anything been done by way of a development of ARDA programmes through the regional development associations, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: First of all, I would like to enlarge a bit on my earlier reply. I neglected to mention in answering that first question the hon. member asked about the directions that money might flow, that it does flow through the other departments. For instance, The Department of Lands and Forests carries out extensive ARDA projects. But when we set up the ARDA directorate in Ontario, with the branch in The Department of Agriculture for administration, we felt that there was no point in duplicating the services provided by other departments.

So what is involved is that the other departments are represented in the ARDA directorate—the various ones I enumerated the other day—and when a project comes up that lends itself to a Lands and Forests project, we will say, then our ARDA directorate, having approved this and forwarded it through the proper channels, right up to the federal Treasury board at Ottawa and approval having been obtained, then it is turned over to the specific department to carry out the responsibilities of implementation. This is another means of doing this.

In connection with the development areas. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development and I have had considerable discussion on how best we can approach these things. We have now set up a meeting that will be comprised of our deputy Minister and his deputy Minister and their respective staffs to discuss ways and means by which we can

use ARDA funds in the areas, to develop projects that will be of benefit in those areas. Quite frankly, I think there is an opportunity here for very substantial contributions to be made to industrial development in areas that will lend themselves to that kind of an industry.

Of course, we always have the problem of industry sometimes being reluctant to move into these areas, unless they can find, first of all, readily available labour. Of course they are always interested in markets for the product of their plants.

I think we can get around some of these things. For instance, the other day, in the county of Hastings, a marble and granite place was opened up there, a little industry, I think employing 36 people locally. This was a project for which some ARDA money was delegated. I believe it provided for a bridge over a creek that would allow the trucks to get to plant and it opened up a little industry.

This to me, is important. I think this is typical of what can be done, and the hon. Minister and I would like very much to see this whole programme expanded as we go across the province.

I think we have to recognize that you just cannot do it overnight. And there has to be a desire on the part of local people to accept industry into their area, because it does change the pattern of living. There has to be an acceptance on the part of local people to be willing and ready to find some other means of employment or earning a living, than just operating the farms that have been in their family name for generations. But I think we are coming to that. There is gradually becoming a public acceptance of this in these areas, and frankly, I have high hopes for it. I think it is an excellent idea. I think it has real merit and we intend to pursue it to the full.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 103 carried?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just have a few comments to make in connection with this vote.

In my lead-off speech, I mentioned something about a local development worker or co-ordinator, and I had envisaged that this chap would perhaps work with the local county councils—the local people involved. I realize so well that the local aspect of the ARDA programme is being looked after by the county councils in each county across the province, but I am wondering if the programme could not be enhanced, and perhaps in some cases facilitated, if a local development officer were appointed in the various

counties across the province, first of all to work with the farm organizations in the area, to work with the local people and to work with the county council people, as well as the people here in Toronto.

I would like the hon. Minister's comments on that.

The second thing I want to raise is the fact that the community pasture programme in Bruce country, I believe, has been passed, but as yet they have not had the go-ahead that it has been completed and the project will be undertaken. I think both authorities—the federal and provincial authorities—have given their okay on the project, but as yet nothing has happened.

I would like the hon. Minister's comments in that connection.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, first of all, with regard to ARDA field men, under the new federal-provincial ARDA agreement, it has not yet been finalized by both governments. It is in the process of discussion and negotiation now, and has been tentatively approved by the Ministers of both departments, but it is in the hands of the governments of both jurisdictions.

There is provision there for the appointment and training of ARDA field men. I think it is significant to note that at Guelph this year, there is a special course provided there with a \$24,000 budget; \$12,000 from each of the two jurisdictions for students to do postgraduate work in this matter of rural development. This will be the first course of its kind offered in Canada. I think it is a step forward, and we must recognize that there are certain aspects to this business of rural redevelopment that require a great deal of further study and consideration. This will be a start.

We do intend to employ some ARDA field men—one has been employed, as was mentioned last week, and will be starting in the Manitoulin Island area this summer on a specific project. We hope that as time goes on, others will be employed. I think there is a place for them.

On the other hand, I want to point out the job that has been done by the agricultural representatives in their respective counties and districts, who recognize the need and application of ARDA in their respective counties. I think the hon. member for Huron-Bruce would agree that there are areas of Ontario where there would be a greater need and application of ARDA than there would be in the area that he represents or that I represent. This is just logical.

In connection with the Bruce county pasture, frankly last summer my deputy and the director of ARDA visited the area and were greatly impressed with the possibilities of the establishment of a community pasture. The project was, as my hon. friend suggested, approved by both governments—federal and provincial—and the project was turned over to The Department of Public Works to go ahead and acquire the land. Unfortunately for the project, we found that it is virtually impossible to get 700 or 800 acres of land in one block without disturbing active and successful farm units, and this defeats the purpose of the project.

As well, I think my hon. friend knows, even better than I, that land values are increased considerably. The ARDA agreement provides for a maximum of something like \$50 an acre for community pasture projects that will be approved, but land values in that area, we understand from reports that have come to us from The Department of Public Works, have gone beyond that. Indeed, I have talked to men from the area who have confirmed this to me, and they say that it is just a plain and simple matter of demand, that land is going up in price. I think one of the reasons for this is the fact that the soils map of Ontario indicates that there is exceedingly good land in the north end of Huron county and in Bruce county.

Brixton clay loam, I believe, is the top quality soil that can be found in Ontario—certainly one of the top quality soils—and as land becomes scarcer and demands for certain crops increase, farmers are finding that this land is available at much less capital investment than it is in other areas of the province, and they are moving in and buying this land.

I know that this is happening, so the fact is that land prices are going up, perhaps as rapidly there as they are in other areas of the province for agricultural purposes, and the simple fact of it is that the land appears to the department to be getting too dear to buy it for community pasture purposes.

Those are the two reasons that it has not moved ahead; first of all, the lack of one large block of acreage and, second, the price of the land itself.

I think that anyone who knows farming—as I am sure my hon. friend does—would realize that there is only one thing that puts land prices up, and that is the need for land, the desire of farmers to buy land. As long as there are people ready to pay that price, nobody is going to sell it for less, naturally.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, when the ARDA programme was first launched by the federal government and co-operation was secured from the various provincial governments, I am sure many of us—and I assume the hon. Minister was among that number—felt that this was a vehicle whereby, and through which, there could be effected the rejuvenation of the agricultural fabric in this province.

Now, I am bound to say that in the years that ARDA has been in operation, it has not fulfilled the potential that many of us had in mind for it. I am conscious of the difficulties that are in the path of the hon. Minister as he seeks to secure the maximum from this programme in co-operation with the federal government.

There are two or three things that seem to stand out that I would like the hon. Minister to talk about. First of all, I think he is having difficulty—I would assume that there is difficulty—in formulating an integrated policy among the various members of Cabinet. Each one of the hon. Cabinet Ministers may well have a phase of the ARDA programme within his particular department, and it would call for a real integration among the various portfolios of government in order that the maximum might be realized from this programme.

I would like the hon. Minister to tell the House this afternoon whether such integration has been effected, and whether we can say today that there is no lack of understanding, or no lack of appreciation on the part of the various hon. members of government of the importance of this programme, and of the necessity of all pulling together in order that it might be a success.

The other part that bothers me is this. We have, as the hon. member for York South said so well a few moments ago, these various organizations throughout the province—development organizations. You know, one thing I think we are plagued with in trying to effect a remedy for the conditions that affect agriculture is a multiplicity of organizations. Perhaps we could achieve better effect of what we have in mind by a singleness of purpose directed through one particular channel, so that there would not be this multiplicity of controls, and this diverse interest among various groups and various organizations in the province.

I think the interest of the people back home—and when I say that I say it about the ridings of many of us—in my own particular riding there are many men who are dedicated to the ideal that ARDA can be an

effective instrument for good, but the trouble seems to be that nothing comes of it. You go on from month to month and have these meetings and try to sustain the interest, but there is nothing, apparently, of a concrete nature to sustain that interest. What is going to happen unless there is a real drive on this ARDA programme, is that you are going to find these faithful, dedicated people in the various areas of this province will not only lose faith in the programme, but their interest in it will lag to the extent that you are not going to have an effective nucleus from which you can derive the best possible effort. I would think that in this province we have not made the full strides that we could have, and should have, made under ARDA. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if he feels that there is one single factor that has contributed to this lack of full effectiveness as far as ARDA is concerned.

Is it the local people who are to blame? Are they negligent in not putting forth programmes to the central ARDA office? Is the government lax in not giving leadership in these programmes? Where is the kernel, where does the fault lie that gives rise to the assertion that ARDA has not made the progress that it should have made in this province? So far it has fallen far short of the potential visualized for it by those of us in this House, and by farm leaders throughout the length and breadth of the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I always admire the way my hon. friend brings points on which he has deep convictions to the attention of the House. The House will be the poorer when the day ever comes that he is no longer with us, from the standpoint of being able to express—

Mr. MacDonald: That will be a good quote for the Tory campaign.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, perhaps it will, but I say this from a personal feeling of friendliness for my hon. friend. That will not at all affect our relationship when it comes to an election.

On the matter of the farm organizations: I notice my hon. friend said there should be less farm organizations, but I did not notice him referring to which ones should be eliminated. Then the conflict that he referred to that is supposed to exist between our departments. I dealt with this, I thought, Mr. Chairman, quite effectively last week when the hon. member for Huron-Bruce raised it in his budget speech on the estimates of The Department of Agriculture, concerning what he

pointed out in the federation of agriculture brief to have been this conflict that is supposed to have existed between the departments. At that time, I said that when the federation presented its brief to the Cabinet council that day, I asked the permission of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) to inquire what illustration they could give to a breakdown within our departments in communication or barriers, and I was interested to find that they could not give me a single illustration.

I asked also about where reference had been made about barriers between our branches within our own department, and I failed again to get a concrete illustration. So I think if there is such a feeling abroad, then I think it is completely erroneous, because in my humble thinking, the ARDA directorate is one of the smoothest functioning organizations that there is in the Ontario government. It is a complete co-ordination of all the various departments which have to do with the ARDA projects, and it really is dealing with our natural resources in this province.

Now if I may be so bold as to suggest, I would think when my hon. friend refers to the fact that ARDA was held out to be one of the things that would cure all the evils, or a lot of them at least, of agriculture in Ontario, that perhaps this might have been picked up with a bit too much enthusiasm at the time. I would also point out that the present Minister of the federal government in charge of ARDA has seen fit to reorient the terms of reference of ARDA to a different type of agreement that is only applicable in areas that are specified as areas—they were defined, I think, as disadvantage areas in the original concept of the agreement.

I protested vigorously against such terminology because I do not think it is good. We substituted for that "redevelopment areas" and so we were able to move ahead with the Manitoulin Island project, defining Manitoulin as a development area. The 11 counties of eastern Ontario are now to be so defined. And I would think that in these respective areas there are a good many things that can be done to relieve some of the distress that has been experienced by agriculturists.

On the other hand, I hardly think it proper to say that nothing has been done. There are an enormous number of projects under way across Ontario—54, I believe, to be exact. I have them here, but I do not know whether we want to take the time of the House to read them all to you. I could go into them—the community pastures; the alternative uses of land agreement, and listing the various places where this is in operation; the soil and water

conservation projects that we have; the research agreements that are going on in certain areas and certain places where we do not have enough information; and one of the most significant aspects of it is our participation in the Canada land inventory, so that we in Canada, on a national basis, will know in each province what we really have as a natural resource, through the various qualities of our soil and its potential.

It could be said, of course, when ARDA was first contemplated, it was going to do a lot to raise prices, and what-have-you. This was never in the concept of ARDA. To me, it is a long-term programme. It involves the philosophy, if you will, towards rural living. It involves the strengthening of rural living, and the acceptance by rural people of a completely changed and new way of life as far as rural Canada is concerned.

There are certain areas where I feel it will have little or no application. On the other hand, I think there are areas where certain things can be done as I mentioned earlier—in the development of industry; in the retraining of people; the acceptance of people of a new way of life, that will perhaps be more remunerative to them than what they have been used to.

I think we must recognize that what we are basically interested in in ARDA is improving the living standards of people, not necessarily on farms, but in the communities across Canada where they have not the advantages of this industrial development and are unable to propel themselves forward on their own motivation without help.

These are the things that I think as a natural process of evolution will gradually develop. These things, where they are now applicable and where they are now in operation, have proven to be of real value. I do not think it matters whether a man makes a dollar from farming or whether he makes it from the tourist industry. If he has some facility on his farm that he can sell to urban people to come out and live in the country and, for instance, enjoy a stream or a place to set up a tent or something like this, to me this is increasing his standard of living and providing services. This, to me, is an illustration of what ARDA should be.

Mr. Oliver: Well, may I ask the hon. Minister, in the new definition that has been given to ARDA, apparently by the federal authorities, will it be a fact that large areas of the province will fail to fit into this definition, and, therefore, the ARDA programme will not be applicable to those particular areas?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say that it would have application to what I described as disadvantage areas, or areas of pockets of poverty really, because of climatic conditions, geography. The old self-contained family farm unit in most instances is no longer acceptable as a means of providing a standard of living for the farm community. I think it will be tied largely to that.

But I would think that we are hardly in a position to be able to say that the new ARDA agreement would have general application right across the province. Quite frankly, I do not think this is the case. I have to confess that in my own area where I come from—north Middlesex. I have had to say that really I do not think there is any application of ARDA there. One could hardly describe that as an area that needed that kind of assistance, because we have the type of soil there that is conducive to provide a good—if it is well managed—or reasonable living to farm families.

In other parts of the province, this just does not apply. I think we have to congratulate the federal Minister for applying this philosophy to the ARDA agreement as it will apply across Canada.

There are areas that may stand to benefit more than others, and perhaps rightly so. Perhaps we have to put a lot of this land back into forests; perhaps we have to develop the tourist industry, recreational facilities, and so on.

Then, I think, we can very well take areas of land and assemble them and do the things I have suggested with them, sir, and out of those areas of land take the good arable land, and assemble that in areas that are large enough to provide what might be described as an economic unit, and then allow a farmer to use that land and keep it in agricultural production.

I do not think for one moment that we should take out of production land that is easy to work, that is good land, that has the qualities that are needed for agricultural production. As time goes on, I am satisfied that we will need it all, but I think we have to take a good look at it, and apply ARDA where necessary.

Mr. Oliver: Well, there is just this one observation. There has been difficulty, and I think the hon. Minister will agree, in maintaining an interest on the part of the county committees in some areas, in respect to ARDA, until the present time. Now, if this new conception is applied—and apparently it will be—then I think the hon. Minister will agree with me that there are quite

substantial areas of the province that ARDA will not apply to.

If you have not been able to maintain the interest of county committees in the past, when we thought that there were some elements of the ARDA programme that would apply, is the hon. Minister of the mind that there is not very much use in maintaining ARDA committees in these areas that clearly would not fall within the purview of the present ARDA programme?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I think it should be pointed out emphatically, that the formation of the ARDA committees was established prior to the drafting of the present agreement that is now under discussion. We left it to the respective counties and districts to form their own ARDA committees.

My hon. friend is referring to the projects that have application under the new federal-provincial agreement. But he is a product of rural Ontario, and so am I. I think we have to recognize, and here I want to digress for a moment, Mr. Chairman, if I may, because I think it applies to those things that cannot entirely be associated with the economics of rural living. I think we have to recognize that there is a place for someone in the rural counties of Ontario, not those counties that would come under the application as far as economic help under ARDA is concerned, but for someone in the counties to take a look at the changing life that we see in rural Ontario today. We see so many less farmers than we used to see. We see so many more people living in the rural communities and commuting to work in the urban centres, with industry really carrying them.

This is creating problems. Problems in the rural community, where you have a differing interest that did not exist before. If I may, I think I would like to say it applies to our churches of all denominations in the rural community.

We have the central school. First of all we have the district high schools that came out after the last war and the contribution they made. The yellow school bus became an accepted vehicle on the road and picked up these students and brought secondary education to the door of our rural communities. Then we have the central schools, the consolidated public schools. Here again, we have a new concept in this.

I wonder if it does not apply to more areas than this. We have our women's institutes facing these problems; our junior farmers; our churches, as I mentioned, faced

with the problem of wondering what is going to be their future with dwindling congregations and the number of them trying to serve in a given community.

Is the future going to be centralization? You may think this is a queer place to bring this up, in ARDA estimates; but to me it all is associated with rural redevelopment. I think even in counties where there may not be the acceptability, the practical application of the new ARDA agreement there are other matters that are of very great importance and urgency to the local people involved. I think where the local people are involved that the terminology of a local ARDA committee may be somewhat out of place, but I am satisfied there is a need for that kind of a committee to perform a very useful function in those counties and districts.

Now this may not answer my hon. friend's question, but to me it sums up to a degree what I feel we must face over the next 15 or 20 years. I think there will be great changes in rural Ontario. I think we should have people who are interested heading up these co-ordinating talks along these lines.

Mr. Oliver: This is positively my last word on it, but I agree pretty much with what my hon. friend has said, except this: At the moment, as my hon. friend knows, we have the women's institute who are doing a tremendous job of evaluating rural conditions and portraying the farm situation as it appears today. We have the junior farmer organization; we have the horticultural societies; we have the agricultural committee for the county council. I suggest to my hon. friend that there is not any use in us setting up ARDA as a separate organization to do the job that these others are capable of doing. What we should be doing: If ARDA is to have a function in the field that my hon. friend has now talked about, then surely it should be as a co-ordinating body, to bring the views and convictions of all these various groups together so that with one voice they can say what is their opinion in respect to these important matters that my hon. friend has talked about.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, the setting up of the ARDA committees was intended to embrace just those organizations you have mentioned; so that we could bring to bear, in one co-ordinated approach, the views of all these organizations. In the committee set-up that was called by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) and myself a year ago, we emphasized to the county

agricultural committees that they should bring in the services, employ the use, the knowledge, the contacts, of the various organizations my hon. friend has mentioned. We suggested it should embrace all these: the junior farmers, the federation of agriculture, the farmers union, the women's institute, the soil and crop improvement association, the county forestry groups, the conservation authorities, the chambers of commerce—in fact every organization that had an interest in a local community so that we could concentrate their ideas in one co-ordinated approach.

Now, admittedly, there are counties now, under the new ARDA agreement, where actually, as I said, the financial arrangement may not apply. But I think there is a great work for those committees to do in making a co-ordinated approach to these various things. I appreciate the interest in the points which my hon. friend has brought out this afternoon.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to return to the point that I made in connection with the Bruce county pasture and the comments my hon. friend made. Am I to assume from the hon. Minister's remarks that he feels the establishment of a community pasture in Bruce county is not feasible at this time because of the factors which he mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would not say it was not feasible. I think there is a useful purpose that can be performed by a community pasture in Bruce county; I really do. On the other hand, I think we have to be guided by practical realities. I would not say that the project has been abandoned at all. In fact it is under active consideration, with the thought of trying to acquire a sizeable chunk of land in one block that would make it an effective community pasture.

We are still working on the project and hope that we will be able to establish one but I am afraid that it will not be as large a pasture as we had hoped to establish. We have great visions for Bruce county, quite frankly, but land prices have changed the picture.

When we were there last year, my deputy points out, we had approved it based on the prices that were quoted us and at the time we told them that if prices advanced significantly we just could not go ahead with the project because of the ARDA agreement, the fact that we are restricted in that agreement.

I do not think that it was because it was a government pasture, I think it was because

a great many people have moved into the area and land prices have gone up. The per acre value of land increased to the point where it is no longer practical from our standpoint, to go as large as we were contemplating. Now, on the other hand, I hope we will be able to go ahead. It certainly is not abandoned by any means.

Vote 103 agreed to.

On vote 104:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 104, while normally I hesitate to enter the debate on these estimates because this field is not one in which I am most knowledgeable, my particular attention was addressed to some of the problems that face the milk industry when I had occasion to read Mr. Hennessey's report made to the government.

In his report, where he deals with cheese production and marketing, he deals with two matters that have aroused my very substantial concern. I am not even going to attempt to deal with some of the more technical branches that affect the industry, I know my hon. colleagues will handle that very well, but there are two matters that concern me very much and those are Mr. Hennessey's references: First of all to the letting of tenders for the Belleville warehouse; and second, to the question of the search of title of the Oxford station purchase.

I am sure that the hon. Minister knows that on page 102 of his report Mr. Hennessey deals at some length with the question of the letting of tenders. He is of the opinion, and I share his opinion, that in a matter of at least quasi public jurisdiction, as the affairs of this body are—and I deliberately say of at least quasi public concern because the province of Ontario pays a substantial sum annually to the board, and then one of the exhibits attached to this report I think shows that one of the assets of the board is the sum of \$450,000 which it received from the province of Ontario.

I say that when we have established this, then it becomes obvious that all of the people of Ontario are interested in the manner in which public money is spent. Apparently the board was going to build a warehouse at Belleville, and they approached two people in 1961, or two concerns, Finlay W. MacLaughlin Limited and another firm, Wilfred Spencer and Sons.

Now Finlay W. MacLaughlin Limited were asked, as I read this report, to submit a bid based on a steel beam type of building. They submitted a bid and their bid was

somewhere in the vicinity of a quarter of a million dollars. About the same time, or a little later, Wilfred Spencer and Sons submitted a bid which was somewhere around \$125,000, but was based on a cement block building.

Apparently no action was taken at all until two or three years after the original request to Finlay W. MacLaughlin and to the Spencer Company for bids, and then at the later time the contract was awarded to the Spencer Company.

The point that Mr. Hennessey raises—and I think it a very valid point—is that first of all there is no public call for tenders. There was an invitational call for tenders, and apparently given only to two firms, and given to those two firms on a different basis.

The Finlay MacLaughlin request for a tender was given on the basis of a very expensive type of steel beam construction, and the Spencer request for a tender was given on a cheaper type of construction, a brick block, with other little things that go in it in one case and do not go in it in another. So that when the time came to let the contract, there was only one firm apparently before the board that the board was prepared to consider.

I suggest that this is a very poor way to carry on this type of business. There is, Mr. Chairman, public money being spent, and there is no indication at all to the board, and there is no indication given to Mr. Hennessey as to any real investigation having been made into the question of competitive prices; into the question of getting the best price and the best method of construction achieved for this public body.

I ask the hon. Minister—and he has had an opportunity of reading this report, I know that, and of examining the various appendices that are attached to it—what does he propose to do about it, because I think this is a very poor way to carry on public business? Anything that comes within the control of this government should be done in a method that commends itself to the colleague who sits beside him—the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton).

We had occasion to point out to the hon. Minister of Highways that if this was the way he built highways, there would have been quite a different approach taken to his colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, when his estimates came before the House. On the basis of the record as produced in the Hennessey report, there is no excuse for this method of carrying on business, and we want to know what is going to be done about it.

The second point, is the purchase of the Oxford station property. That is dealt with substantially on page 103. My hon. colleague says it is a question of whether or not it is purchased with public money, but the fact is that public money and public legislation creates this board and allows it to function. I admit that the money is part of the money put up by the producers and so on, but nevertheless there is at least, Mr. Chairman, a trusteeship resting on the shoulders of my friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture. He should be so anxious to make sure that everything is properly done that he should never allow a series of events such as this to take place.

Now what happened in the purchase of the Oxford station property? For some reason, even though they had lawyers, Spragge and Cameron, who are solicitors in Belleville, who were retained to assist them in the purchase, they told those lawyers that they did not want them to search the title. And the lawyers said: "Now this is a strange way of doing business and we don't like it, and in order that we won't get into trouble, we ask you, Mr. Chairman of the board, to give us those instructions in writing." These are the instructions in writing that were given:

I, the undersigned—

and this is addressed to Spragge and Cameron, barristers and solicitors at Belleville:

I, the undersigned, being chairman of the Ontario cheese producers marketing board, do hereby specifically instruct Messrs. Spragge and Cameron to make absolutely no searches whatsoever of any kind in connection with this transaction. And I hereby acknowledge that I have been specifically advised by Mr. A. B. Spragge of Spragge and Cameron that searches should be made.

In other words, the lawyers said: "You should make searches to be careful in order that you know what kind of property you are buying."

And I do further acknowledge Messrs. Spragge and Cameron are not responsible for title or anything arising out of the transaction.

Well, having gone that far, I wonder why they bothered to retain lawyers at all. Merely to give them that kind of instruction they might just as well have taken the deeds themselves and registered them themselves and forgotten about it.

In witness thereof the corporate seal of Ontario cheese producers marketing board has been hereunto affixed and attested by the hands of its duly authorized officials.

It is signed "H. C. Arnold, chairman" and it is also signed by Allan B. Spragge, whom I presume is the senior partner of Spragge and Cameron.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, as this matter is discussed through the report, there is a reference to this matter coming before a subsequent executive meeting of the board, and the chairman points out that there has been some question as to whether or not a part of this Oxford landing property is in fact railroad land to which they could not acquire property.

Through this whole document, I have not been able to find the answer. I do not know whether they got a deed to all the land they were supposed to or not; whether the railroad owned part of it or not. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, a most unusual, a most careless, a most irresponsible way of carrying on business of a public body in the province of Ontario, that when they go out and purchase land to the value of \$60,000-odd; when they retain lawyers they so instruct the lawyers to take no action, that they might just as well not have retained the lawyers. Anyone buying a piece of real estate—and farmers above all, Mr. Chairman—would be more knowledgeable and concerned about this than anybody else; would make sure that when they bought a piece of land for which they spent good money, that they would make absolutely certain that they were getting what they bought. And the only way to ascertain this is to have a proper search of the title made.

Somewhere in these minutes, Mr. Chairman, there is a reference to the fact that the colleagues of the chairman on the board thank him and his associate, who is the general manager, for searching the title and they take their advice in regard to it. I do not know what qualifications the chairman of the board may have had for searching a title, or his associates on the board. If they did have any qualifications, this is all to the good, but even so, Mr. Chairman, they are still acting in a public capacity.

If they did have any qualifications and they were prepared to accept their own judgment insofar as their own personal purchases were concerned, all well and good. But they were not dealing with their own money; they were dealing with public money in a very substantial sense, and they had no right at all to take it upon themselves to certify the title, which is, in fact, what they did.

They had the responsibility of going to lawyers and they did go to lawyers—they retained lawyers. They had the responsibility of going to someone who could certify the

title for them. I do not know what they paid the lawyers for this service, but they probably paid them the usual tariff fee which would involve the certification of title, and the responsibility for any faults in the title being transferred from them to the lawyer, but that is not the issue at all.

The issue is in dealing with public money of this sort, I say that this is no way at all to carry on public business and there is no reason at all why this should have continued. I ask the hon. Minister, in regard to this second question, what is he going to do about it?

In addition, if he says it is too late, it is gone, can the hon. Minister tell us with any positiveness today that the board, or on behalf of whoever the property was bought, did in fact get a good title? Does anyone know? Does the railway have any claim to any portion of these lands? Was there a portion of these lands for which a deed was not available? Did anybody get a survey? Did they see that the buildings that were on the land were within the boundaries of those lands and that sort of thing? Was this record followed up? If so, what follow-up steps have been taken?

I think, Mr. Chairman, those questions demand a most clear answer from the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the intrusion of legal advice in the debate on our Department of Agriculture. In connection with this particular matter, it has been of concern, admittedly, as far as we are concerned, to have this report as it has been submitted concerning these two deals covering the purchases of these two properties in the province.

First of all, I would be the first to say that in a strictly legal sense the hon. member for Downsview has a valid point; in effect he is quite correct in what he has said. There should have been a search of the titles, I do not think we would deny that. The tender call perhaps should have been made; but I would like to point out, and this is where my hon. friend and I may differ in our attitudes to accomplishing things as far as rural ways of doing business are concerned.

Mr. Arnold and the cheese board directors, all of them being farmers and rural men, knew the property with which they were dealing. In connection with the erection for the Belleville warehouse, the Spencer firm was widely known as having had a great deal of experience in the construction of cheese plants and cooling areas—curing rooms I should say—and as such the cheese board

sought their advice. I think they were perhaps more interested in getting the advice of Spencer and Company in the construction of the warehouse than they were in calling competitive tenders.

I will admit the foregoing quite frankly. My hon. friend has said that there should have been tenders called, that they were in effect dealing with public money. To a degree it might be considered public money because through legislation they have the right to deduct the levy that builds these warehouses. On the other hand they are responsible to the cheese producers who employ them. As far as our department is concerned we have examined these charges that have been made here, and while we would be the first to admit that the deals were not as orthodox as they might be, we have not found the slightest evidence of any skulduggery on anyone's part and have not found that the cheese producers in any way have not gotten value for their money.

Now, as to the question of the searching of the title for the property that was obtained at the Oxford station plant: I discussed this with Mr. Arnold myself at some length—I have not got the letter which he sent me with me—but in it he sets out, as he did in our verbal conversation, the background of all this.

It had been owned by a family for two generations, I believe, before this purchase was made—by the Sanderson Company—and it was an understood fact that some of it was on railroad property. It had been so constructed for its accessibility to the track. This is common practice for buildings to be constructed on railway property for their accessibility to the railway, there was nothing wrong in this. It had been there for all these years, and while the railway owned the property the company owned the buildings and the man was buying the buildings, not the property.

There is where the difference came in; there was absolutely nothing wrong with it. I suppose in a strict court of law one should have had the thing all set out clearly, but there was really nothing wrong with the deal.

In our loans that are made to co-ops, many of these co-ops have their property—elevators and grain pipes, grain legs and mills—on railway property in order that they have accessibility to the line. Of course there is an agreement, that we asked for with the railway, giving them a 99-year lease for their right to the railway to cover the period of the mortgage that we give them on the co-op vote.

In this particular case, Mr. Arnold told me that as far as the Sandersons were concerned, those buildings had been there for years and had never been any problem. They felt that it was hardly worthwhile, I think he said, spending between \$3,000 and \$4,000 of the cheese producers' money, to search the title and to get the agreement all straightened out and to survey the lot as it was being acquired.

Frankly, our dairy branch people have examined all this and they are perfectly satisfied that there is nothing really wrong. But I have to confess, as I said earlier, that it was something less than an orthodox type of arrangement.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was very interested to hear the hon. Minister's explanation. The hon. Minister said that he is satisfied that there is no skulduggery. I do not think that Mr. Hennessey suggested that there was any skulduggery; he suggested that this was an unusual, or to use the hon. Minister's phrase "an unorthodox," method of procedure.

He said he was satisfied that it was not a bad deal. This may well be; but I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that because of the public nature of this organization that there is no real method of satisfying the people who are participants in the organization that this is the best deal they could have gotten. It may be that the people who built the building built the best building that was possible, in the best and most economical methods; but even the approach of asking two companies to put in tenders and putting them in on a different basis, you cannot compare steel beam construction with cement block construction.

There may have been a dozen companies that would have been anxious to tender and it may have been that the company which finally built the building would have gotten it in any event, but it would seem to me that it should be the rule and not the exception that when public funds are being handled that every step is taken to satisfy those persons who are concerned with that money that their interests are being protected.

I have argued on many occasions that a tender need not necessarily be awarded to the lowest tenderer. There are people on the job, and perhaps the gentleman to whom my hon. friend refers, could say that contractor "Z", who might have put in a tender, is not the sort of fellow we would ever want to build anything for us, even though his tender was the lowest. But they had no opportunity to get a feeling as to what the

position was. Somebody went to MacLaughlin—surely MacLaughlin did not put in a bid out of the air—and they asked him to put in a bid on the basis of steel beam construction, so the price was almost double what the Spencer Company put in. How could anybody really tell?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that unless they are doing business privately they have no right to act in the way they did.

Insofar as the title is concerned, I am more surprised than ever really. My hon. friend tells me that this property was owned by the same family for several generations. He is not a legal man and he would not be aware that one of the most complicated situations you can come across insofar as title to real estate is concerned is when a property has been in the same family for a series of generations; because families have a habit of splitting up and producing all sorts of children who live in all parts of the world, families have a habit of not leaving wills and there are all sorts of complications you can get into when a piece of property is owned by several generations of the same family. I suggest to you that the chairman of this board and his general manager, without looking at the title and without being able to bring legal intelligence to an analysis of the family breakdown, whether the property had been left from A to B in a will, whether the various people who were the nominal head of the family acquired title to it properly, whether there were infant children, whether the official guardian could have been involved; I suggest to you that unless these things were investigated, nobody could be sure—least of all, as far as I can tell, the chairman of the board and his assistant, the general manager—could be possibly aware whether or not the title could have been conveyed to them by the people to whom they gave the money.

Now my hon. friend says, in addition: Yes, there was some railway property involved and there was a building on the railway property. Well, my trite understanding of the law in that regard is that if I build a building on your property, I lose title to it and you gain it. Now, if somebody put a building on the railroad property, it would seem to me that the building belonged to the railroad and not to the people who put the building on it. It would seem to me that that would cause great concern to the milk board, who were paying out the 30-odd thousand dollars to the apparent owner, the representative of the family who had been there for several years.

I would be awfully concerned about paying out money to X, who says yes, do not worry about it, the railroad has that piece of land but the railroad has never bothered me. It may well be that the railroad has a claim against the board, but nobody has bothered to ascertain that.

My hon. friend talks about a 99-year lease. Certainly arrangements might have been made; maybe there was a written lease, maybe there was an unwritten lease. Maybe there was some arrangement with the railroad, but nobody has been able to tell us. My friend the hon. Minister has investigated and he cannot tell us this afternoon. Now insofar as spending \$3,000 or \$4,000, as these minutes unfold, it seems to me there were two parts to the purchase. The total price paid for the Uxbridge station property was \$60,000, which is broken down into two parts, \$32,000-odd for the property, and \$27,000-odd for the equipment.

Insofar as the legal fees are concerned, the tariff in the county of York—and I would not imagine it is too different from the tariff in this county, which is the county of Grenville—is one and a quarter per cent of the purchase price and if you figure out one and a quarter per cent of \$30,000, you have got \$400 at the most. How did you get up to \$3,000 or \$4,000 for the legal fee? If you can get that job done in Toronto for something under \$500, why is it going to cost \$3,000 or \$4,000 in the county of Grenville?

The story that my friend tells, just does not hold water. I would be very concerned today, if a client of mine owned a piece of property which might have come through several generations, and there might be all sorts of relatives all over the world claiming bits and pieces, and where somebody thinks that a particular building which they thought they purchased is on railroad property and the railroad does not worry about it—I would be very, very concerned about it. And I would suggest this was a thorough-going bad deal. There is no way of explaining this, even at this late date, other than for the hon. Minister to take the advice of Mr. Hennessey, take over trusteeship of this board, have the trustee, whoever he is, go in and hire a lawyer and get him to look at the title and see if he cannot clear it up.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are three topics I would like to raise in this vote, and the first is the one that has been under discussion.

I think the hon. Minister has let it be clearly known in the House that he does not defend what went on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He does not what?

Mr. MacDonald: He does not defend what went on in the way of unorthodox business procedures, and this raises a point that I would like to emphasize, because I think we are heading for trouble if we do nothing more than we have done up until now. There was a great deal of indignation in farm circles—in dairy circles, not just restricted to cheese producers—with regard to what they felt was Professor Hennessey's straying from his original terms of reference of dealing with marketing, when he went off onto administrative procedures. There may be something in this!

However, I think the basic point is that one runs into serious danger if one begins to operate a public business in the same fashion as one might, or as one is entitled to run it, as an individual. Now the hon. Minister said farmers and rural folk have certain ways of doing things and sometimes they get it done just as well—it does not cost any more, and so on. This is true. There is many a problem solved by bale wire back on the farm, that is not very defensible if you want to examine it in a strictly scientific or mechanical way, but it gets done, but I do not think this approach is going to solve the problem.

For example, I remember years ago when we got into quite a tangle in this House with regard to unorthodox business procedures in the Niagara parks commission, and the Prime Minister of the day said: "Well let us not get too excited, you see, down in the Niagara peninsula everybody considers the Niagara parks commission as a family business, sort of a family affair."

Well, it is all very fine to run a family business as a family business, but if it is a public concern, you are going to get into difficulties. Indeed, there was a gentleman by the name of Gordon Laverne, who ran the city of Eastview as though it were a family business, and I would like anybody on the other side of the House to get up and defend what happened there when he ran city affairs like he ran his haberdashery, on sort of a Harry S. Truman approach of do as you are inclined each day, to meet the problems of the day, so that the money out of the parking meters was put in a drawer and used for pretty cash and so on.

I do not think this can be tolerated and I do not think it should be tolerated even in the instance of the cheese board. I say this, out of an interest for the people involved in the cheese board, rather than being critical of them. They are going to get into serious trouble if they pursue this kind of unorthodox

procedure, and they have enough problems in marketing cheese without getting into the cross-currents of this kind of a battle, and the suggestion that they should be put under trusteeship.

Indeed, I put this question to the hon. Minister. We have had many an argument, the hon. Minister and I, as to the validity of the Ontario farm products marketing board, moving in on the day-to-day operations of a local marketing board. And the hon. Minister has come to the conclusion since that iniquitous bill of yesteryear, that it is the right of the marketing board to move in and dictate how money shall be spent, how it shall be raised, and how the marketing board shall proceed.

The thing that puzzles me is, why did the marketing board in this instance not intervene; because even I would be on the hon. Minister's side on this kind of a thing. When any marketing body begins to operate a public body as though it were its own little family farm, and follows what the hon. Minister described as unorthodox business procedures, then I think it would be very legitimate for the Ontario farm products marketing board—since presumably they follow the business closely enough to be aware of this—to step in and say: Do not get yourself into unnecessary trouble; if you are going to build a building, call tenders in the way that is normally done when you are handling public funds.

I am curious to know whether or not the Ontario farm products marketing board was aware of this; if they were not, why they were not, and if they were aware of it, why they did not, in effect, exercise the powers that this government saw fit to give them, in intervening in this instance, to get this organization back onto normal procedures.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in connection with the jurisdiction of the farm products marketing board, the board has nothing to do with this particular case. This came under the jurisdiction of the milk industry board—this is a cheese marketing board. Now, I do not say that critically, it is just a matter of jurisdiction.

Mr. MacDonald: Have they the same powers? They have.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They certainly, I think, would have the same powers if they were to exercise them. Now, as for the matter that has been raised here, as mentioned earlier by the hon. member for Downsview—that this in effect should not have really happened

without the proper steps having been taken—with this I would have to agree. On the other hand it was done and accomplished before it ever came to the attention of the milk industry board.

I am advised by the dairy commissioner that an examination was made of everything that had been done, and it appears, having been a fait accompli, that there was little that could be done. There appeared to be no real harm done to anybody and there was no indication that somebody got a payoff, or anything like this and so we just let the matter rest.

I would have to agree that perhaps the milk industry board should have moved in this particular instance and said, "No, we are going to negate the deal until everything is cleared up to everyone's satisfaction and is legally done." This may have cleared up some things that the hon. member for Downsview raised. It is quite a legitimate argument.

On the other hand if we had required this board to spend a certain number of dollars, whatever it may be—and Mr. Arnold advises me it would have been over \$3,000—to have done all the things that were suggested—this may be a debatable figure, it might have been more, it might have been less, I do not know, but whatever the figure may be, the cheese producers marketing board would have been required to foot the bill. And if everything had turned out to be in order, as we think it is, and they had had to pay the bill, somebody would have turned around and said, "Well, that is what your milk industry board does, it causes us to pay good money out for no particular reason."

I agree with my hon. friend that some of us in the country may be used to doing things in a more or less haphazard way; we get things accomplished and it is our own business if we fail or if we lose. But certainly when it is public business you have to do things in a different way, so there is no argument there. But on the other hand, I do not think there is a great deal more that can be done. I would point out to the hon. member that while it is recommended in the Hennessy report that a trusteeship be established to take over the operation of the Ontario cheese producers marketing board, there does not exist under the present Milk Industry Act the authority to do just that. But that authority does exist in The Farm Products Marketing Act, and I point out the jurisdictional difference.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, just as a final comment on this. Personally, I would not go as far as the hon. member for

Downsview in saying that it should be a trusteeship, I think this is a cure that is almost worse than the disease. I agree that I do not think any conflict of interest, or anything unsavoury took place in this instance, it is just business practice that should not be repeated, and perhaps a reading of this debate by all concerned, and some exercise by the milk commission in the future—because this body would fall under that jurisdiction—will meet the situation.

The second point that I wanted to raise, Mr. Chairman, in this vote is that I was very interested when we had testimony before the standing committee on the milk bill, to listen to Mr. Laverne Dymont, the president of the whole milk league, make a plea for sound quality regulations and strict enforcement of them with regard to fluid milk.

I assume that if the president of the whole milk league comes before the government in the standing committee and says they want sound quality regulations and strict enforcement, he is doing this because he feels that the regulations are perhaps not all they should be at the moment, or the enforcement is perhaps not all that it should be at the moment. Otherwise, I do not know why he would raise the issue at the present time. Clearly his plea was motivated by discussions revolving around the new milk bill.

I come back to this because when I was speaking on second reading, I made the suggestion to the hon. Minister that there may well be up to ten per cent—and I said “up to ten per cent”—of the present fluid producers who were not really meeting the standards and the hon. Minister for one moment got out his little soap box and delivered a political speech to the effect that the consumers of the province of Ontario could be assured that they had milk that was of the highest quality, and so on.

Now, let us deal with the facts, Mr. Chairman, and I know that when I am presenting this it is a matter of interest not only among members of the whole milk league, but among some officials of his own department. I will not name them and thereby embarrass either them or the hon. Minister, but what are the facts?

I was interested to discover that last year there were 103,515 bacteria samples taken and tested; 84.62 per cent graded 1; 8.81 per cent graded 2; 4.6 per cent graded 3; 1.96 per cent graded 4. So you had 5.56 per cent of those tested below the level that is tolerable and, therefore, they were cut off.

Now 5.6 per cent of 10,000 farmers is 560. Indeed, the further figures I got from

the hon. Minister's department, figures that are public information, is that 265 were shut off—and another 11 because their premises did not meet the standards.

I think I would like to have the hon. Minister's comment now, with the political podium set aside, on why the whole milk league is asking for some quality regulations and stricter enforcement; and whether or not it may not be true that if we are looking for opportunities to integrate concentrated milk producers who are producing grade A milk into the pool—into the top price—that there is not an area here of people who are now in it but who should be forced out under these regulations. I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to speak on this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am shocked to think anyone would think I would climb up on a political soap box. I have never done that.

I would like to say this in connection with these points the hon. member has raised. First of all, this is a resazurin test and I assume this is a report of the resazurin tests. This includes the heating of milk, as I understand it, after it is cooled.

I think one of the things that has happened is that our bulk tanks cool milk so quickly and bring it down to such a temperature level that you cannot get an accurate test. So they re-heat it, bring it up and activate some of the bacteria that might be there so it will show up in the test. So it is a very strict test, much more strict and accurate than that pertaining to some other classes of milk. I think it is an indication of the very, very high quality of milk that is provided in the province of Ontario.

In connection with this 5.5 per cent—I believe that was the figure the hon. member raised—which had been turned down, or where they had to correct the situation before they could ship again. This may only have been a temporary affair for a day or two. I have known of some cases where something has gone wrong and the farm owner himself could not find the reason.

I can think of one particular herd where a very great problem developed, and it is probably one of the finest milk-producing farms in the province of Ontario. Yet a problem developed on that farm, and it took a great deal of research to finally locate what the trouble was. It turned out to be a feed problem, of all things.

So you see, there are things that can develop that will shut a man off from access to the market; that may be of a purely

temporary nature and does not necessarily mean that he generally produces a low quality of milk.

I would not for a minute suggest that there are not some farms in Ontario where perhaps they are producing milk that is not of the quality that we would like it to be. Our Ontario Department of Agriculture dairy branch is taking over from the various health units across the province who were charged previously with the responsibility of administering quality standards on the various farms. We have seen that their standards were somewhat different to the standards of The Department of Agriculture, and they are coming up to our standards now.

But here again I think we must recognize that it is a process of development, education and showing reasons why these things should be done, and always bearing in mind that it is a quality product that engenders confidence and further sale of the product. So while these points that my hon. friend raised are valid to a degree, I still go back to the statement that the consumer public of the province of Ontario are offered a very high quality and a very safe product to use.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not disputing for a moment that they are not generally in the overwhelming majority getting it, but it is just this thin edge of danger. Indeed, this test must be a pretty strict one because grade 2 is acceptable, and after you have been shut off, I understand you have to get back to grade 1 before they put you back on again. There must be a margin of error there beyond which there is no danger, otherwise, I am certain that the dairy branch would not be tolerating it.

There is a third point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to raise with the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, before you go on to another point, my deputy advises me that the dairy commissioner has suggested to him that in this connection, because there were some who could not correct, or who would not correct—whichever may be the case—there were at least 277 producers who were shut off completely from the fluid market last year. So that is an indication of the effectiveness of the testing programme, and the teeth that are really in the Act that says, "Produce quality or else."

Mr. MacDonald: I thank the hon. Minister for that, because he now really underlines the point that I was going to say later, that he has shut off 277, and that opens the doors to 277 concentrated producers of grade

1 milk who can come right in. Whether or not you can do that every year I do not know, but as Laverne Dymont is saying that he wants sound quality regulations and strict enforcement, I read that as suggesting he thinks there may be 277 each year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think the point that we want to be sure about though, is that this milk is not reaching the market; that it is being shut right off.

Mr. MacDonald: The third point that I want to raise, Mr. Chairman, flows out of the milk bill, but I think it is a policy issue. I raised it before, but the hon. Minister evaded any comment on it. I think it is a point that should be brought out. I do not use the word "evaded" in any nasty sense; he just missed replying to that one question among many that I gave him.

I am informed that in British Columbia, in the Fraser valley, after some years of negotiation the milk producers there did succeed in getting Ottawa to contribute to their pool a certain amount of money. This, in effect, goes into the fluid milk pool and assisted in bringing in grade A producers who were not in the fluid milk pool to begin with.

Now, if I can illustrate my point: If we are faced with the problem in the establishment of the new milk set-up here and the pool—if I can use that term that there seems to be a tendency to shy away from a bit—but if we are faced with a situation in which, across the board, approximately 70 per cent of the milk produced by the full milk league membership is getting top price and 30 per cent is going into manufacturing, if you can get Ottawa to contribute to that pool so that you have a 60-40 basis, that means that you can bring in pretty quickly—you can hasten the process of bringing in—concentrated producers. It will not mean any more out of the pocket of Ottawa because if they remain as concentrated producers they are eligible for a subsidy.

Would the hon. Minister indicate whether or not, since this kind of an arrangement has been worked out in British Columbia, we are pursuing it to get the same kind of a subsidy into our grade 1, grade A milk pool here, as the new commission is established and gets under operation, so that it will hasten, in an orderly way, the bringing in of the grade A shippers without wrecking the market for those who are in it now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I welcome what the hon. member has said. This is a point of difference that we have with the

present Ottawa government. The Ottawa government does pay to the British Columbia pool a subsidy on surplus milk over and above the ratio of surplus fluid milk that pertains in Ontario and Quebec. Why they chose us I do not know, but they seem to use us as a barometer for their payments in British Columbia. There is now 28.5 per cent surplus; so they will not pay on the first 28 per cent surplus in British Columbia, but on any over and above that they do pay into the British Columbia pool. It is complicated, but this, I understand, is the policy in British Columbia.

When we were in Ottawa on numerous occasions we discussed this very point before we brought in the new Milk Act here. We have not yet agreed on it. We would like the Ottawa government to pay to the pool that would be established in Ontario, through the marketing board under the commission, a subsidy on surplus milk production that would be used for manufacturing purposes; but they have not agreed to do this as yet.

We feel frankly that they should do this. I welcome what the hon. member has said because he has agreed completely with the arguments that we have advanced at Ottawa along this line. I think if they would, it would hasten the day when we could bring in many more of the top quality manufactured milk shippers in Ontario. But until we have that assurance from Ottawa, it puts us in a position of jeopardy, as I see it, to let in a huge flow of milk that is not already in the fluid market. As I said earlier in debates in the House, one can only sell so much fluid milk in Ontario. We can try to increase it, but we do not want to get ourselves into a position where we pull the whole market down for everybody.

This is a point, as I say, that we are trying to work out. I am hopeful that something satisfactory will be worked out but Ottawa's argument has been that Ontario and Quebec are where the manufacturing industry is centred really. We have the facilities to produce here and perhaps this is where that milk production should remain, but they said there should be a substantial price paid for manufacturing milk; with this I must agree.

I think the real problem is this. If that price for manufactured milk could be raised up to where it becomes satisfactory to the manufacturing milk producer, then I think he is going to lose some of his enthusiasm for getting over into the fluid market. This is something I hope—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, let me say this in conclusion: On the assumption that

the people at Ottawa are completely reasonable and on the assumption that Harry Hays is really interested in stabilizing the dairy industry in this province—on the first assumption I am not completely convinced, but on the second, I am.

I do not know why Ottawa would hesitate. As I understand it, and the hon. Minister has given me one more wrinkle on it, a new sort of medium—I did not realize that they calculated milk subsidies as they calculate Dominion-provincial grants, they do it on the basis of Ontario being the yardstick, this is a new revelation—but on the assumption that this is the case, then Ottawa is not going to be out of pocket.

It is a case of instead of giving it to people who are considered to be concentrated milk producers, they would give it to a pool which will enable concentrated milk producers to come into the pool, as I understand it. Therefore, it would seem to me that it would just help to stabilize the whole dairy industry, which is the publicly expressed objective of the hon. Harry Hays. I would think that the hon. Minister and Harry Hays should go to a barbecue and get some of the famous "kickaboo juice" that they had at the barbecue out in Alberta and settle this little point quickly without any further delay.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You will have to get another Minister of Agriculture; he will not drink it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): I would like to ask the hon. Minister one or two questions about the dairy branch. Previously, in a discussion on the responsibilities of the new milk commission that would be constituted by the bill before the Legislature and its relationship with the field men named in the commission, the hon. Minister said that he felt the commission itself had to be made up of civil servants because those working for them would have civil servant capacities. I understand, in my reading of Mr. Hennessey's report, that he recommended that those doing the field work in the dairy branch would be transferred to the jurisdiction of the commission. I would like the hon. Minister, if he would, to clear that point up for us.

Second, I was wondering what provision has been made in these estimates for meeting the cost of the commission as it would gradually come into being in the year ahead? I realize that this is up perhaps \$180,000 over last year—I am not sure of the exact amount—but whether this would meet the increased costs as envisaged by the Act is something of which I am not sure. I would

appreciate it if the hon. Minister would give us some information on this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: First of all, I may be guilty for the misunderstanding the hon. member has concerning the entire composition of the milk commission being civil servants. If I left that impression, it is a wrong one. I have said that the chairman of the milk commission should be a civil servant, but not necessarily the members, Mr. Chairman.

As far as the transfer of the dairy branch staff is concerned, Professor Hennessey did recommend that in his report. We intend to implement this. The dairy branch staff will be, in effect, the arm of the milk commission, but they will still be retained as civil servants because I think we cannot divorce our responsibility to the dairy industry. When you come into the matter of inspection, as was mentioned and discussed a few moments ago, we get into pretty vital points that I think must be under the jurisdiction of this Legislature and under the Minister responsible to the House and the public.

The other point the hon. member raised was on the funds to administer this. The general idea of the new Milk Act is that it become self-supporting as soon as possible, but in this transitional period there will be necessity for funds. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that when we drafted the estimates, this was done last fall before we had the report submitted even. We have not got enough funds, admittedly, for this transitional period. So I would propose, with the concurrence of the House, Mr. Chairman, that we would introduce an amendment to the House in committee stage providing for an amendment in The Milk Act to pay funds out of the consolidated revenue fund for the transitional period. Now it only amounts to a few thousand dollars in our estimate, about \$30,000, in addition to what is covered here. It may not be necessary to even use that, but we wanted to have it included. I appreciate my hon. friend raising the question.

Mr. Nixon: There was also some reference in the milk report, we might as well apply it wherever possible since it is now available, that in the dairy branch itself there was not sufficient staff to accomplish the inspections that would be necessary. He made some reference to the staffing in the dairy branch and he felt that there had been some considerable difficulty in the period under which he had the opportunity to observe it in operation. Would the hon. Minister say that this

difficulty had been corrected, or would he wait for the transition to correct it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have taken on eight new inspectors since the beginning of 1965, this spring. As you know, last spring we took on a group of inspectors. We have taken on another group now, and as the need continues we will have to expand the service. But I would think that with the general acceptance of, and the educational programme that is going on towards, the improvement of quality standards on the various farms there may not necessarily be the need for increasing that inspection staff.

I think once you reach a satisfactory standard, then it is a matter of just following that standard. But, as I say, we have increased the staff, and this year we have 76 inspectors compared to 45 in 1962. That is quite a sizeable increase.

Mr. Nixon: Mind you, that change in staff was accompanied by the assumption of considerably more responsibility. Dairies used to have this responsibility, and the municipalities to a lesser extent.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a couple of questions on this vote. Two years ago, I believe, the department instigated the quality cream control programme. It started out as a pilot project at that time, and I believe it was extended last year. I would just like to ask my hon. friend if he intends to extend this right across the province in the coming years.

The second point that I want to deal with is in connection with the mastitis programme. Mastitis, of course, as we all know, is very costly to the farmers in this province, indeed, across Canada. I believe that the figures are something like \$25 million to \$30 million in terms of cost to the farmer, certainly a very sizeable chunk of money in anybody's language.

I would like to ask my hon. friend if he has anything planned, in addition to what is already being done, to control this disease further. I am thinking in terms of research, or any other programme that he might have in mind in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In reply to the first question concerning cream quality, this pilot project was so successful that it is being broadened across the province in other areas, so that it will become more effective. It is done on the same basis as the cream producers contributing toward the cost of this quality programme, and I want to pay tribute to the Ontario cream producers marketing

board for what they have done to improve their own position.

The quality improvement of cream has lent itself to the greatly improved quality of butter being produced. In fact, one of the creameries in the area where the quality programme was in effect, had the grand champion lot of butter in one of the recent exhibitions here, an international exhibition. This gives one an indication of the effectiveness of the programme. This is being extended across Ontario in the chief cream producing areas. So it is a most satisfactory programme, a most rewarding programme, and I pay public compliment to those who are associated with it.

With regard to the mastitis control project, this is one that should rightfully come up in the veterinary services branch, but I do not hesitate to deal with it here. If you would like to raise it when we get there, it will be fine.

Mr. Gaunt: Whatever you wish.

Vote 104 agreed to.

On vote 105:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on vote 105, just a word about the services rendered by our agricultural representatives at the county level. You will notice, if you will glance at the first page of the estimates, a large number of associations supported by the government. As well as these, there are many organizations associated with agriculture in every community.

I do not know whether it is true with every agricultural representative—I believe it is—that they wind up acting as secretaries of countless organizations in the community, and night after night, particularly during the wintertime, they are at annual meetings or other meetings of these various associations.

Frankly, I think if this can be financed, it is a good thing. There is somebody in the community with a continuing interest in agriculture, who more or less can co-relate the activities and projects right through the list.

On the other hand, it is a trial that must be almost more than bearable for some of the agricultural representatives. And it seems to me that it would be worthwhile having some sort of study done, in order to determine whether their time might not better be used in working with the farmers in the field, rather than having to accept this almost overwhelming responsibility.

I know in many cases, certainly in our case in Brant, both sides of the job are done very well indeed. As a matter of fact, our own

agricultural representative has taken the opportunity to travel abroad, and to the United States, looking at farm conditions, and in his spare time, he and his wife go around speaking to a number of groups, some not even closely associated with agriculture. He is a salesman for the industry in the very best sense, as well as being very useful and effective in all of his other responsibilities.

But it does appear to me that we are perhaps asking these men to do more than they should. If we were to restrict their duties along one line, they might be more effective.

I wonder if the department has made any survey of this problem—if it is a problem—and if the hon. Minister has a comment he would like to make.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the comments made by the hon. member for Brant, because I could not agree with him more. I believe that our agricultural representatives have been used too extensively by a good many organizations as secretaries—I am thinking of breed organizations and this kind of thing.

Now, we cannot apply this philosophy right across the board and say they should resign all secretaryships, because I feel that they should continue as secretaries in certain organizations to which they should belong, such as the crop improvement association and the beef improvement association. These are co-ordinating responsibilities. But when they become secretary of breed organizations within a county or an area or region, within the province, then I think they are being asked to assume responsibilities that, as you so well say, might be well assumed by so other prominent agriculturalist within the area, who has certainly the ability to do this kind of secretarial work.

We feel, in fact, we have already advised our agricultural representatives to cut down on this secretarial work, this extra work that they have assumed over the past insofar as it is possible to do, as quickly as they can do this.

I would like to express my appreciation on behalf of the department for the compliment the hon. member for Brant has paid, Mr. Chairman, to the agricultural representatives—the image they have created and the prestige they have brought to the agricultural field. I am not altogether opposed to them spending time with urban groups, and with others not directly related to agriculture in order that a proper and basic concept of agriculture as it pertains in this year 1965, should be brought to the attention of people in all walks of life.

Vote 105 agreed to.

Vote 106 agreed to.

On vote 107:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, on vote 107, there is a matter which I wish to raise under this vote, one of which the hon. Minister has already had notice, through the Speaker the other day, in connection with the farm products inspection. It is the matter that was raised in the investigation into FAME, and in the *Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, May 26, we have this statement:

The F. W. Fearman Co. Ltd. meat-packing plant in Burlington was losing money on its daily operations because it was giving the consumer too much of a break—by trimming too much fat off its meat, and not using enough brine to give it extra weight, a Royal commission was told yesterday.

Mr. Bourdon said he found the Fearman plant was trimming too much fat off meat compared with the Quebec plant and other firms, where he had worked for 24 years before joining the Quebec co-operative. He said the Fearman plant was not injecting enough brine into the meat, which adds to the weight.

"You mean, they were giving the customers too much of a break?" M. A. Craig, commission counsel asked.

"Yes," Mr. Bourdon replied.

He estimated the Fearman operation would realize—

the rest perhaps is not relevant here.

The question I would like to put to the hon. Minister is the significance of this statement regarding adding to the weight by pumping brine into the meat. We have heard of this for some time and here we have a statement that is being made that this is a general practice, evidently, in the meat-packing industry. Prices are thereby raised because the weight is raised, and this particular plant evidently was not doing this and was thereby giving the customers a break. Here it seems to me is a place where we ought to have some clarity by the hon. Minister as to what this means and whether it is a bad policy; and if it is a bad policy, then what steps are being taken to change it? There may be some justification for this practice, perhaps the hon. Minister could comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, this was the question that was asked the other day. I had the answer all typed out, put it in some

of these files and am blessed if I can put my hand on it. I will have to speak from memory.

First of all this is a matter that does not fall within the jurisdiction of The Ontario Department of Agriculture. The matter of the injection of brine into meat falls within the purview of the food and drug inspection service at Ottawa as far as residual amounts are concerned.

But I think to preface this discussion we must recognize that the treatment of fresh pork in a brine solution goes back, as long as memory goes back almost, to the various methods of treatment that have been used to preserve pork, and this is just another one.

The old method was that it was soaked in a brine solution in barrels for a period of days and then it was taken out. It was either sold in what was known as the pickled state or the fresh brine solution state. Some of it was rolled in peameal bacon and sold as fresh peameal roll; some of it was cooked and sold as cooked meat after it had come out of the brine solution. In some cases the weight may have been increased by the soaking in the brine, in cases where it was cooked the weight was greatly decreased.

In any event, The Meat Inspection Act of Canada provides that meat sold for public consumption that is treated with a brine solution, or cured pork as it were, must be so treated. In fact, the regulations are set out pertaining to this and the slaughterer or slaughterhouse operator has no choice but to do it according to those regulations.

This matter of injecting brine into the meat by method of syringe or needle injection, as they call it, is a new procedure which has just been developed in the relatively last few years, I believe, and it works quite effectively. It reduces the amount of time taken to soak the product in brine to effect the proper curing and it, the injection, spreads the brine throughout the pork and renders it fit for human consumption. This is all done, as I said, under strict supervision of The Canada Meat Inspection Act and the residual content is under the inspection and control of the food and drug branch of the federal government.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I might just add to this.

The hon. Minister explains the process and I quite agree that it may be a new and better process than the old soaking method which we knew years ago. But the inference here in this investigation is that the co-operative was doing this, but injecting enough brine in order to preserve the meat and make it palatable but not injecting as much as other

plants were injecting and thereby giving the consumer a break. Other plants were injecting more than they needed to in order to raise weight, this is the inference here. I quite agree that this process might be legitimate and proper, but surely this inference that comes out of this investigation is one that ought to be looked at by the Canadian people, whether at this government level or at the federal level.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, before this vote is passed, I do not want to let that go by because the inference here is that one company was not using as much as another. Now on what is said in the press statement, really, the opposite meaning could be taken.

I have not got the clipping before me, but I read it very carefully and as I recall, what happened was that the losses of the Fearman company as related by Mr. Bourdon had been cut from \$11,000 a week to, what was it, \$3,500 a week, after this man took over and his process had been implemented. I think this was grossly exaggerated, quite frankly, as far as the effects are concerned. If one were to read that article, as it says in that press release—and I am only quoting from memory—they would think that what was said is just the opposite to what my hon. friend has said, that the co-operative itself was gypping the public. This is not the case, nor is it the case with any other meat packing plant. The fact remains that the amount of brine that is in the pork is inserted into it first of all for curing purposes as well as for disease control. It must conform to a certain standard, there must be a certain amount of it; and residual amounts are subject to the control and inspection of the food and drug. I really do not think there is any great problem here, nor would I suggest for a moment that the public is being gouged by any packing company.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I just call to the hon. Minister's attention the words upon which I based the question. I will read them again:

He said the Fearman plant was not injecting enough brine into the meat, which adds to the weight.

"You mean they were giving the customers too much of a break?" M. A. Craig, commission counsel asked.

"Yes," Mr. Bourdon replied.

That is all. Now, the Minister has given an explanation, I presume, which he thinks is justified.

Vote 107 agreed to.

On vote 108:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 108, we have had considerable discussion so far with this department on the legitimate role of the government in conjunction with farmers and their marketing to build the facilities for more effective marketing and stabilizing the market. When I raised this in connection with my comments on FAME, the hon. Minister interjected and said that his counterpart in Nova Scotia had said that they had lost a great deal of money. I told the hon. Minister I did not have the document at that time but I have it now. I think once and for all we should lay the half-truths and the rumours with regard to exactly what has happened in another jurisdiction as a legitimate example of government assistance or co-operation with the producers.

In the instance of the Nova Scotia Co-operative Abattoir Limited, the finances were as follows: Share capital subscribed by farmers, approximately \$570,000; share capital subscribed by the Nova Scotia government in cash, \$200,000; loan by the Nova Scotia government in the form of a mortgage at five per cent, \$1 million; bank guarantee by the Nova Scotia government, \$340,000—that is simply underwriting some credit need, that might conceivably be for working capital. Indeed, later on in a document here which has spelled out the whole operation and background, there is a portion which I would like to read into the record:

In 1957 a new formula was worked out between the government and the producers. The government of the province would provide \$3 for every \$1 of the farmer money up to \$1.2 million in the form of \$200,000 in share capital and \$1 million of a loan in the form of a mortgage, providing the farmers subscribed \$400,000 in share capital, which must be cash, and three months in which to do it. The challenge was accepted by the farmers, and before the limit had expired they had raised \$570,000 in cash instead of the \$400,000 that they had been challenged by.

A building committee, composed of government and farm representations, was set up, and the building was built and equipped at a cost of approximately \$1,200,000. Operations began in August of 1960.

The first four years of operation resulted in considerable losses. It should be understood this was expected due to several factors. One, not one man in Nova Scotia had any previous experience in an abattoir. Two, getting new equipment to perform

properly. Three, to produce and market a high quality product—

and so on. They give a number of reasons which are not particularly relevant here:

Predictions were that we would have to operate for at least five years with losses or until livestock receipts reached a figure of 1,000 hogs per week and 200 cattle. After four and a half years of operation, with an average of 800 hogs and 120 cattle, we will break even and show a small profit for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1965.

Another section of the report points out that the result of this whole thing is that hog production in Nova Scotia had virtually disappeared. Establishment of their own plant has tended to increase the production, so that while in 1958 it was 21,000, by 1965 it is at the rate of 78,000 to 80,000 for the year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I ask the hon. member the date of that report?

Mr. MacDonald: Of recent weeks. It was prepared by somebody in connection with the Nova Scotia Co-operative Abattoir Limited, and was received by people up in Ontario—I was among them—who have heard varying comments as to what the system was, and I have inquired on a number of occasions.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member does not know who wrote that?

Mr. MacDonald: No, I am not sure exactly who wrote it. But it was the president, or one of the officials of the co-op plant.

Now, one final point later on in this memorandum. I would be glad to show it to the hon. Minister as a matter of fact.

The government of Nova Scotia has lost no money to date on this project. We have paid the interest to date on the loan, \$50,000 annually, and met all other obligations.

So the simple fact of the matter is, that it is true the co-op lost money for the first four-and-a-half years, but they knew this was going to happen. They are now into a position of being in the black, but in the meantime, the government has lost no money at all.

So I think this should be borne in mind as we come to a further consideration of the FAME situation in Ontario at the appropriate time after a report has come down.

The hon. Minister may have a comment

on that, but before I sit down I would like to read one other question as a footnote to our discussions on the bean board, which has been pretty extended and detailed up until now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will answer that first one before we get into the other one. They are two separate matters.

I appreciate the sincerity with which my hon. friend has read this report and I am quite sure he believes it, but frankly I cannot believe it for the simple reason that it is not signed by anyone. There is no name on this at all. I gather there even is not a date on it. I read it, as I listened to the hon. member, as four-and-a-half-years operation predicted, not an actual reality—

Mr. MacDonald: No, no, they started in 1960.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, but it is predicted by March 30, 1965 such and so would happen. Whether it has actually happened or not, I do not think the report makes clear. I may have misunderstood this, but I gathered that it had not, that it was only a prediction.

I do not know how one assesses these things. I made the statement the other day in the House that this plant had cost the government of Nova Scotia half-a-million dollars a year since it opened. Well, it may not be right, but I do not know whose word one takes—the word of someone who does not even sign his name to a report, or the word of the Minister of Agriculture of the province of Nova Scotia?

I discussed this matter with the Minister from Nova Scotia when he was here last fall and went into it in some detail with him, and I can tell you that it was a matter of very great concern to him, as a liability against the government of Nova Scotia, not only from the standpoint of the capital investment which they had, but of the cost of operating the plant, and the money it was costing them year by year to keep the doors open on that plant. There was no hesitancy whatever on his part in saying this to me.

Now, I have not got it backed up and confirmed in writing at all, but I said to him: "Well, the time may come when I may have to say this." And he said: "Well, you are perfectly at liberty to say this. You have discussed this with me, and this is the case as it pertains in Nova Scotia."

My deputy reminds me that I talked to him by telephone this spring and I did, when this problem was in everyone's mind and the Nova Scotia example was held up to me by

certain people in Ontario as something that I should be doing. I called him personally and re-confirmed the conversation we had had last year and I asked: "Actually, is this the case?" And he said: "It is indeed the case." Now all I have to go by is what he told me. What my hon. friend has read is news to me, and I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, news I cannot quite accept.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister can take my word for it that at the moment it can be accepted. These are memoranda that were covered by a letter. I was not given a copy of the letter, but the letter is from, I believe, the president of the co-op, or certainly some authoritative official in the co-op.

On the point that the hon. Minister tried to throw doubt on, I do not think there is any validity for him to suggest that, because that paragraph reads as follows:

After four-and-a-half years of operation, with an average of 800 hogs and 120 cattle, we will break even and show a small profit for the fiscal year ending April 30, 1965.

The four-and-a-half years of operation was some time in 1964. They reached it at that period and began to break even. They were predicting—and did, I assume, because this is since the end of May—a small profit at the end of April in 1965.

If I may, just to be completely fair with the hon. Minister, I should read the last two paragraphs:

I might add further, the government of Nova Scotia has recognized the work of the Nova Scotia co-operative abattoir in the increased returns to farmers, the development of a livestock industry and it means the general level of the economy of our province . . . In fact, I am prepared to say that they have taken a real statesman-like approach to the whole project, and I am sure they would be prepared to support it to a much greater extent than in the past.

This is very greatly appreciated by the farmers of Nova Scotia. You will recognize how closely the government, The Department of Agriculture and the farmers have worked together on this deal. I am convinced this is the only way to get things done.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Who signed that?

Mr. MacDonald: I told you that for the moment I cannot give you the name because it was on an accompanying letter, a copy of

which I have not got. But this is the memorandum reviewing the history up until the present time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I cannot accept an unsigned letter. That is all there is to it. Anyone could write that letter.

Mr. Oliver: It is all right for my hon. friend to say he cannot accept an unsigned letter, but what I would like to ask my hon. friend is, what sort of a case has he been building up for the last ten minutes or so? Is he trying to suggest that because there was a possibility of financial involvement by the Nova Scotia government, and perhaps even a loss of some stature, that that provides a basic and an immovable reason why my hon. friend's government would not put any money behind a co-operative organization which seeks to start a packing house industry in this province? Surely that is not what my hon. friend is arguing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no relationship, nor does anything I have said bear any relationship to anything else that may pertain in my hon. friend's estimation. I am dealing purely with the Nova Scotia situation, because it has been held up to us as a money-making project and something that the government of Ontario should do. I simply relate to the hon. members the facts as they were related to me through at least two discussions pertaining to this particular plant, and this is all I have to say.

Mr. Oliver: My hon. friend will appreciate that governments in the past in the same straits in which he belongs did back a co-operative packing venture in this province. The Copako at Barrie, for instance. I believe a loan was given by the Conservative government of the day of some \$100,000 at least to that company, and the fact that that loan was given was, I think, the lever which brought that company into a position where today it is an outstanding co-operative company, and doing a good job for the people of this province. So I hope we are not going to get into the position where we rule out any financial support for these organizations on the part of the government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I already mentioned a \$100,000 loan, the same loan that was given to Copako—

Mr. Oliver: But those were different days—30 years ago and now is quite a difference.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The very same loan.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, there is a specific area of this vote on which I should like to make a few comments, and that is the subject to which both the hon. member for Huron-Bruce and the hon. member for York South made reference in their general statements following the introductory remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture last week, and to which the hon. Minister made a most suitable reply. I refer to the Ontario bean growers marketing board.

It is appropriate, I believe, for me to present certain views to the House because in the riding of Huron, which I am proud and privileged to represent and which comprises the southern two-thirds of Huron county, the production of white beans constitutes one of the principal cash crops in this farming area of Ontario. In fact, it is safe to say, in the comparative sense, that Huron is now the largest producing area for this important cash crop in Ontario, indeed in all Canada. The 1964 acreage figures showed Huron with 25,840 acres, followed by Kent county with 24,000 acres. While the production is spread both north and east, the southern portion of Huron would still account for the major volume of production.

It is also a matter of interest that production has increased in Canada—with by far the major percentage in Ontario—from just over 26,000 tons in 1954 to more than 50,000 tons in the last production year of 1964; approximately double in the last 10 years.

Another important feature, and one worthy of note, is that while domestic consumption has remained fairly constant for the past four years, ranging between approximately 33,000 and 37,000 tons, export sales have risen sharply from 3,300 to 14,000 tons in the four-year period 1960 to 1964. In other words, export volume has risen by approximately 11,000 tons while consumption in Canada, as I have mentioned, has risen by about 4,000 tons.

Present indications are that the planted acreage will increase sharply this year. Some early plantings have already been made and with favourable weather, seeding operations will be underway in the growing areas of southwestern Ontario by the end of this week. Dealer distributors indicate an unprecedented demand for seed. Importation of pedigreed seed for planting purposes shows an increase of between 30 and 40 per cent over last year—1964.

Now, there is, of course, a reason for this, Mr. Chairman. The breeding of new strains and varieties of improved types of seed have

made it possible to grow this lucrative cash crop over a much broader area than ever before. Intensive research, plant breeding and selection programmes have developed varieties with shorter maturity terms which make it possible to extend production areas north and east into sections of western Ontario which only a few years ago could not have considered the cultivation of white beans as a cash crop.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, these same plant-breeding techniques have produced plants which have more of a bush or upright growing character than the dwarf or low-growing type of a few years ago. The net result is the growth of varieties of white beans which can be grown successfully in areas with shorter growing seasons and which, because of the other growing habits to which I have referred, have a much better chance of being harvested before the former hazards of frost or long periods of wet weather intervene.

It can also be said, Mr. Chairman, that these plant-breeding techniques have materially reduced the disease factors that were prevalent not too long ago.

These factors would seem to establish the trend towards continuing increases in planting private acreage and yields, and while weather and many factors between planting and harvest must still be reckoned with, it seems obvious that the present and foreseeable future holds promise for greatly increased production potential. If this can be accepted, and I as well as many others believe it can, then it seems to me to be nothing less than prudent to examine our position which is precisely what my colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, is attempting to do.

Firstly, as I stated earlier in my remarks, home or domestic consumption would appear to have its limit. It has apparently levelled off in direct proportion to our population increase. At the same time, indicated potential production may well exceed domestic requirements by greater amounts than ever before.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to you and to the hon. members that this could and would be serious if we did not fully employ the many advantages that are open to us. The hon. Minister outlined some of these last week, and I should like to repeat these and possibly elaborate to some extent if I may.

Firstly, the British market can absorb not only presently indicated production surpluses, but also vastly greater quantities of Ontario white beans if we introduce a few simple expedients, one in particular which will gear us to accommodate this vast potential market. As it presently stands, the British prefer our

beans to those from any other production area. They like the quality and they like the grade. In fact, our Canadian grading regulations provide, in large measure, for the quality features to which I have referred.

Secondly, and as the hon. Minister pointed out, we have the advantage of the protection afforded by Commonwealth preferential tariffs coupled with the preferential position of our currency versus that of our principal competitor and the largest producer in the world, the United States—mainly the state of Michigan.

As a matter of interest and fact, an article in a British trade journal dated November, 1964, entitled "The Saga of the Ubiquitous Baked Bean, the most popular of all canned vegetables," shows the fantastic growth of this most important food product. The article states that canned baked beans are bought by 68 per cent of all British housewives and that the total volume of sales has increased from £12 million sterling to £27 million sterling from 1953 to 1964, which of course can only be described as a tremendous volume of this staple food product.

Processors are quick to tell you why the quality of Ontario beans is important to them. It is simply a matter of economics and the British, Mr. Chairman, are very astute in these matters. The simple facts are that because of the reliability of Canadian grades—the minimum amount of impurities and so on, a ton of Ontario beans processes into more cans or cases of finished product with less processing cost than do white beans of other origin. So it can be clearly and positively stated that our Ontario product has a high acceptability on the United Kingdom market. But there are difficulties standing in the way of trading, one of which may be overcome shortly.

The first difficulty has been that of consistent supply. Having indicated to the House the tremendous volume required, for which the UK processor must rely on foreign production, the available quantities from Ontario until at least recently have been little more than a drop in the bucket. If marketing procedures can be implemented here in Ontario, coupled with apparent trends towards increased production, Ontario can develop a vastly increased share of the British market.

To do this it is of the utmost importance I believe to take one more competitive step and that is to establish through the Ontario bean growers marketing board our floor or support price concurrently with the time this procedure, or at least the counterpart of this procedure, is implemented in the United States.

At this precise moment Ontario dealers are receiving inquiries and requests for offers of 1965 crop Ontario white beans. Because the growers board in the past has negotiated the Ontario support or takeover price in the fall, versus the United States commodity credit corporation practice of announcing their purchase price in the spring, the latter has already been announced for 1965. Thus, it seems to me that Ontario dealers and growers can be placed at an extreme disadvantage.

This situation can be particularly important in a year when production appears to be headed for an all-time high both here and in Michigan. It will be apparent, I am sure, that with Michigan dealers now able to trade against a domestic floor price already established, they may very well be in the advantageous position of being able to provide for a sufficient share of the British market as to have a serious and prejudicial effect on the marketing of our Ontario crops. The board has expressed concern about the plight of dealers who make pre-crop sales in the event of total or partial crop failures. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, with complete conviction, that this fear is groundless. The Ontario dealer trade are thoroughly competent to protect themselves against this probability and possibility.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the House that I know the dealer trade and that they are by and large completely efficient and reliable from the standpoint of accumulation, processing and distribution, just the same as our farmer-growers are as good, reliable and efficient in the production field as can be found anywhere. Furthermore, I know that Ontario dealers support the basic principle on which the Ontario bean growers marketing board was established.

The agriculture industry, Mr. Chairman, is the sum of its several parts, each with a closely related responsibility to the other. The producer, processor and distributor, as well as consumer, whether the latter be domestic or foreign, each has an equally important role to play; but it can only be accomplished on a basis of mutual trust and confidence. The differences between some—and I emphasize some—growers as represented by the board, the dealers and the hon. Minister are small and if resolved, and resolved soon, can only result in a closer, stronger relationship of all segments of an important sector of our agricultural industry.

This, Mr. Chairman, is what my colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, is endeavouring to bring about. In this I support him wholeheartedly. I suggest all in this House

should support him rather than propose measures which can only be divisive in character, and which were stated for rather obvious purposes a few days ago.

Mr. Chairman, may I propose to the House also, the implementation of a suggestion that has been under consideration of the hon. Minister and his advisers for some time? I have reference to the establishment of research facilities which would combine the efforts of the growers board, the University of Guelph and other appropriate agencies in a programme of plant breeding and collection here in Ontario, with the end in mind of further developing varieties of seed that would be even more particularly adapted to the production needs and characteristics of the growing areas of our province.

As already mentioned, much has been done by Michigan state authorities in this important field. I have already indicated the extent to which improved varieties of seed have meant in broadening and extending the areas of production in Ontario. I am also aware of the nature and extent of the co-operation and collaboration between Michigan and Ontario in this important field of agriculture research. As we now appear to be on the threshold of exciting possibilities in terms of expanding our production areas even further, it occurred to me that we might pursue our endeavours in this direction even more aggressively with some special field testing and subsequent selection and plant breeding, using our own facilities as a measure of further collaboration in this field.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested, listening to the hon. Minister of Highways outlining the research programme for the bean industry in the province. I must say I have been greatly concerned in the past with this bean marketing board. The hon. Minister has told us that it is unconstitutional to have a bean plant operating under the board; there has to be something done to divide this. I believe he has had set up an inquiry by Price Waterhouse, and if I understand correctly, the report is in.

I must say, Mr. Minister, I had thought the bean board was one of the most successful boards we had in the province of Ontario. It has brought the price of beans to where most of us who are in the bean business can exist and make a livelihood. I am one who is very much concerned to hear this report from Price, Waterhouse. I must agree that they are a very capable firm, but I hesitate

to go along with anything that might upset a fair return to the producers of beans. I hope the hon. Minister can advise us—maybe he has not yet made up his mind—what course is going to be followed since Price, Waterhouse has put in their report.

I want to say to the hon. Minister of Highways I do appreciate hearing him recommend a research programme for the bean industry here in the province of Ontario. I think it is a step forward; I think it is a step that should perhaps have been taken long ago, Mr. Chairman.

I am also very pleased to hear that there is a keen demand in the British market for Ontario-grown white beans. I wonder if the hon. Minister could advise us what course is going to be taken since this report has now reached his office.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, first of all I appreciate the comments of the hon. Minister of Highways, concerning, first of all, the support for me on the matter of establishing floor prices. I am so convinced that we are right in this that I believe that every day, even today, it is costing the bean farmers of the province of Ontario money not to have this price established. I mean that sincerely, because just as soon as that price is set across in the United States and this price here is not set, our bean dealers, with inquiries coming to them indicating the need and the demand of the British market for beans, cannot give them a price. That is how bad it is right here in the province of Ontario.

I am appreciative of the suggestion for further research facilities. I think we must recognize the fact that we have a research institute in the province of Ontario which has done, to my mind, a magnificent job in co-ordinating research within the province of Ontario and Canada, and indeed in the United States. This matter of research on growing and development of new varieties of beans came up, I believe, two years ago for discussion with the research institute. It was decided at that time to use every possible means of co-ordination between the University of Michigan research facilities on new varieties of beans and our own research stations here in Ontario at Guelph and at Ridgetown. There has been the closest co-ordination here, but I believe we must recognize the changing trends in the bean-growing areas across Ontario. They are expanding north and east very rapidly and, to a lesser degree, are being grown in areas of Kent and lower Lambton county. So I think the hon. Minister of Highways has made an excellent suggestion here. I feel

that we should do a good deal more to establish test plots in these new areas to see what the reaction of climate and soil is going to be on these varieties.

Now, in connection with the question the hon. member for Kent East has raised concerning implementation of the Price, Water-house report, let me say it is under active discussion by the bean board. What they are going to do with it, I do not know, to date.

The other point that the hon. member raised was that the bean board had been the most effective commodity marketing board we have in the province of Ontario. I want to pay tribute to what the bean board has done. I believe in giving credit where credit is due, but I want also to point out, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. members of this House, that I sometimes wonder if the bean board has acted in the best interests of all the bean farmers in Ontario or those who would like to grow beans in this province.

I point out to you that in 1962 and 1963, the bean dealers in this province in price negotiations offered the bean board \$7 a hundred as a floor price for beans. And what was the price settled on? \$6.35. Why? Why was this done, when we know that in Canada there is a market annually for at least 600,000 hundredweight of beans every year? The domestic consumption of beans in Canada is about 3 to 3.6 pounds, and it is increasing at about the rate of our population increase annually. So we know, relatively, what the annual consumption of beans is.

Along with this figure, there is a 77 cent stabilization fund taken off the price of beans to aid in export sales, over and above the domestic export price. There is not a reason in the world why the farmers of Ontario should not have gotten \$7 a hundred minimum for their beans in 1962 and 1963. That is 600,000 hundredweight of beans at a loss of 65 cents a hundred. What does this figure out to in dollars and cents to the farmers of Ontario? In 1964, when it came to the price negotiations the bean dealers, among other reasons, said, "there is no point in us even offering, this group will not even accept the higher price for beans that we are ready to offer."

So there was nothing done about negotiations. They refused to negotiate. The take-over clause was one of the reasons. I will admit that they refused to negotiate, but certainly the experience of the last two years was indicative to them that there was bad faith some place along the line.

The result was that an arbitration was set

up under the terms of The Farm Products Marketing Act and the price was established, not at \$6.35 as the bean board wanted, but as arbitrarily was decided by the arbitration board at \$6.60 a hundred for beans.

Mr. Spence: That is just the floor price.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is just the floor price, exactly. There is no reason why they cannot go on up, as they have gone on up. But I want to ask my hon. friend, why would the bean board set the price so low and then start bidding above that floor price for beans right off the bat? The simple fact of it is that what has been happening in the past is that when they bid more for beans than they were actually worth on the market and sold them for less than they could obtain on the market, they could reach into the other pocket, where their licence fee was, and take out the losses and pay the losses. The individual dealers cannot do that kind of thing.

Now that is one thing that I think is wrong. It is not easy for me, Mr. Chairman, to stand here in this House and say these things, nor for the Minister of Highways, the hon. member for Huron, to stand in this House and say these things about a commodity marketing board that affects the people in our own areas, that affects friends and neighbours of both of us, whom we know and have known since we grew up together and on whom we have differing opinions. But as a responsible Minister of the Crown in this government, I have to think of the good of the industry and of the farmers of Ontario, and I have to take that stand.

I plead with the bean board today, I plead with them, to recognize these differences and to sit down and resolve these differences in order that we might get on with the business of expanding the agricultural food exports of this province and really accomplish something that is worthwhile.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? One of our dealers is handling 60 per cent of the beans; is this fair, why is one dealer handling 60 per cent of the beans?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether there is anything fair about this or unfair about it. Surely to goodness—

Mr. Oliver: A lot of beans!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A lot of beans indeed; a lot of beans is right; a trite statement. Nevertheless, I think it is indicative of the expansion of one man under the operation

of the present bean board that has allowed him to reach the place you say he has reached.

Now there are differing figures as to whether he handles 60 per cent or not. There are figures quoted where he handles 40 per cent. There are some who say he handles 50 per cent, some 60. I do not know. But I do know this, Mr. Chairman, that we need the co-operation of bean dealers, just as we need the co-operation of all commodity handlers in this province who render a service to us as farmers and producers. That to me is just sound common sense and logic.

The way to get that co-operation, is to try to meet on common, mutual ground, recognize differences that may exist and try to iron them out to the general, mutual satisfaction of both parties, always bearing in mind that both groups are intended to serve, in the end result, the best interests of all agriculture.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. Minister is right. I am not an expert in this field, nor have I made a study of it. But one thing that alarms me, as I believe the hon. member for Bruce outlined in his address the other day, is that the prices of all agricultural products are lower today than in 1951. That is 14 years ago, Mr. Minister, and here we have white beans higher. This is what staggers me. Whether we are right or whether we are wrong, I hope you are right. I cannot argue with you on that, but it makes me wonder. We hope that we do not upset anything that has worked, has brought in a fair return to those growing white beans in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say one more word in this connection, because I think the inference has been left here that it is the bean board which has been responsible for what is happening.

Mr. Spence: I think they help.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, they may have helped to some degree, but they are certainly by no means responsible for all the increase in price. The very fact that the bean price has increased to the place it has today is because the market for beans in Great Britain has increased by over 100 per cent in 11 years. When you have a buoyant market like that to which you can ship surplus, as long as there is not too much surplus, there is no problem at all.

But you see, the fact that you and I as farmer members and as members of this

House must recognize, is that we have a responsibility to expand and to exploit every opportunity we have to sell more of any agricultural food product that can be produced in this province. So with that in mind, surely it must naturally follow that this bean board that we talk about should have gone out, recognizing the importance of that growing market, and said to the farmers of Ontario: Look, grow more beans; here is an opportunity; let us cash in on this growing market.

And what did they do? They went out said: Oh, no, do not increase production!

This does not make sense, Mr. Chairman, when right across the line the Americans increased their sales to Great Britain by 56 per cent, while we increased ours by 6.7 per cent. There is the thing that is wrong, as I see it. I feel that when we have an advantage of 15.5 per cent in our market over others, that we should have been exploiting it to a far greater degree.

I point that out, that the bean board to my mind had very little effect on the increase in the price of beans compared to what they were in 1951. No more than that the Americans affected the price more than anyone else. It is a growing market, indicated by the acceptance by the British housewife that this is one of the most popular canned vegetables there is in Great Britain today.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 107.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Mr. Chairman, if I might just add this one small point. My hon. colleague from Kent East has raised the fact that one dealer who happens to be a constituent of the hon. member for Kent East has a large percentage of the market. I do not think the percentage matters, but I think to be completely fair it should be added at this point that the greatest share of the credit for the development of the market which we now enjoy in the United Kingdom goes to that company. I would think that the hon. member for Kent East would be the first to admit that.

And if this is true, then the fact that the price of beans, in which you are interested, and in which we are all interested, is high today, then a great deal of the credit should go back—and let us name him here—to W. G. Thompson, who was a former member of this House. He has done a tremendous job in developing this market in the United Kingdom. I do not think it should be left that there should be any criticism of the job that he did in that market. I do not think you want to leave that criticism.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I never left any inference of criticism against him. I wanted to know why one dealer had 60 per cent of the business in the bean industry. It is unusual. We have co-operatives all over southwestern Ontario and they cannot sell. I would like to know why they cannot sell. The hon. Minister has been over to Europe, to England; he has examined the bean industry and here we only got one, practically one, operator who can market beans. This is what makes it unusual for me.

Another thing I want to say to the hon. Minister in regard to the bean industry: Why has it expanded like it has, or we could have been growing more beans in the province of Ontario?

One of the reasons is on account of the price of corn, on account of the price of soybeans. There is a great risk in growing white beans on account of weather conditions. When you grow corn and soybeans there is no risk. The price of soybeans and corn has increased, so the income per acre is practically the same as what it is for beans, and naturally you would grow the crop that has the least work and the least risk.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments in this connection. I was very interested in what the hon. Minister of Highways had to say about the bean industry. I know that he has a great many growers in his riding as I have in mine. Certainly he is most interested in it, and I am interested in a solution being found to this rather thorny problem as well.

He did say that we in the Opposition had talked about this problem for obvious reasons, and I hope he was not imputing motives to me. I am certainly as interested in finding a solution to it as he is, and I want to make that abundantly clear.

I did mention a little earlier that as far as I was concerned, the government and the bean growers marketing board were on a collision course in this connection. The government has said that the company and the marketing board must be separated. On the other hand, the marketing board says that it is not going to separate the company from the board unless ordered to do so by the government. It seems rather obvious that this is a collision course.

What I suggested at that time was the setting up of a co-operative, with a special relationship to the marketing board. This co-operative could handle beans, and perhaps enlarge its area eventually to handle wheat and a number of other products. It

seems to me that this is a workable solution, and I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture should do everything in his power to get together with the personnel of the bean growers marketing board, to try to convince them that this is a good thing, and one way out of the rather nasty situation that has developed in the bean industry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Could I ask the hon. member what he meant by that "special relationship" there? I do not think the hon. member mentioned that the other day and it intrigues me. I wonder what you mean by that.

Mr. Gaunt: I did make reference to it the other day. I said that the special relationship could include some of the same personnel. That is to say, some personnel on the marketing board could also be directors and managers, if you will, in the co-operative. That is what I meant by the special relationship.

Mr. MacDonald: Like the cheese set-up.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I want to say we have done everything I think that it is possible to do in trying to get them to set up a co-operative. I have discussed this with them at some length, and I know that the farm products marketing board on innumerable occasions have both, verbally and in writing, suggested that this be done. But they seem to feel that they do not want to accept that suggestion.

I do not know what else one does, and for the life of me I cannot understand why they take this attitude, because here—is it Fenton Cryderman who is the vice-chairman of the United Co-Operators of Ontario, who is also a member and a past-president, I believe, of the Ontario bean growers market board, sitting on the board? Surely, you could not have a man who was more indoctrinated with co-operative philosophy than a vice-chairman of the United Co-Operators of Ontario! And yet he refuses to accept this suggestion. It defies my sense of reason.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this vote. Some two thousand words back I was quoting from a document with reference to a co-op abattoir in Nova Scotia. I was not in a position to state with certainty who signed it—all I stated was that it was an official. The document is the product of Douglas Curtis, president of the Nova Scotia Co-Operative Abattoirs Limited, and it was dated May 24, 1965. I suggest to the hon. Minister that it is accurate and, therefore, either he or I, preferably he since he has

more time and machinery, should try to reconcile it with the information he has been given from other sources.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, may I raise a question concerning the marketing of onions? Is this the correct vote?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, sir.

Mr. Paterson: I realize from the various growers papers and so forth that approximately 50 per cent of our Ontario grown onions should be exported, and I wonder if the hon. Minister has any figures at this time as to the market availability and placing of the number of bags in England this season? Is there any indication to date as to what our exports will be of onions this year, or have there been any orders placed from England as yet?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am quite prepared to deal with this question, but it comes under the food council vote—not the farm products marketing board produce. That is a food council vote. We will deal with it then, if it is all right with you, sir.

Vote 108 agreed to.

On vote 109:

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I am in a bit of a quandary. I have two items that I want to bring up but I just do not know under what vote they would fall. One is in connection with the machinery inquiry and the setting up of a machinery board, and the other deals with charges of a fertilizer company in respect to the formulas that they put out on the fertilizers. That is to say, the formula offences. I am at a loss to know under which vote they would fall.

I mention it in this vote simply because the information branch would handle some of this material, and I know that they have sent out various pieces of literature dealing in particular with the machinery board. I am wondering if it would be all right to carry on?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For the information of the hon. member, the formula for fertilizer analysis, the consistency of formula analysis—

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I am referring to the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is a federal responsibility, and it is administered by the plant products division of the federal Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact we had one of the inspectors here in the House just

last Friday, I was talking to him and introduced him to some of our people.

Mr. Gaunt: The other point was the machinery board.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That should have come under the main office vote, and we have passed that. If the hon. member has a question to ask I would be pleased to deal with it if he wants to talk to me later about it. That is in the main office vote.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I just wanted to make one brief comment about it. I know that my hon. friend has set up a farm machinery board to deal with machinery, the distribution and sale of farm machinery and so on. But a number of farmers have complained that the distribution of farm machinery, and particularly farm machinery parts, in busy times and over the weekends, has not been improved since the hon. Minister set up his farm machinery board. I was just wondering if he would have any comments. I would suggest that perhaps this machinery board could be improved, and its operation streamlined to that extent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed to hear this comment from the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, and I am sure he makes it in good faith. We have been led to believe from general comments that we have heard that there is an improvement, that there is an availability of parts on holidays and weekends that have not pertained before the implementation of the committee's study and report. Any criticism that has come to our attention we have gone to work on it immediately, and relayed it to the secretary of the committee who is the liaison man between the machinery company and the advisory board, and it is his responsibility to track down any complaint that may arise. I think he has done an admirable job in establishing a better relationship between the dealers out in the country and the central distributors, permitting the dealers to provide a better service to the farmers themselves.

I have heard of one or two illustrations pertaining to one or two companies that has left something to be desired, but I believe it is working itself out quite satisfactorily, and we are led to believe that any problem is going to be corrected as soon as the merger completely takes place and the organizational problems work themselves out.

We have been pretty adamant about this with the company involved, Mr. Chairman, and I think we will find there is a much better relationship existing there than in

other places. Now, there are certain parts for some types of machines that are outdated, they are old, and are very difficult to obtain, I must confess. On the other hand, I think we have generally accomplished a very great deal.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add one footnote to what my hon. friend has said. I am glad that he has been working with this board, and the board itself has been conducting its work in this area with such a degree of success. It goes without saying that farmers have, in the past, experienced considerable difficulty, particularly on holidays and weekends, and my hon. friend and I know that when a farmer is harvesting and a machine breaks it is most distressing not to be able to get a part for that machine. I am glad to hear that the board has been this effective, and I hope it will be even more so in the future.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the hon. Minister in regard to a copy of a letter I received on May 13 from Barney Wilson of the Ontario fruit and vegetable growers association. It concerns a broadcast given over the CBC network. Last year, I read into the record what I think this House considered, and I personally considered, a very derogatory writing concerning agriculture in our province. This is a very similar thing which was broadcast by our own CBC network. I just wondered, did the deputy Minister reprimand the directors of the CBC concerning this broadcast?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am sure the hon. member realizes that we in this House have nothing to do with the CBC. What they broadcast is their own affair. I must confess I have not heard the article he refers to. I am told by one of the deputies that we have a copy here, so if this is the case we will have a look at it. I am sorry that it has happened.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of interest I would be most interested in learning of the policy of The Department of Agriculture in respect to the information branch, that is to say, how many broadcasts on television and radio are conducted monthly, and what is the hon. Minister's policy in interviewing various people at the university at Guelph and elsewhere within the agricultural industry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As far as the number of broadcasts per month, I cannot give the hon. member those figures. I do not know if

they are here or not. If they are, they are probably through some of this information which involves several pages. I do not think that needs to be read in the House. I would say that the policy of the information branch is to relay to the agricultural community the information pertaining to the findings of research, and the developments of agriculture as it pertains today. I think it has been done with a good deal of success. Television clips and tapes have been made. I think one of the most significant contributions ever made in an extension programme was that pertaining to the three television broadcasts relating to the business of farming through co-operation with the CBC.

Mr. Gaunt: Farm management.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, farm management. The Business of Farming, I believe was the title of these three consecutive broadcasts, beginning I believe at 10.30 in the forenoon and running an hour to 11.30. We found, on research, that there was a very wide acceptance of this programme. It involved farmers—practical farmers from across Ontario—with farm management specialists, extension specialists in various fields, not only in farm management but in engineering and what-have-you, sitting down to discuss with these farmers their operation, and the film being made on the actual operation of the farms and discussing it with them. It was a most interesting series. I heard more favourable comment from that than any other series that I know anything about.

To me this is the new modern concept of getting information out to farmers. The old way of short courses that we used to attend, years and years ago—a month's short course, or two weeks or what-have-you—in individual communities organized under the auspices of the extension branch and The Department of Agriculture representatives were very, very effective. But when you use television you can spread right across the province in the series of programmes that has an enormous impact, and it brings up-to-date information to these farm families in a way that is most acceptable.

Some of the comments that we have had on this, I was interested to note, reveal that they would prefer that the hour started at 11.00 and went until noon, rather than start at 10.30 and go to 11.30. I suppose the farmer does not want to spend that extra half-hour in the house. He wants to come in and stay there until after lunch. I think that is a very practicable suggestion. We intend to carry this on next year. To me, it is a tremendous programme, a very worthwhile

programme, and one that I think is having a very great impact.

As far as our policy is concerned and what we do with farm news, 94 releases were made last year on production and marketing information, 139 releases were made on information for consumers of Ontario farm products, 104 releases were made on topics of interest to the home gardener, 85 announcements on coming events of importance in the agricultural field across Ontario having to do with policy and programme announcements where statements were made. Then there were this other series with feature stories with 40 articles especially written by the department personnel, including staff members at the OAC, Western Ontario agricultural school and the Kemptville agricultural school where these were widely used by the farm press as background stories and for information.

It seems to me that the information branch is fulfilling the purpose for which it has always been intended, and that is the dissemination of news to the people who can use the news. Regardless of the effectiveness of the research programme carried on by the agriculture research institute, unless the findings of research and the findings of our people who are specialists in their field are related in a practical way to the understanding of the farmer so that he can apply it in his own individual circumstance, they are of little use. This, to me, is the function of the information branch, and I want to pay tribute to its director, Mr. Schneller, and all the people who are associated with him in the branch. I think they have done, and are doing, a magnificent job, and I feel are really the arm of our department that implements the functions of many of the other branches.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I appreciate full well the fact that the potential of television as an educational medium is certainly tremendous. I am just wondering if the hon. Minister would consider perhaps extending the programme beyond the farm management field into other areas. I think television offers a tremendous potential for the dissemination of information and I think it should be used to its fullest extent.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, under subsection 8—compensation for damage by hunters—I notice this is under the livestock branch and I would like to pose two questions. First, is there any compensation allowable to farmers, say of soya beans, who have hunters tramping through their fields, and

second, does this apply to greenhouse damage? In my particular area we have a great deal of damage on the boundaries of our Crown reserve in the area by shotgun firing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that our present policy applies only to livestock and farm machinery. Farm buildings—and I can only assume the greenhouses must be considered farm buildings—do not apply under our present policy.

Mr. Paterson: What about the soya bean—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I am sorry, there is no application here.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. W. E. Johnston) is absent from the House. He had some comments on this vote that he asked me to make and with your indulgence I will do that right now. And, as a matter of fact, we have the Ontario stock yards in High Park and also the largest packing houses in Canada, so there you go.

The policies and programmes administered by the livestock branch are designed to assist livestock producers in breeding meat animals suitable for today's markets in an efficient, economical manner.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you know what you are talking about?

Mr. Cowling: Quiet, please. Insofar as meat production is concerned, we are a North American economy and so from both a price and a quality standpoint are in competition with U.S. producers. Ontario produces more finished cattle, more hogs and more milk than any other province in Canada. Approximately 75 per cent of our cattle population is made up of the dairy breeds and so considerable emphasis is placed in this area. Fifty-nine dairy herd improvement associations with a membership totalling nearly 1,300 are in operation. With the average herd size of 27 cows there are thus approximately 34,000 cows on test. If only the benefits of production records credited to the members are considered the cost of about \$9 per cow may seem rather high, however, when the value of the cost of production records and the importance of production records in the proving of bulls in artificial insemination units are considered, it is apparent that this is a most worthwhile programme. The hon. Minister of Agriculture announced—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: Just a minute, you might learn something new here.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture announced in the House that this programme is being enlarged through the introduction of an owner-sampler system under which the herd owner will collect the milk samples and the testing will be completed by the supervisor possibly at a central testing laboratory. We will all recall the hon. Minister announcing this.

Such a system will make possible the testing of a much larger number of cows at a lower cost per cow tested. A monthly mail-in system has been conducted as a pilot project in Bruce county with most favourable results. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) will know about that. It is planned to expand this service as it has been well received by the members concerned.

Improvement programmes associated with beef cattle production have continued to expand. In 1964, 1,397 bulls were started on performance tests and 1,134 completed tests. During 1964 the number of herds enrolled on herd tests increased to 34. Among the commercial producers there is a constant increase in the demand for beef bulls of good type along with good performance. Such producers are encouraged to buy good performance-tested bulls through a system of premiums which applies to those bulls which have met the necessary standards for type and performance and are sold through inspected auction sales. Good sires are the foundation of all livestock improvement programmes, so in order to meet the demands of the future this policy should be expanded.

Artificial insemination continues to be a major factor in livestock improvement. Dairy herd improvement records show that the offspring of AI unit bulls produce more milk and more butter fat than those cows in the same herds that are sired by bulls in natural service. Assistance to artificial insemination units is given in the form of a grant on the purchase of sires subject to certain regulations. Dairy sires can qualify for grants totalling \$750 and beef sires for grants totalling \$600.

The service to farmers in northern Ontario is subsidized at the rate of \$2 per cow bred in those areas, and amounts to approximately \$30,000 per year. Total assistance to artificial insemination units is nearly \$60,000 per year.

As in the case of beef cattle, the main assistance to swine producers is in the payment of premiums on approved performance-tested boars. Many progressive commercial producers will not buy boars that do not

meet the standards of this programme. Premiums in excess of \$40,000 were paid to approximately 1,400 commercial producers who purchased such boars in 1964.

While sheep production is not a major enterprise in Ontario, through the federal-provincial sheep assistance policy over 4,000 breeding ewes were brought into Ontario from western Canada in 1964. This is the only source of relatively large numbers of uniform commercial ewes available to Ontario farmers who wish to enlarge their flocks. Distribution of good quality purebred stock throughout the province is encouraged by the paying of grants to inspected, approved, consigned sales. In the case of cattle sales the grants are \$5 per head, for swine \$2.50 per head and for sheep almost \$1 per head sold.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall during the comments of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, he was talking about the price received on hogs on the market. Well, according to the *Globe and Mail* of just a day or two ago—and this took place at the stockyards in Toronto—top beef sold for \$27.90 and hogs got up to \$32.35, which is a high, high figure for hogs and is an indication of the great job The Ontario Department of Agriculture is doing.

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on vote 110, item 4. The amount of money to be voted is justified as serving a most important purpose. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture visited the Rainy River district during 1963 he observed the possibilities of beef cattle raising in the area, and the programme was inaugurated by the cattlemen's co-operative through the purchase of some 365 head of breeder cattle and some bulls from out of the province. I bring that to your attention—out of the province.

This represents a guaranteed loan of about \$100,000 and as stated before, the distribution has been based upon ten animals per farmer. Last year 45 farmers from the three districts of northwestern Ontario were invited by the hon. Minister of Agriculture to tour the different beef breeder and feed lots in this part of Ontario and this included a visit to a bull sale auction.

The result of this visit was that three farmers from the Rainy River district attending the hay sale during the spring purchased 27 registered bulls at approximately \$14,000. This money remained in the province instead of going to western Canada. In my opinion, this vote justifies the continued confidence of this Legislature in this kind of a programme. The Department of Agriculture is to be commended for its interest in further-

ing the beef cattle arrangements in the Rainy River district.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments concerning AI. My hon. friend from High Park made reference to this in passing and I would just like to make a few comments. I would agree with him when he says that AI has made a tremendous contribution to the livestock industry for the past number of years. The quality of the average herd has certainly been raised through AI and its services.

I would point out that as far as AI is concerned, I think many farmers have used it indiscriminately. I say this because I have gone into farms on occasions and have been told by the farmer that he has a bunch of cows or heifers that have been sired by eight to twelve and sometimes even more bulls. Now to me this would indicate that the farmer has no planned programme when this large number of sires is used in the breeding programme of a herd of cows.

What I am suggesting is that the department should take a look at this particular matter because I understand that 80 per cent of those farmers on DHIA use artificial services. I would think that the department, through its DHIA programme, would be well advised to employ a geneticist on a full-time basis to advise farmers concerning a breeding programme. It is a cardinal rule of genetics that live breeding is much more effective in establishing a good solid breed, improving the breed on a long-term basis, than is either in-breeding or outside. So I would say that if a geneticist were employed by The Department of Agriculture on a full-time basis I think he could perform a very real service.

He could set out for every farmer—and I think, if I recall correctly, there are about 1,280-odd farmers on DHIA—he could set out for those farmers a planned breeding programme established on sound, genetic principles. He could show him how he could improve his herd through line breeding and advise him what sires he should use. I think that in the long run this would be a very real service to the farmers in this province because, as I said before, they tend to use too many sires to actually carry out a common-sense breeding programme. I would say that this could be extended.

It would even, in the final analysis, encourage the artificial insemination units to hire their own geneticists, and second it would certainly move them into the field of recognizing that they must get related sires; that is to say in their purchase of sires they would be more conscious of the fact that they perhaps

should be purchasing in common terms, cousins, if you will, rather than unrelated animals. I say that because I feel that the two points that I made could result from the fact that the department, if it sees fit, should get a geneticist and work with the farmers in this connection.

I think there is a very real result to be obtained from it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would not let that suggestion go by for the simple reason that my hon. friend recommends the hiring of a geneticist. Now this is a good lesson in genetics with which any good farmer would agree. But for the department to go out and hire a geneticist to try to persuade farmers of the value of line breeding is something that the farmer, if he would read the literature that he gets from his own artificial insemination unit, would know the benefit of right now.

Each insemination unit in the province of Ontario sends this out in the form of a newsletter to every farmer indicating the value of certain blood lines that are established and pertain in the various bulls whose semen is available from that unit. Any good farmer would recognize the importance of the theory which my hon. friend has expounded today.

Now, how you persuade farmers not to order semen from a particular bull over a period of a year or two years to establish a uniformity within the herd is something that I just do not know. The fact that the number of inseminations is increasing annually is an indication that artificial insemination is accepted by the farmers. Good service is being provided, but how one gets farmers to accept the fact that they should be uniform in their requests or that they should request semen from a given bull for a given period of time to establish that uniformity that we all like to see in a herd of cattle, is a point for which I do not think I would want to have to accept the responsibility. You can do all the educating you like. You can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is so. I realize that what the hon. Minister said is so, but I just want to point out to him that a lot of the pamphlets which are sent out by the AI units are rather complicated and perhaps the ordinary farmer just does not understand them. My point was that if the department had a geneticist the theories which are expounded in some of these articles could be brought down to earth, simplified and brought down to the

point where he could understand them and could apply them.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, on vote 110, item 8, compensation for damage by hunters, \$15,000: I see in the estimates for last year that there was \$15,000 allotted for this. Could the hon. Minister inform us if this was just for livestock shot by hunters, or what does it cover, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It was only for livestock, and the amount was just under \$14,000.

Mr. Spence: How many head of cattle or horses—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One hundred and seven.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the mastitis control programme was mentioned a few votes ago, I do not know how extensively the hon. Minister went into it—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is in the veterinary services branch and we will come to it—

Mr. Nixon: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks in this connection. I would like to talk for a moment about the ROP programme. I realize full well that it is a Dominion programme, but I want to make some reference to it, if for no other reason than to impress upon my hon. friend's mind that perhaps he could go to Ottawa and suggest that a few changes be made in it.

It seems to me that as far as the ROP record of performance is concerned, the rate of gain is set out. The ROP score is indicative of the carcass quality and the score—if you like—of the hog when it is killed. It seems to me that an ROP record should actually contain a maturity date, paid when it is scored anywhere from, I suppose 60 to 100, if 100 is possible. But there is no indication of the maturity date on that ROP record, as I understand it, and I think that I am right in that, so that you may—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Would the hon. member explain, for the benefit of the hon. member for High Park, what ROP stands for?

Mr. Gaunt: Record of performance. Mr. Chairman, may I tell my hon. friend from High Park that ROP is record of performance.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I knew that, and it is a record of performance insofar as milk content is concerned.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, sure, I am very familiar with that. Mr. Chairman, may I tell my hon. friend that it also applies to pigs and hogs and the swine industry.

In any case, the point I was making is that an ROP score as such does not give an entirely true picture. That is to say, a pig might have a score of, let us say, 89, and have a maturity date of 150 days. That ROP record would be much better to my mind than one that had a score of 95 with a maturity date of 200 days. On the one hand, the hog with the score of 89 and 150 maturity days would be a money-maker, and the one with the score of 195 and 200 days maturity date could in all probability be a benchman which would lose money.

So I would say that the maturity date is very important on any ROP records. I would urge the hon. Minister to exert his influence on the federal people and see if they could change it in that respect.

I would also make passing reference to selective registration for boars. I think this is an objective for the future, I think it is something we should be moving toward. I feel that where you have selective registration of any registered boar, then you weed out the lower scorers, and in the long run this will improve the quality of the industry as such.

The Ontario hog producers' association's annual convention in Toronto this past year—I believe it was March of this year—passed a resolution which purported to suggest to the government that they ban all unregistered sale of boars through community sales yards, and any other sales facilities in which they might be sold. I think it was the opinion of the meeting at that time that the sale of unregistered boars was a thing which was very detrimental to the hog industry, because it was from these boars that many of the B and C grades were coming.

They felt that steps should be taken to see that this kind of thing be stopped. I have seen many hogs pass through sales barns that certainly were not fit to go into the herds of farmers and sire pigs. I am as sure as I am standing here that the pigs which would result from such a mating would give a large proportion B and C grades.

Another suggestion that was made at the Ontario hog producers' annual meeting was the fact that they were interested—I say "they," I mean the hog producers—in setting up an export authority for hogs. I believe the Danes have something comparable to this. They have, as was mentioned earlier, I believe, all the facilities, or most of the

facilities, to process the pork in their country, and they have an export authority to handle that pork so that they can say to Great Britain: "We are going to give you so much pork," and it is handled through this authority.

It has been very effective for them, and certainly they have had great success with it, because the Danish pork in export markets has been a real competitor and has increased, I believe, successfully every year for the past number of years. So I would first like my hon. friend to comment on the point about selective registration, the fact that all unregistered boars should not be sold at community sales barns and so on. And then I would like him to comment on the establishment of a pork authority.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first instance, the ROP service, as it pertains to both swine and cattle, is a federal responsibility, and I have no comment to make on it whatever. The hon. member prefaced his remarks with that, and I am sure he would not expect me to comment in that regard.

Concerning the prohibiting of sale of unregistered boars, this is a matter that I think is debatable. I can see the point that he is making, and I can see where it could be useful. However, I would point out to him that I have known a number of purebred breeders with the very best breeding stock, who for some reason or other fail to keep up the registration papers and the progeny of the very highly qualified sire and dam. If such a law were to be enacted a sale could not be made of that progeny and would deny the right of some farmer buying that animal to carry on the bloodline of that particular animal. So I think we have to judge the abuse that might come in to any particular aspect of such an arrangement as he suggests.

Mind you, I do not for one minute condone the use of low quality or scrub sires, either in livestock or hogs or sheep. It is not good farming practice. We have always decried this as far as possible, but I think it is going quite a piece to say that we should have such legislation. I think that the good sound common sense and judgment of farmers is about the best type of legislation one can have in this particular regard.

This pork authority, I am afraid, is something I fail to grasp the significance of. My hon. friend might want to elucidate on it a

little bit further. I am afraid I am not in a position to comment on it. I do not know enough about it.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I realize there is a problem. My hon. friend has suggested that if a farmer was slack, I suppose, in the registering of a good boar, then if this were to become law then he would be denied the right to use that boar. I realize there is a problem there.

I have been at community sales when boars were sold, and in some cases peddled from one place to the other. Often the price of such a boar would not be over \$50. To me, this is bad for the industry. I think that improvement in the industry is certainly hampered when such a practice is taking place, and in some areas to the extent that it is quite common.

The other point about the hog authority—the Ontario hog producers at their annual meeting indicated that they were in favour of such a hog authority. Now I presume that they got the idea from the Danes. As I pointed out before, the Danish people have had such a hog authority, an export authority, for some time, and the export authority actually handles all the pork for export. I understand that they actually negotiate the price in all cases for the export of that product.

The Danes have a two-price system for pork, that is to say they have a price for the domestic market and a price for the export market, and if the export market is such that the producers cannot make a profit, then the consumer is charged a surcharge on the pork which she buys in the store. In this way, the moneys resulting from that surcharge are sent back to the export authority, as I understand it, and distributed amongst the hog producers in that country. In this way, they can maintain a satisfactory price to the producer. I think this is the way it works. This is my understanding of it, at any rate.

Vote 109 agreed to.

On vote 110:

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I have some rather lengthy remarks in connection with Connaught laboratories on this vote, and I am just wondering if I should start them at this time?

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX "A" — REHABILITATION OFFICERS AS OF JANUARY 1, 1965.

NOTE: Average caseload—45

NAME AND LOCATION		CASELOAD	EDUCATION	RELATED EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF YEARS IN REHABILITATION SERVICE
<i>Main Office</i>					
Hill, J. D.	Assistant Director (Adult)		Grade 12; 2 yrs. Army Staff School; Univ. Ext. Courses—4 yrs.; in 3rd year of Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.	3 yrs. at Metro Toronto Jail. 9 yrs. service in Department	9 yrs.
Braden, J. W.	Assistant Director (Juvenile)		Grade 12; 1st year Psychology, Queen's; 1 yr. Corrections Course at U. of T.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Physical Training Course.	18½ yrs. service in Department	15 yrs.
Maxted, E. K.	63		Army Matriculation; Completed 1 yr. of Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Summer School of Alcoholic Studies—Yale Univ.	8½ yrs. service in Department	2 yrs.
Snow, B. A.	33		Grade 11; 1 yr. Corrections Course at U. of T.	12½ yrs. service in Department.	12½ yrs.
McConnell, L. R.	15		Grade 12.	20 yrs. service in Department.	13 yrs.
Huddleston, E.	40		Grade 8 and 4 yrs. Night School; 2 10-week Courses in Corrections and Social Work, U. of T.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	12 yrs. service in Department.	4½ yrs.
Duncanson, J.	33		Grade 12 (British Equivalent); Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	8 yrs. service in Department.	2½ yrs.
Sharpe, Mrs. G. M.	35		Grade 12; 3 yr. Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Extension Course U. of T. for B.A. majoring in Psychology.	4 yrs. service in Department.	2 yrs.
Simpson, Mrs. D.	30		Grade 12 and 2 yrs. Nursing School; 3 yr. Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Staff Course at O.T.C. Brampton.	5½ yrs. service in Department.	2 yrs.
Robinson, Mrs. G. M.	19		General B.A.	1 yr. service in Department. Field Projects at U.B.C.	1 yr.
Nokes, D. E.	53		Grade 13; In 1st yr. Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; In-Service Course of Metro Toronto Police.	1 yr. service in Department. 26½ yrs. Metro Police—Sergeant.	1 yr.
Youngblut, B. L.	39		Grade 12; Presently taking Correspondence Course to complete Grade 13; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	3½ yrs. service in Department.	1 yr.
Pallister, A. G.	55		Grade 12 (British Equivalent); Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	3 yrs. service in Department.	½ yr.

<i>Bowmanville</i> Cuthbertson, H. A.	Supervising Rehabilitation Officer	Grade 11; Completed 1st yr. Psychology at McMaster Univ.	18½ yrs. service in Department.	16½ yrs.
Thompson, J. C.	50	Grade 10.	23½ yrs. service in Department.	15½ yrs.
Rabb, W. M.	47	Grade 13.	18½ yrs. service in Department.	9½ yrs.
<i>Brampton</i> Gunn, V. C.	63	Grade 10; 2 Correctional Courses at U. of T.	17½ yrs. service in Department.	12½ yrs.
<i>Brantford</i> O'Sullivan, G.	53	Grade 12; 3 yr. Correctional Course at McMaster Univ.; Has 18 credits toward B.A.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	6 yrs. service in Department.	2½ yrs.
<i>Burwash</i> Brennan, F. M.	35	1 yr. University; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	12 yrs. service in Department.	7½ yrs.
LeVert, D. B.	34	Grade 10.	17 yrs. service in Department.	5 yrs.
Hughes, J. E.	26	Grade 12 and 1 yr. Commercial.	15 yrs. service in Department.	1½ yrs.
<i>Cobourg</i> Ross, M. A.	56	Grade 13.	15½ yrs. service in Department.	11 yrs.
Jackman, D. F.	38	Grade 12.	17 yrs. service in Department.	4½ yrs.
<i>Galt</i> Shipley, Mrs. T. I.	7	Grade 12; Certificate Course in Social Work, Univ. of Waterloo; In-Training Course at O.T.S. Galt; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	9 yrs. service in Department. 5 yrs. Registered Nurse.	8½ yrs.
Simmons, Mrs. M. E.	15	Grade 12.	8 yrs. service in Department.	5 yrs.
Elliott, Mrs. F. H.	36	Grade 12 and Physical Education Course; Corrections Course at U. of T.; In-Training Course at O.T.S., Galt.	8 yrs. service in Department. 14 yrs. Teacher.	4½ yrs.
<i>Guelph</i> Ingle, G. W.	Supervising Rehabilitation Officer	Teacher's College.	26 yrs. service in Department. 6 yrs. Teacher.	12½ yrs.
Smith, P. A.	52	Grade 12 (British Equivalent); Salvation Army Social Work Course; In-Training Course at O.T.S. Galt.	17½ yrs. service in Department. 9 yrs. Welfare Officer Salvation Army.	17½ yrs.

REHABILITATION OFFICERS AS OF JANUARY 1, 1965. (continued)

NOTE: Average caseload ~45

NAME AND LOCATION	CASELOAD	EDUCATION	RELATED EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF YEARS IN REHABILITATION SERVICE
<i>Guelph—Cont'd.</i>				
Foster, L. D.	56	Grade 10.	7½ yrs. service in Department.	5½ yrs.
Moore, G. D.	96	Grade 12; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	9 yrs. service in Department.	2½ yrs.
Loker, T. J.	45	Grade 10; Working towards B.A. Degree, majoring in Psychology; Course in Social Pathology Univ. of Waterloo.	18½ yrs. service in Department.	6½ yrs.
<i>Hamilton</i>				
Johnston, A. D.	60	Grade 12 and 1 yr. O.A.C.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	7 yrs. service in Department.	2½ yrs.
Dawson, Mrs. M. B.	40	Teachers' College; 1 yr. Night School, Waterloo College; In-Training Course at O.T.S., Galt.	7 yrs. service in Department. 1 yr. Teacher.	6½ yrs.
Havel, F. J.	51	Grade 12 (European Equivalent); Dept of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	14 yrs. service in Department. 3 yrs. Male Nurse.	7 yrs.
MacDonald, H. G.	53	Grade 13.	1 yr. service in Department. 21 yrs. Rhodesia Police. 2½ yrs. Municipal Admin. and Welfare.	1 yr.
<i>Lindsay</i>				
Parrott, Miss V. J.	13	Teachers' College; Corrections Course at U. of T. In-Training Course at O.T.S., Galt.	14½ yrs. service in Department. 1 yr. Teacher.	6½ yrs.
Moen, Miss A. H.	18	Grade 12.	½ yr. service in Department. 21 yrs. Registered Nurse.	½ yr.
<i>London</i>				
Hopper, H. F.	63	Grade 9; In-Training Course at O.T.S., Galt.	20½ yrs. service in Department.	16 yrs.
Graham, J. L.	58	Grade 10; Dept. of Reform Institutions Physical Training Course; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	17 yrs. service in Department.	6½ yrs.
Fletcher, F.	56	Grade 10 (British Equivalent); Extension Courses in Psychology, Counselling and Grade 13 subject.	17½ yrs. service in Department.	11 yrs.
<i>Millbrook</i>				
Fitzsimmons, G. R.	28	Grade 12.	13½ yrs. service in Department.	13½ yrs.

<i>Minnico</i> Park, P. D.	29	Grade 10 (British Equivalent); 1 yr. Corrections Extension Course, U. of T.; In 1st yr. of Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	7½ yrs. service in Department.	3½ yrs.
Griggs, D. B.	Supervising Rehabilitation Officer	Grade 12; Summer School of Alcoholic Studies—Yale Univ.; Evening Course at Bell Clinic; In-Service Course at O.T.C. Brampton.	16½ yrs. service in Department.	13½ yrs.
Pulido, F.	69	4 yrs. Univ.; Summer School of Alcoholic Studies—Yale Univ.; In 1st yr. of Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	15 yrs. service in Department. 1 yr. Welfare Worker.	12 yrs.
Thorpe, J. W.	62	Grade 8; Evening Course at Bell Clinic; Summer School of Alcoholic Studies—Rutgers Univ.; Corrections Course at U. of T.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	16 yrs. service in Department.	8 yrs.
Gregerson, A. I.	60	Grade 10 (European Equivalent); 3 yr. Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Summer School of Alcoholic Studies—Rutgers Univ.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	8 yrs. service in Department.	5½ yrs.
Blomme, E. R.	52	Grade 12 (European Equivalent); Presently enrolled at U. of T. for B.A.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	7½ yrs. service in Department.	3½ yrs.
Byrne, J. G.	54	Grade 12 (European Equivalent); Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course; In-Training Course at O.T.C. Brampton; Completed 1st yr. of 3 yr. Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.	7 yrs. service in Department.	3½ yrs.
Kiddle, D. P.	55	Grade 12 (British Equivalent); Attended 2 yrs. of 3 yr. Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	3½ yrs. service in Department.	1 yr.
<i>Monteith</i> Oliver, D. M.	53	Grade 8; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	16 yrs. service in Department.	7½ yrs.
<i>Ottawa</i> Bradley, C. E.	75	Grade 12; 1 yr. Criminology and Corrections Course—St. Patrick's College; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	19 yrs. service in Department and County Jail.	5 yrs.
Houley, Mrs. T. M.	43	Grade 11 (Australian Equivalent).	8 yrs. service in Department. 4 yrs. Nurse.	4 yrs.

REHABILITATION OFFICERS AS OF JANUARY 1, 1965. (*continued*)

NOTE: Average caseload 45

NAME AND LOCATION	CASELOAD	EDUCATION	RELATED EXPERIENCE	NUMBER OF YEARS IN REHABILITATION SERVICE
<i>Port Arthur</i>				
Nepjuk, J.	51	Grade 10; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	14½ yrs. service in Department.	12 yrs.
Grynol, T. J.	46	Grade 12; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	12 yrs. service in Department.	2½ yrs.
<i>Burrill's Rapids</i>				
Virtue, A. T.	50	Grade 10; 1 yr. Evening Criminology and Corrections Course—St. Patrick's College; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	15½ yrs. service in Department.	12½ yrs.
<i>Simcoe</i>				
O'Sullivan, J. L.	60	Grade 12; In 3rd yr. of Corrections Course at McMaster Univ.	4 yrs. service in Department.	1½ yrs.
Ball, R. R.	53	Grade 12; Dept. of Reform Institutions Staff Course.	5½ yrs. service in Department.	3½ yrs.
<i>Toronto (Mercer)</i>				
Kennedy, Mrs. K. H.	25	Grade 10.	12½ yrs. service in Department.	5 yrs.

APPENDIX "B"

Answer by the Minister of Lands and Forests:

ANALYSIS OF TRAVELLING EXPENSES FOR J. E. HIETALA, ONTARIO LAND SURVEYOR, AND PARTY AS THEY
 APPEAR IN THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS FOR THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO FOR
 THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED MARCH 31/64 (PAGE K-10)

Period Covered	Description of Survey	No. in Survey Party	Meals		Lodging		Transportation		Supplies		Maintenance of Equipment		Total Account
			\$		\$		\$		\$		\$		\$
May 6-16/63	E. Pt. Lot 15 Con. 3 Fauquier Twp., Lot 13, Con. 10 Fauquier Twp.	6	211.20		195.00		—		6.81		5.28		418.29
May 16-31/63	Pt. Lots 7, 8 Con. 1 Burton Twp. E. Pt. Lot 15, Con. 3, Fauquier Twp.	6	54.60		234.00		—		6.53		—		295.13
June 3-15/63	Subdivision of Pts. Twps. Ivanhoe and Foleyet	7	214.15		172.00		—		3.89		—		390.04
June 16-26/63	Subdivision of Parts of Twps. Ivanhoe and Foleyet	7	187.35		132.00		—		2.41		—		321.76
July 6-15/63	Locations CL511 and CL512 Lot 2, Con. 5, Twp. of Bigwood. Allowance for road between Cons. 17 and 18 in front of Lots 20-29, Twp. of Wood	7	196.80		154.00		—		3.20		2.00		356.00
July 16-30/63	Road allowance between Cons. 17 and 18 in front of Lots 15-28, Twp. of Wood and easterly boundary of Limerick Twp.	7	320.15		191.00		5.10		9.62		—		525.87
Aug. 1-15/63	Easterly Boundary of Twp. of Limerick, County of Hastings	5	249.40		140.00		5.05		10.49		2.00		406.94
Aug. 16-30/63	Easterly Boundary of Twp. of Limerick, County of Hastings	7	325.75		196.00		—		4.01		17.34		543.10
Sept. 3-15/63	Easterly Boundary of Twp. of Limerick, County of Hastings	7	220.50		154.00		—		1.59		—		376.09
Sept. 11-27/63	Easterly Boundary of Limerick Twp. and allowance for road between Con. 4 and 5 in front of Lots 4-12 Twp. of Dugannon	6	186.95		104.00		15.30		4.32		27.42		337.99

APPENDIX "B" (continued)

Period Covered	Description of Survey	No. in Survey Party	Meals	Lodging	Transportation	Supplies	Maintenance of Equipment	Total Account
			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Oct. 2-15/63	Allowance for road between Con. 4 and 5 in front of Lots 4-17, Twp. of Dungannon	4	128.85	72.00	—	—	—	200.85
Oct. 16-30/63	Twp. of Peck, Subdivision Twp. of Burton	2	33.45	22.00	—	—	—	55.45
Nov. 4-15/63	NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Lot 2, Con. 1, Dryden Twp. and of S.R.L. CLS. 515 Lot 5, Con. 3, Servos Twp. and Retracement in Trill Twp.	5	212.20	200.00	—	.99	1.95	415.14
Nov. 19-28/63	Northerly $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles of the Eastern Boundary of the Twp. of Tarentorus, District of Algoma and NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Lot 2, Con. 1, Dryden Twp.	6	198.50	187.50	—	—	—	386.00
Jan. 6-13/64	Exterior Boundary of Brunetville Subdivision, Twp. of O'Brien	1	34.80	20.00	34.50	—	21.20	110.50
Jan. 23/64	Survey—2 bridge abutments—Tay Twp.	2	5.10	—	—	—	—	5.10
			2,779.75	2,173.50	59.95	53.86	77.19	5,144.25



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, May 31, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, May 31, 1965

Estimates, Department of Agriculture, Mr. Stewart, concluded	3447
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davis, second reading	3466
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3478

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MAY 31, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(continued)

On vote 110:

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments about the Connaught laboratories and their full-scale entry into the swine business in the province—indeed across Canada. The intended aim of the programme is to develop a pig that will consistently outperform all other pigs, in terms of feed efficiency, rate of gain, livability, quality, and so on.

I understand that today Connaught has more than 1,000 purebred pigs in its herd. In addition, there are satellite farms that are producing thousands of high-bred gilts. It is estimated that 6,700 high-breds will be sold this year. Farmers taking these hogs are tied to the laboratory by a legal contract.

Now, in 1967, or 1968, I believe it is, Connaught plans to supply 25,000 gilts to farmers across this province and across Canada, yielding approximately half a million hogs. To say this is a large-scale operation, is certainly one of the biggest understatements of the year. The programme started with the introduction of SPF pigs, which means, as my hon. friend knows, that the pigs are free from atrophic rhinitis and virus pneumonia—diseases which certainly inhibit the growth and feed conversion of the hog.

In addition to Connaught SPF programme, an intensive cross-breeding programme was launched, with top breeding stock from this country and from Great Britain. The stock was culled and the very best of animals were selected, so that Connaught ended up, I believe, with four strains of Landrace, three strains of Yorkshire and three substrains of Lacombe.

It is an ambitious programme, but there is one question that looms large in the minds of farmers in the province. As far as they are concerned, is it going to hurt or help the industry? If it is going to hurt the industry, then I would be safe in saying that the

farmers in this province would want the government to tell Connaught in no uncertain terms, that the programme must be changed. If, on the other hand, it is going to help the industry, I am sure that it would receive widespread support.

However, there seems to be growing fears that it is going to hurt the industry. For example, government veterinarians detected, I believe last fall, some positive heads among those that were sent from Connaught, which would ordinarily mean that the veterinarians at the veterinary college in Guelph, had detected atrophic rhinitis. What happened then, as I understand it, was that Connaught immediately stopped sending heads into Guelph for testing—and that included lungs as well; but they continued to sell breeding stock as SPF pigs, and they charged SPF prices.

In other words, when the government veterinarians diagnosed atrophic rhinitis, Connaught arbitrarily decided that they did not have atrophic rhinitis.

Another interesting facet to this whole affair is the fact that there is a very definite absence of records of the Connaught herd and the Connaught stock. They have also failed to meet ROP requirements. This means that one is really not too sure of the quality of the stock that is being produced and sold to farmers across Canada. Not only is ROP testing not done, but Dr. Crawley has said that he has no intention of participating in such a programme. He even said that he would not permit government officials to check his livestock.

Connaught, it seems, has applied pressure on both the provincial and federal governments to get the herds certified, despite the fact that they are not willing to make any attempt to live up to the standards and the regulations necessary for such certification.

There are a number of questions in regard to the quality and performance of the breeding stock. If the laboratories are going to sell breeding stock on such a large scale, then it naturally follows that the breeding stock should be of a superior nature. If it is not, and we have indications—no real proof—but we have indications that it is not, then real and perhaps permanent damage could be

done to the swine industry in this province, by such a programme.

Since no one really knows for sure whether these animals are superior or not, because the laboratory themselves have not seen fit to give the general public the information, then I think that it is the responsibility of the government, either to find out, or get someone else to find out exactly what is going on in connection with Connaught's programme. If Connaught fails to meet the standards in the SPF programme or in ROP testing, the government should, in my opinion, put a stop to the programme and what I would call the misrepresentation that appears to be taking place.

If, on the other hand, Connaught is willing to co-operate and meets the standards and regulations of the various programmes producing superior stock, then all well and good; there is nothing wrong with that. But if Connaught continues to exhibit the attitude of thumbing its nose at the government and conducting its own programme, really in effect being a law unto itself, then I say it is time the government stepped into the picture and took a firm hand in this matter.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 110 carried?

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): I would like to hear the hon. Minister's views on this, if he would care to comment.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): I would like to say this in connection with Connaught laboratories. First of all they are not a participant in our SPF programme of hogs in Ontario. They are not certified. Now as was said this afternoon, the ROP programme, as it pertains to swine, is a federal programme. They establish the standards, they carry out the tests.

As far as Connaught laboratories is concerned, it is a separate entity, I believe wholly supported by the University of Toronto and what donations are made to it. They depend on no support from the government whatever, for the operation of their laboratories.

Mr. Oliver: Do they not get any support from the government?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, none whatever.

As far as the programme of swine breeding is concerned, it is the prerogative of the farmers of Ontario to choose this breeding stock as they wish. If they feel it is in their interests to become engaged with Connaught Laboratories in the production of swine under this programme, then it is their affair, just

as it is to go to any other breeder and become involved with him in the production of live-stock.

I do not feel that we have any right to get into the position of saying to farmers, "You cannot participate in this programme at all." I do not think we have any more right to say this with regard to Connaught than we have to go to any other breeder in the province of Ontario, and say, "no longer can you sell your breeding stock to farmers."

If the farmers are willing to buy under the circumstances and under the terms of the agreement, then I think it is their prerogative to do so.

When it comes to enrolling the programme in our department, then it becomes our responsibility to determine whether or not the company, or the farmer, complies with the standards laid down, and whether he will be certified or not.

Mr. Oliver: Well, may I ask my hon. friend to what extent does the University of Toronto support the Connaught laboratories in this venture? Does he know? Because to that extent, they are jeopardizing the other breeders in the province, would my hon. friend not say?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If my memory serves me correctly, the Connaught laboratories are wholly supported by the royalties they get on the serums that are produced at the laboratories, and on various types of antibiotics and what-have-you that are produced there. This produces revenue and this revenue, or part of it, has been invested in the swine programme, which is in itself self-perpetuating—

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Chairman, may I be very naive for a moment and ask my hon. friend what is the extent of this programme at the Connaught laboratories? How many swine are involved, and what is the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce related these figures and they are quite extensive. I think they have plans for them to expand in quite a substantial way across Canada; there are, I believe, contracts being drawn up. From reports that I have read and from what I have seen on television—there was a show on this, I believe, on CBC Country Calendar, if my memory serves me correctly, a few weeks ago—Connaught laboratories are expanding their operations into western Canada.

Mr. Oliver: That is the difficulty, if I may suggest this to my hon. friend, I think they

are going beyond the realm of research and they are into a commercial venture.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, I think that is quite right.

Mr. Oliver: You think that is quite right?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I do.

Mr. Oliver: Therein I suggest lies the great danger! If we are going to allow this mammoth to grow and grow with university support, where is the end going to come? I mean, to what extent are they going to go all across Canada? Are they going to produce untold thousands of hogs in competition with other breeders? I mean, there must be a final stage to this thing somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Perhaps there should be, but at the same time I do not think it is the position of this government to step in and say, stop this programme. I do not think it is our place at all to step in and stop this programme. They are an autonomous company, they are self-supporting, they are indeed a branch of the University of Toronto, as I understand it. We have no authority to step in and say to Connaught laboratories, you cease this programme; because obviously a good many farmers must be accepting the programme or they would not be meeting with the success with which they are meeting.

Mr. Oliver: Does my hon. friend say they are a company?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I said they were a separate entity, but associated with the University of Toronto, as far as I know.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You said a company.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If I said a company, I do not believe this is the case. They are a branch of Toronto University.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that Connaught is actually selling SPF pigs and they are not certified. Yet they are selling pigs and contracting pigs out to farmers across the province as SPF pigs and are charging SPF prices. Herein lies the danger, or one of the dangers.

I think that as far as the responsibility of the government is concerned, it is quite clear to me; I think that this is misrepresentation. If Connaught wants to certify their herd and live up to the regulations and the standards in order to certify their herd as an SPF programme; fine, well and good. But they have

not done that. As I say, herein lies one of the dangers.

Vote 110 agreed to.

On vote 111:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): On vote 111, Mr. Chairman, might I raise a question regarding the two price system that has been bandied around in various agricultural press? I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment, say, specifically on onions. If there were established a two price system for onions, do you think this would help in our serious problem in this regard in establishing a firm price now for our export markets?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the hon. member's question, this comes under the food council vote. Are we at 112?

Mr. Paterson: No. I was asking this under marketing and I—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, this is the office of the commissioner of marketing, and really what you have raised I think comes under 112. I will be quite pleased to deal with it then.

Mr. Paterson: That is fine.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of interest, I would like to know the purpose of the office of the commissioner of marketing. What is the purpose, I really do not know?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The purpose of the office of the commissioner of marketing has been co-ordinating marketing research and acting as liaison officer between the markets branch, the farm products market board, food council, the Minister's office, the deputy Minister's office, with the various commodity groups, particularly associated with the Ontario food terminal and with the Ontario tender fruit institute and such organizations as that. The intention is that the office of the commissioner of marketing will be blended into the food council with the recent resignation from The Department of Agriculture of Mr. G. F. Perkin, who was the commissioner of marketing. He has left us after, what, 40 years service, 35 years service to the department? This aspect will be blended into the Ontario food council, so I think next year you will see one vote for the food council instead of the two votes that we have this year.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, on that specific point, this is perhaps an administrative matter, but if you are

going to blend it in and Mr. Perkin has now resigned, why have we got this estimate this year? Why is it not "instant" blending instead of "one year" blending?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There are two very good reasons: First of all, when this estimate book was prepared I had no knowledge and I do not believe anyone else in our department had any knowledge that Mr. Perkin was resigning. In the second place this estimate was, as I said, prepared last December; the position will be filled, but filled in the food council, so that in effect the personnel would just be moved over into that vote. It is just an administrative detail.

Vote 111 agreed to.

On vote 112:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, on the food council. It would be a shame to let this vote go by without asking the hon. Minister for the information his statisticians have been able to provide him with on the extent to which vertical integration has been eased, or perhaps even rolled back by the activities of the food council. Perhaps there is some information he could give the House on the subject.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is a perennial subject for discussion. I would say that there may be little indication that there is less vertical integration in Ontario, but I would say that there is little indication that there is any more than there has been in the last few years.

In fact, some of the companies that had gotten into the field have retired from it now and others have, in some areas, expanded in two or three crops. I can think of canning peas and sweet corn as being two illustrations where there has been some expansion in this programme. On the other hand, I think we have to recognize that after a good deal of study by all sides of the industry, both the production and the processing side of it, through the food council, there has been some general acceptance that there is a place for at least a limited amount of vertical integration. This may be a strange admission for me, but nevertheless I must say that this is the result of their findings.

Mr. Oliver: I would think it was. Just what type would the hon. Minister condone?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think we want to see it expanded to the place where it becomes wholesale across the province and extends to every aspect of commodity production; and yet, on general principles, after

a great deal of thought, there does not seem to be as much opposition to it as there was a few years ago.

Mr. Nixon: I might submit, Mr. Chairman, that the reason the opposition to integration seems to be fading out is that the large number of farmers who were put out of business by vertical integration have accommodated themselves as best they can to other markets and other projects. As the hon. Minister has said, the topic has come up for a number of years now. I hope he does not get the impression that it still is not working hardships on the farmers of the province, specifically in the canned crop field where he has said that vertical integration has continued unabated, and, as a matter of fact, this year is considerably advanced over last year.

The hardship has been one that has been absorbed by the farm community over a period of probably eight to ten years. We have lost all hope that anything the department can do would bring back these cash crops into the realm where the ordinary farmer can take some advantage of them.

The food council that we are discussing at the present time was instituted specifically to be the arm of government which would deal with vertical integration. I remember very little of any ancillary objects that were discussed at the time. I know that there are other objects that have come into more importance as the government has admitted, I suppose, that it is either powerless or unwilling to do anything about the fact that the large processing firms have taken over primary production in a good many fields of the agricultural industry.

I would like to ask my hon. friend, Mr. Chairman, if in fact his admission that some kinds of vertical integration are in the general good would be an indication that, if I might call it the fight against vertical integration, has been lost and the food council is going to concern itself with other matters.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I would not want that opinion to exist. The food council is very conscious of this matter of vertical integration, in fact it has been their continuing objective to in every way relieve and alleviate, in fact not allow, the sudden damaging effect of immediate vertical integration to pertain in an expanding way to some of these agricultural food commodities. I think it has been most effective in limiting the spread of vertical integration, and in fact in some instances it has been responsible for eliminating it altogether. In other areas, there seems to be general agreement, even

between the producers and the processors involved, that there is a place for it to a limited degree.

It seems to lend itself to co-ordinated harvesting and continuity of supply to the plants that seems to work reasonably well. Both the producers and the processors have agreed and are working with the food council at every opportunity where there appears to be a threat of increasing vertical integration. So I think we have to recognize that there has to be some reasonable attitude taken to this. Insofar as possible we must guarantee the continuance of contract negotiations between producers and processors, but also we must recognize the place of vertical integration.

Mr. Oliver: Could the hon. Minister tell me what concrete evidence there is that the food council has been instrumental in stemming the onward march of vertical integration? Can he give me one specific instance?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Where they have thwarted it or eliminated it?

Mr. Oliver: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In tomatoes, for one instance.

Mr. Oliver: That was before you appointed the council, though, you said you had done that yourself.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, no; the food council was in operation at that time.

Mr. Oliver: I do not think so!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The food council completely wiped it out on tomato production. I am flattered that my hon. friend has given me the honour for this, but my humility makes me feel that I must give some credit to the food council for this.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that it was eliminated and is no more as far as the tomato industry is concerned. There are other instances where it was tried and has been stemmed by the efforts of the food council in working towards the elimination of it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just a brief comment here. I was very interested in the observation of the hon. Minister that vertical integration may be acceptable under certain conditions. The food council or the hon. Minister—let us not quibble on which—may have removed it in tomatoes, they may have limited it elsewhere, but I think quite frankly, as the hon. mem-

ber for Brant has said, they have just decided that they are going to live with it.

But there is one kind of vertical integration that is not only welcomed, it should be encouraged, and that is vertical integration from the bottom up instead of from the top down. This is where I have my complaints with this government—in their reluctance to give to the producer that degree of control of marketing, if necessary in processing right through to the market, so that vertical integration is going to be a process in which the benefits accrue to the original producer who did most of the work rather than to the man who dominated the heap right from the outset and is just going to extract more of the middleman's profits, as well as his original profits.

In other words, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Grey South thrown in during the course of the debate—what kind of vertical integration is good? I would say vertical integration from the bottom up, where the farmers control it and carry the process right through to the market is not only good, it should be welcomed. I think this government should encourage it and assist it.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, we are asked, actually, to appropriate \$156,000 for the food council. I have no doubt that they have rather elaborate statistical facilities at their disposal. I was wondering if there are statistics available that we as members of the House could look over that would indicate the change in vertical integration in the various aspects of the agricultural economy.

I may have missed the report of the food council—this is quite possible—but I kept an eye out for these statistics and I have never been able to find anything available this year that would indicate just how the statistics are changing with relation to it.

I wonder if there is such material available?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think we have it here, but we have material in the office we could get for the hon. member on the specific contracts that have been let. For instance, I have been handed a note from my good friend, the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde) which tells me that one canning company contracted 250 acres in the Kerwood area this year where none was contracted last year. Now, this is a very large company that I understand was in the vertical integration field some time ago but apparently is going back into the contracting field again. I think this is typical of it.

I do know that in the Exeter area, where there was some vertical integration, Canadian

Canners of Huron county have rented some farms and yet they have vastly expanded their contract acreage this year over last year; and last year was expanded over the year before. I have talked to them on many occasions concerning these matters as have the members of the food council. I think we have pointed out to them the dangers that are inherent in vertical integration and our objection to it.

On the other hand, I do not think even my hon. friend would want to draft legislation that would completely obliterate vertical integration because, as I said, there does appear to be some reason for it.

As the hon. member for York South has said, vertical integration from the bottom up is quite acceptable. We have illustrations of that in Ontario today. Now, if you have a law that there can be no vertical integration, then I think you must realize that that law will affect those who are vertically integrated from the bottom up, as my hon. friend says, from producer level to the processor.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister's views on a proposed law that might control vertical integration, but actually we are very interested in the statistics that would indicate how this problem is changing in the province of Ontario. As a matter of fact, it is not clear at all whether vertical integration is expanding or contracting. Every bit of information that I am able to gather would indicate that it is expanding, notwithstanding the comments that have been handed to the hon. Minister by the hon. member for Middlesex South. It seems to me that if we are going to finance the food council, whose primary aim is to control vertical integration or be the authority on this, that we should be able to expect some statistics from them in the form of a report that would indicate just how this problem is changing.

I will let it go at that, but I would like to see the statistics.

Mr. Oliver: I would like to ask the hon. Minister: Does the food council make a report, a statistical report, an annual report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, not an annual report.

Mr. Oliver: They make a report to which the members have access?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not think so. It is in the Minister's report. I do not have one with me, but it was tabled in the report of The Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Oliver: The food council is made up of representatives of producers and industry; why should they not make a report that would be available to the hon. members of the Legislature? It is not strictly a government commission; it is a commission that is representative of wide, divergent groups and they focus their attention on very important problems.

As my hon. friend from Brant said, it would help us to know whether they are winning or losing and just what the situation is in respect to vertical integration. We do not know anything except what the hon. Minister says and all he talks about is tomatoes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In this connection, I think that is a very good suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend has made; but in the Minister's report that was tabled some weeks ago there is a report on the Ontario food council at page 192. It is quite an extensive report. It goes from page 192 to page 198—a six-page report.

Mr. Chairman, we are overlooking the importance of the establishment of the food council and its operation. I think we are doing a great deal of talking tonight about vertical integration in connection with the food council. I want to say that the food council has done more to expand the marketing of Ontario farm food products than any other organization in this government and I think this is where the emphasis should be placed. We have heard a lot less talk about vertical integration since it expanded the market for Ontario food products through the food council's efforts in Great Britain and offshore markets to the point where today, we are hard set to meet the demands of those markets with the products, whether they are vertically produced or whether they are produced under contract.

This, to me, is the important aspect of our whole food council and its operation, the fact that we are able to deal with specific projects, many of them, for instance—and I go back to the red cherries, a problem crop last fall and a typical illustration of this. What has recently happened with the onion problem in the Brantford marsh where they had an enormous crop of onions a year or two ago, and the development of the two-price system there that my hon. friend from Essex South has referred to.

This was a typical illustration of the food council's efforts on a voluntary basis to work with the Bradford marsh producers, and establish a two-price system for onions based

on what the overseas market would pay and what the domestic market would pay. By feeding the market as it was required they cleaned up the onion problem and raised the price at the same time to the producer. It was a magnificent operation. This, to me, is the way organizations can and do operate.

We were told in London last fall by the importers over there that we were, at that time, exporting 30 per cent of the entire imports of the British market. The overall annual import from Canada to Great Britain is 10 per cent of the total import to the British market of onions, and to me that is a most significant development. And this has all come about in the last few years.

For instance, last year we exported 1,200,000 50-pound bags to the United Kingdom market. We have virtually provided an export industry for onions through the efforts of the food council and our overseas office in Ontario House. This, to me, is illustrative of the things that can be done, and I think we should be focusing our attention on these kind of things rather than on the matters of vertical integration as they are matters of concern to all of us concerning the food council.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has answered the great bulk of my questions, but I wonder has there been any firm commitment this year as to the placing of onions in Great Britain?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must confess that there are no firm orders for next year's production. It is just planted now. Suffice to say that this market has been built up, and the quality of our onions is well accepted in Great Britain. As a matter of fact, when we were over there we found on the London market that the only onion that was more acceptable to the trade, and selling at a higher price, was the Polish onion. And the only reason that it was selling higher than ours was that there were uniform size onions in each bag. You could not tell the difference in size, they had been so carefully sorted. Our onions were of equally high quality, but they were not sized as accurately as were the Polish onions, so our onions were selling for a little bit less per bag.

I came back and talked to the food council about this, and I made some reference to a consumer group or two about this and I must confess that my wife took me to task for this. She said that she was not so sure that I was on the right track, that when she bought onions she did not want every one of them the same size—one day you

want a small onion for what you want to do, and the next day you want a large one. She said that perhaps what I was talking about was something that the housewife does not really appreciate. I found that she was substantiated by other consumers who seemed to know a little more about that aspect of it than I did. So I soft-pedalled that approach, and I think the fact that we have broken into that market to the extent we have is indicative of the fact that we do not have many problems.

Last year we brought over, for the first time, through the efforts of the food council, a group of British food importers and had them here for a period of a few weeks. We gave them the opportunity to visit the production areas, the processing plants and packaging areas of many of these food products that we have here. The result was that they went back to Great Britain tremendously impressed with the potentials of our production possibilities. When we were in London last fall, we had a meeting with them and they were so enthralled by what we had to offer, and the connections that could be developed and expanded, that we formed a branch of the Ontario food council in London, with Ted Merritt, who is our man at Ontario House, as vice-chairman of the food council in charge of the off-shore markets for Ontario food products.

The very fact that we are in the United Kingdom market these last few years to the extent of supplying 42 per cent of the total tomato juice imported is indicative of the tremendous strides that have been made in exporting our food products from this country. I feel that these products that we can export should be exploited to the full, and this summer we are bringing over another group of food importers—food brokers—in order that they might have a look at what we have to offer and thereby establish contact and make purchase contracts. This is the thing we are interested in.

Mr. Paterson: I appreciate the comments of the hon. Minister. I wonder if at this stage there are any specifics available as to the number of acres that have been planted in onions this year as compared to last year. The onion farmer tends to gamble quite a bit on his crop, and I know for a fact that a great many hundreds of bags of onions were dumped in the province this year that were not sold. I have read also that there were a few problems in England with the quality of some of our shipments. Could the hon. Minister tell us how many bags were dumped through regrading in the United Kingdom?

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Just the ones from Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: I might mention to the hon. member for Kent West that the top grade onions came from Kent and Essex.

Mr. McKeough: We did not dump any in Kent.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am advised that the acreage of onions is up about 10 per cent this year. As far as the onions that were dumped are concerned, there were a few that were not acceptable for human consumption. We ran into a very bad harvesting season right at onion harvesting time last year, I cannot recall the name of the disease—

An hon. member Neck rot!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Neck rot set in. It is a peculiar problem that developed last year and it did show up in a few in England. We did not find any when we were there, but we were aware that it had been a problem. But the food council had been advised that the problem had appeared in Great Britain and had checked with the various onion packaging plants here who, when advised of the problem, were a little more careful about the grading of the onions as they went into the bags, because the disease showed up after they had been stored a little while.

Mr. Paterson: Will this affect our market this coming year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It should not affect it.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): I might say that I am talking the opposite to what you said with regard to the food council and the fine job they have been doing in expanding our markets, I would like to say that I am on the other side of the picture. Some of the processors of tomatoes and vegetables are concerned about the large number of tomatoes processed in one form or another that are brought from Italy into the province of Ontario. They are selling for more money than our Ontario product is selling for, and yet we have land here in the province of Ontario that will grow these tomatoes. It is a great concern to some of the processors.

I wonder if the hon. Minister has any idea, or could inform me of the volume of tomatoes brought in, in one form or another, into Ontario or into Canada?

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Is that not a federal matter?

Mr. Spence: I would not think so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say that there are sizeable quantities. For example, tomato paste brought in from Italy. I think we can look forward to a lessening of this importation because the costs of producing that tomato paste in Italy are going up, and our people are more competitive now with the people in Italy than they were. We also have a tomato paste factory, I believe, being established in Ontario to produce this very tomato paste. This is being built by an international firm, as I understand it, and I am sure that unless they felt they could be competitive from the production standpoint here, they would not be building that plant and putting that investment in here. So I have good reason to believe that there may be a lessening of this importation of tomato paste. We have certainly more than offset that in the exports of our tomato juice.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, does The Department of Economics and Development still maintain a committee to foster the sale of Ontario agricultural goods?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The Department of Agriculture and The Department of Economics and Development work together very closely in this field. We have appointed Mr. W. H. Richardson—I do not know whether he is here with us tonight or not—but W. H. Richardson has been appointed, and his office is in The Department of Economics and Development. He is our man in that department who works with the overseas offices of The Department of Economics where food products inquiries may come to their office. They in turn funnel them through to him, and he in turn works with the food council here in developing and providing the necessary information and in every way facilitating the expansion of our food export programme. It is a very, very efficient and smooth operation, and I think it is working exceedingly well.

Now, we have approval, and we are asking for approval in the estimates this year for an additional officer for the food council in the United Kingdom. We found that Mr. Merritt working in Ontario House just could not possibly cope with the demand for Ontario food products that does exist there.

I was greatly impressed. I could talk for the rest of the night on this subject. I know the hon. members would not want me to do this, but if they will permit me I would like to say that when we were there we visited innumerable food stores, many of them that were not on the itinerary at all for us to do, because many times I just simply went into

a store without anybody knowing that I was coming or anything else. I did not find a single food store without Ontario food products. They were there in every food store we visited.

We found, too, that there was some suggestion in Belfast, Glasgow and in Edinburgh food stores—that is with the food brokers there—that they would like to have additional help from Ontario House. They knew our offices were there, they had made contact, but they felt that if there was additional help, there would be a closer relationship with the Ontario food industry. This is our job and this is what we intend to do, Mr. Chairman.

Of course, the food shows that we have had in Great Britain have contributed immensely to an acceptance of our product by the British housewife. And this has built up the demand in the various stores and they are going to put us in there. We are going to Germany to do the same thing at the Anuga show this September, and I think there are great possibilities for expanding the export of many Ontario food products.

Mr. Nixon: At the risk of triggering any further ministerial enthusiasm on this, I would like to ask again about the relationship of The Department of Agriculture with The Department of Economics and Development. I well remember under a former Minister of Economics and Development the setting up of an Ontario economic council and there were subcommittees in that having to do with tourism, agriculture and almost every field. I remember very well the various Ministers commenting about the great era of co-operation. I thought the hon. Minister of Agriculture at that time was a bit less than enthusiastic, although I may have been wrong. I want to know if that committee is still in operation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To my knowledge the committee itself is not in operation, but there are represented on the economic council, agricultural representatives. There are at least two or three on that council as such, but I do not believe the subcommittee itself is fully operative, because the responsibilities of that committee have been assumed through the development of the Ontario food council. It has in effect supplanted it.

Mr. Nixon: Does our own food council in this department have any success in penetrating the common market of Europe? I know they have been successful in the British Isles and in certain countries, but how about the common market area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say that here again an indication, as I mentioned, is the food show in Germany. This is a show that is attended by a million-and-a-half food buyers, or something like that, from well over 50 countries. We think there are opportunities for us to get into that market with certain food products. I think we must be guided by the economics of the possibilities. There are certain commodities that we may be able to sell in the West German market, and in the European market, but there are certain commodities that we cannot sell, and there is no use in us trying to sell something that is not economically feasible.

It is just like talking about selling meat. We know there is a great shortage of meat in Europe, and we would like to sell them meat. But when it comes to economics our price is just too high to sell over there as yet. Maybe their price will get to the place where we can export, I do not know. I hope that that will be the case one day, but today it does not exist. There are other areas where we can compete and those are the products we should be exploiting.

Vote 112 agreed to.

On vote 113:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on the junior farmer loan branch, the provincial auditor had some comments to make about the procedures for the setting of interest, and financing any deficits of the junior farmer loan branch, and actually some other operations of the government. Is the hon. Minister familiar with these recommendations? It is on page 19 of the auditor's report.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I do not have the auditor's report with me.

Mr. Nixon: Has the interest rate for the junior farmer loan changed in the last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it has not changed. It was set at five per cent, and it is still five per cent.

Mr. Oliver: It is right in the statute.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is, very much so.

Mr. Nixon: The audit says that the department is losing money on its operation, without suggesting a rate increase—which would take an amendment of the House—but it does say that the estimates should include a sum that would cover this deficit. I may be incorrect in this, but as I read it he draws specific attention to it, and perhaps the hon. Minister might comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Apparently this matter has been discussed by my departmental officials with the Treasury board, and they have decided to put an entry through to clear up this particular item as a Treasury board order. I suppose it can be done both ways; it can be done through a Treasury board order, or it can be done through an addition to the estimates here to make up for the loss because, as I understand it, it is entailed between the rate of interest that we receive, and that which we pay for the money that is loaned out.

Mr. Nixon: Would the hon. Minister tell us what the amount of the Treasury board order this past year would have been to cover this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have not got it.

Mr. Nixon: Has the hon. Minister any idea what it is?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would be guessing, but I know I can get the figure.

Mr. Oliver: On this 113, Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism of the Ontario junior farmer loan board, but I had a young man who wanted to get a loan from them a few months ago and I thought that perhaps we were drawing the lines a little too fine.

This young man had received a loan when the old original junior farmer loan was in existence a few years ago. He is now, of course, over 35, but he wanted to buy the adjoining farm. He is an excellent young farmer, an outstanding farmer in the community. Now I thought that the junior farmer loan board would have accepted his application for an extension of the loan on a new purchase, inasmuch as he had formerly come in under the junior farmer loan board. Now, why would not that be done? They turned it down, apparently, quite flat, and I was a little surprised at the procedure.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I regret that such disappointment was experienced by my hon. friend and his friend. It is quite understandable that when a loan application is turned down there is such a feeling. However, I think we have to recognize the fact that there has to be an age limit somewhere along the line. There are other sources of credit through the farm credit corporation, and it is exactly the same loan as this is and they have no age limit in there. Our age limit is put in from 21 to 35 years.

It is quite conceivable to me that farmers who may have qualified under the old loan from 21 to 35 years may have outlived that

loan, we hope, and now find themselves in the position where they want to get further credit, but do not have access to it because of our age restriction.

However, the money is available through the farm credit corporation at the same rate of interest, under almost exactly the same conditions, so I would not feel that there should be any real problem there in this particular regard. I do feel that we have to maintain these age limits. Now this is the reason why this gentleman was turned down.

Mr. Oliver: I could understand if it was a new loan, but actually he was taking an extension of an existing one.

Mr. Nixon: I do not want to delay this, but this seems to be quite an important matter, Mr. Chairman. If I might quote from the auditor's report:

This deficit condition is due to the interest rates on much of the money borrowed being in excess of the rate being charged on the money that is presently outstanding. Although the rate charged currently on new mortgage loans has been increased, it is not expected that the revenue of the corporation will be sufficient to meet the cost of borrowed funds.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What was meant there was that the old loans that my hon. friend from Grey South referred to a moment ago were at four per cent, and there is a considerable deficit. In fact, the provincial auditor said that the accumulated deficit was \$1,010,000, and I understand that on the new loans the interest rate has been raised to five per cent, but that still does not offset the cost of borrowing. So we accumulate a little there, but we are still paying the difference on that four per cent and what money is costing today. So the accumulated overall effect is something less than \$2,000,000 of all the losses we have had in this connection.

Vote 113 agreed to.

Vote 114 agreed to.

On vote 115:

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, on vote 115, I have not been able to find a place to ask a question about the blackbird research work that is being done, and I trust that it will fit in this area. I simply ask, has there been any significant development in the programme that was undertaken last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I think this would come up more properly under 121, federated

colleges, because actually they are carrying out the programme. It can be dealt with there.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell us what progress is being made on the eradication of common barberry in the province?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it is quite—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If it is ornamental barberry, my friend, the hon. member for Riverdale has no problem, because that is exempt. It is not known as a carrier. There are types of common barberry that are carriers for certain types of rust spores. This is the barberry that is being attacked and being eliminated under the programme. It will take about three years at least to cover the province and I am advised that the programme is on schedule. It started off last spring and it is now in its second year and progressing quite favourably and, I think, quite effectively. We are meeting very good co-operation, generally speaking, in the areas in which the eradication crews are working.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is it anticipated under this programme that the common barberry will be completely eradicated from the province in a matter of years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. For all practical purposes that will be the case. If my friend the hon. member knows of some in the province we shall be very happy to know about it if it has been missed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would be interested to know under what conditions payments to municipalities under The Weed Control Act are made; item four of this vote.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Fifty per cent of the cost of the weed inspectors' salary and travelling expenses.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, since the barberry eradication programme has gone along so well, I am sure the hon. Minister and his advisers are casting their eyes to new fields to conquer. I would suggest that one of the most noxious weeds we have in the province that really has had very little thought on it at all is the common hawthorn. As you travel through the country you can see countless acres being taken over by this tree. It is very difficult to control, particularly where land is being held for a speculative purpose, or being held by an absent land owner. We see this weed tree taking over farm after farm. I wonder if the hon. Minister has a

particular programme for the control of this or if he would contemplate something along this line.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have no programme under way for this. I think it is just good farming practice to keep thorns under control. As far as we know, there is no real hazard to growing crops as there is with the barberry, so it has not come to our attention that we should go out on any eradication programme.

Vote 115 agreed to.

On vote 116:

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): I would like to have the hon. Minister discuss veterinary grants for northern Ontario, as we call them here under this vote. First of all, as I understand The Brucellosis Act, this problem has been treated through a programme of mandatory vaccination of young calves, and now this treatment is no longer mandatory. I may not be reading the bill right, but this is the way I understand it. Since I have a concern in this regard, I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell me if I am interpreting the bill properly and correctly.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Farquhar: In this connection I feel that since it is no longer mandatory, it will not be done by any means on the scale that it has been done. It is of real concern among veterinarians in northern Ontario—two that I know of feel they will have to give up their homes and move. This has been quite a source of their income, and it is going to disappear. This is going to be a real problem. I do not intend to deal with the merits or demerits of the actual cessation of the programme because I do not know them. But I am concerned about the fact that we will lose some veterinarians in northern Ontario as a result of it. I wonder if the hon. Minister would consider, in the light of this condition, a different look at subsidies or arrangements that might be made to make it a bit more attractive to keep these people here? Because if we lose them, quite apart from the merits and demerits of the vaccination programme, it is going to have some other effects, and it is going to be really a terrible effect for northern Ontario.

Incidentally, I know that some northern veterinarians are having a meeting to decide what they can do about this problem and this new condition.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, as a department, we are quite aware of the problem that exists as far as veterinary services in

northern Ontario are concerned. Our veterinary services branch and the Ontario veterinary association are carrying out discussions now, trying to work out solutions to this great and pressing problem in northern Ontario.

The matter to which you refer here—a decrease in revenue to veterinarians because of the compulsory aspects of the brucellosis programme being eliminated, this cutting into their revenue—is something that must be taken into consideration. At the same time, if this is the case I would say that they would have more time available. I must confess that I would like to see an arrangement worked out whereby the veterinarians in northern Ontario could be worked into the meat inspection service. I think that it could be done, and perhaps the service of veterinarians expanded to try to cover both fields. This is the area in which we are examining the possibilities right now. I had hoped we would be able to announce what progress we will be able to positively make at the time our estimates were being presented, but it has not been finalized as yet.

Mr. Farquhar: Just one more remark in this connection. I am very glad to hear that the hon. Minister is cognizant of the problem, but I hope that efforts will get to their attention very shortly—that they will understand there are moves on foot to keep them in business, let us say.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the programme is mandatory to January 1, 1966. We will have details worked out—

Mr. Farquhar: I understand that. But I hope you do not wait until January 1. In fact, I know of one that is not going to be there very much longer unless there is concrete evidence that they are going to be able to live in the area.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few brief comments in connection with the mastitis programme. I mentioned this earlier on, and my hon. friend indicated that it would be more appropriately brought up under this particular vote.

As my hon. friend is aware, the disease mastitis causes a huge economic loss to the farmers every year—I think it is about \$25 million or \$30 million yearly, across Canada, certainly a large amount, and one that we should not look upon lightly. I want to be brought up to date on what the department has been doing in the field of controlling this disease. I know that the veterinary services branch

has conducted a programme of mastitis control; I am simply asking my hon. friend to bring me up to date on what is being done, what has been done in the past year and what will be done next year to, at least in part, control this disease and keep the loss to a minimum.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that the mastitis problem is one of the most pressing in the dairy industry today. I know of no other problem that causes as much concern to dairymen than this problem of mastitis.

The exploratory programme that we carried out was most effective. We found that it really worked, so we have expanded this now into a wholesale control programme across the province, making it voluntary for the farmers to join this programme if they wish. We have a mastitis control policy that has been set out here with various conditions and terms of reference that the farmer and the department sign and carry out in unison. To date, since December 1, 1964, when we inaugurated the province-wide programme, we have 161 herds enrolled; there are more coming in all the time.

I think this is indicative of the interest of a good many successful dairymen in trying to clean up this problem within their own herds. We feel that we can handle up to 750 herds quite conveniently, and we would hope that other farmers would avail themselves of the opportunities that present themselves, in really coming to grips with this problem.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, another matter that I want to raise is the matter of rabies. Rabies has been a problem for a number of years now, and I know many farmers in my area have been worried about it. They have had cattle afflicted with this particular disease and, of course, we all know that once it is contracted, there is no cure for it; the animal simply dies.

We have had this disease with us for a long time, but it has become a problem in the more populated areas of the province within the past three or four years. I wonder if there is any indication that we are close to a breakthrough in terms of controlling this disease? It seems that, until this point, we have been able to do very little to control and pinpoint it, so that we might eradicate it altogether. It seems to me that the disease comes and goes at its own leisure. We have recently had an indication that it is on the way up again. I wonder if my hon. friend would have any comments in connection with it?

I know that farmers in the province have suffered financially because of this, and I am sure that they would be interested in anything new the hon. Minister would have to bring forward at this time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I share my hon. friend's concern with this disease. There is very little that can be done to actually eliminate or eradicate it, or bring it under control. We have to confess this. It is so thoroughly established in our wildlife population that it seems to go across the province in cycles, or waves. As the wildlife population is decimated, so the incidence of rabies seems to go down. Then you have the cycle of the increase coming back up again in the wildlife population, and then another cycle of rabies spreading across the province again. I think we are in our third cycle of this now, and the incidence of it is on the increase. It just goes in waves. You will see it start off in the far part of the province, north and east, and it goes across the province. Right now, it seems to be most prevalent in the south-western part of the province.

There is little, really, that can be done. Last year the claims for rabies indemnification was \$32,391, shared on the basis of 60 per cent paid by the province of Ontario and 40 per cent paid by the government of Canada, for indemnification for livestock losses due to rabies.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would be interested in knowing if any research is being conducted into the disease of rabies. I am thinking of research at the University of Guelph, or any of the other universities across the province, with the idea of eventually controlling this disease and getting it to the point where we can completely eradicate it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. This has been tried generations ago, to find some means of controlling this disease and there has been no practical means found. It is in the wildlife population; I think we have to live with it. It is one of those things, and I can see no sense in standing in this House saying that much as we would like to find an answer, and let us spend public money on research, we know that answer before we start—there is virtually no way of controlling it in wildlife. How in the world can you go out and eliminate it in skunks, groundhogs, foxes and squirrels, even in the bats that fly through the air? This is the problem. So what can one do there? I think we might as well be realistic and face it; say it is a problem and we have to live with it. We have got to be aware of

it, we have to be cautious that humans are protected insofar as it is possible. Make everybody aware of it, but live with it. I do not think there is anything else we can do.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask in regard to The Meat Inspection Act. On February 5 last, there was an article in the *Globe and Mail* headlined: "125 Slaughterhouses Due To Be Scrapped If Changes Not Made." I realize that your programme is getting nicely under way, but I wonder if the hon. Minister has any details as to the number of small plants that have updated and upgraded themselves since the passing of this Act last year, and as to how many have closed their doors?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think we were all aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, when The Meat Inspection Act was introduced that there would be some of the operators of some of the smaller plants who would feel that perhaps it was not worth their while to bring their plants up to the specifications that would be required for inspection purposes. But when our staff went out on the road and interviewed the operators of these plants, we found that at least three-quarters of the plants would qualify for inspection with minor improvements and updating of the standards. I think the preliminary inspection and the interviews with these operators on the spot has worked out very well; they are now in the process of bringing their plants up to the standards that are required with the minor changes that have to be made. Some of them do not have to make any change, and so it is working out very well.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to say to the hon. Minister that I think these facts give a great deal of assurance to our consuming public that things are under good control.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. Minister remembers December 1961, when arrests by the mounted police indicated the scandalous dealing in uninspected and bad meat in the province of Ontario. I suppose it is for a member of the Opposition to say that now that it is the spring of 1965, we are listening to the hon. Minister report that his inspection of meat in the province is getting under way.

I well remember last year when the committee on agriculture met with the hon. Minister and the chief of the health of animals division from Ottawa, when it was made clear that although the Act provided for separate inspection by provincial authority, we were going to do something far better

than that. We were going to have federal inspection across this province so that the consumer would be assured of the quality that all of us feel should be provided. I have never really been clear in my mind why it was that the section of the Act which provided for separate provincial inspection was relied upon to bring inspection even as far as it has presently come. Was it that the regulations at the federal level were more stringent than the hon. Minister had expected, or was there some other reason that the present level of inspection was implemented?

I would say, before the hon. Minister answers, that in many areas this is a sore point. One of the first speeches I ever made in the House recommended to him that some form of separate inspection should be implemented—this was in January, 1962—so that perhaps at a slightly different standard we would be able to allow the many small operators in the province to continue the slaughter of animals, and so that trade of the type to which we had grown accustomed before the scandals were revealed, could be continued. Perhaps the hon. Minister would tell us why it was decided to change the basis of inspection. And secondly, precisely what the level of inspection is at the present time.

I understand that there is bound to be a period during which inspectors are trained, but are we in southern Ontario at this point under full meat inspection?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: First of all this is a very large question to answer in just a word. There has been much debate in this House on many occasions as to why the province of Ontario has entered into the field of meat inspection on its own. Suffice it to say that we, with the best of intentions—and I thought with a very reasonable attitude—approached the federal government to work out with them the details of providing meat inspection throughout the province of Ontario. They have their inspectors established in the federal plants now; we felt that, under their supervision and with properly trained lay inspectors, it could easily be expanded to include the smaller plants that are not involved in interprovincial or export trade, which is the responsibility of the federal Department of Agriculture inspections. I thought that this was a very reasonable suggestion. I liked it so well that we talked it over with the people in Ottawa, and they were agreed that this could be worked out.

Mr. Nixon: Might I interrupt and ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: What year was it the exploratory talks took place, would it be 1963 or—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, no. The Act was passed in 1962, was it not? January, 1962, the Act was passed and it was in that year we entered into the discussion with Ottawa to carry it out, because, as the Act—

Mr. Nixon: The Dead Animal Disposal Act, or whatever it was, was January 1962?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, because I became Minister in 1961—we are getting confused about these dates and I do not think it is really important, quite frankly.

Mr. Nixon: Well, I would assume that the first talks took place in 1963—for federal inspections.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it may have been in 1963, I do not think it is a point of great importance.

Mr. Nixon: Sorry to interrupt.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The fact is that they did take place and we thought that everything was coming along very well. The Minister, his deputy and the director of the health of animals branch—the veterinary director-general under whose auspices meat inspection is carried out—were agreed that this was a logical proposal and that it could work. But when we got around to the actual implementation of it, when it came right down to coming to grips with the small slaughterhouse operator and what he would be required to do, we were of the opinion that the intent of our legislation had not got through to the people who would be, in effect, enforcing the legislation in the country.

This does not pertain to the Minister, his deputy or the top staff at all, and I do not say this in a derogatory way. I want to be as non-political as I can possibly be because there is no politics involved in this. We worked away at it from time to time; we had trips back and forth to Ottawa but we could not seem to arrive at a common meeting ground on making applicable and workable the federal standards as these pertained to small slaughterhouses.

Mr. Nixon: They would not lower their standards; or is that unfair?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think this would be about what one could say, yes. And I think with good reason, because they felt that if they were to lower them, someone could

say: "Well, you have asked us to accept two standards." Now, we went to Ottawa and simply told them that we were going to embark on this ourselves, I think it was a bit of a shock to all of them, quite frankly. It was to us, but we decided to do it. And having decided to do it, we asked them for the fullest co-operation and they offered the fullest co-operation, and it was mutually to our advantage to accept.

They provided for us top senior people from their staff to inspect the plants throughout Ontario in co-operation with our veterinary director of the province of Ontario, and under his supervision. The survey has been completed. There were 403 red meat plants inspected and 75 poultry plants surveyed in Ontario, making a total of almost 500 plants that had been surveyed. We found that about 75 per cent of them could meet the requirements with very modest modifications.

First of all, I want to make it abundantly clear that there is absolutely no difference in the standards of the meat itself—the health standards of the animal in ante mortem inspection and the standards of the meat in post mortem inspection—they are identical with the federal standards. The difference pertains to the plant standards, the height of ceilings and so on, the various plant requirements that do in some instances pertain. This is where the difference really exists. So our consuming public, when they buy meat inspected in the province of Ontario, will be buying meat that meets exactly the same health standards as does the federally inspected product.

Mr. Nixon: The final part of that question was: Can you assure us then that in the territory covered by the bill, that is, southern Ontario, all the meat is presently inspected?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it is not presently inspected; we are gradually bringing it in. I believe we have the inspectors working now in the Niagara peninsula, it was decided to start the programme in the Niagara peninsula and it is now in operation there. The first group of inspectors have been brought in, have been given a briefing course on our standards and they are now in the field carrying out meat inspections. The second group of inspectors have been engaged and they are presently, I believe, in the plants on actual inspection work with the federal inspectors. They will be starting out into the field as well.

The idea is gradually to cover this with lay inspectors directly under the supervision of qualified veterinarians who are health of

animals inspectors, who will be in charge of the whole programme and it will be expanded right across the province of Ontario.

At the time I brought in the bill back in—I see it received assent in December, 1962, the session prorogued on April 26, 1963—at that time I said that northern Ontario might not come in at the same time. Now I am hopeful, recalling previous discussion here tonight that perhaps northern Ontario may get the inspection before parts of southern Ontario, because of the developments we anticipate.

Mr. Nixon: What is the timetable then for the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The timetable is to bring it in just as quickly as we can train inspectors and get it into operation. But I want to point out to my hon. friend that if he had suggested to us, as I think he would like to intimate to this House, that we should have brought this in sooner, it could have caused untold hardship to many of the small slaughterhouse operators who were providing a healthy, wholesome product for the people of this province then as now. I think we have to respect their financial position and the contribution that they are making to the community and to the service they are providing. Having borne this in mind, we are bringing it in as quickly as we possibly can, in as efficient and practical a manner as is possible.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I was quite ready to accept the information but if the hon. Minister is going to make some comments about what I might have suggested, then I would like to put the facts on the record again: The original scandal causing this was in 1961; your Act passed this House in 1962; we have not got meat inspection in 1965 and I doubt if it will be ready by the end of this year. Now, I agree with the hon. Minister that the meat that has been provided by these small abattoirs is of a high standard, but we do not know for sure and the consumer has not known for sure, although the hon. Minister and I would agree from our experience it is good. Maybe we would have agreed before 1961, when the federal revelation concerning this came out.

I do not want to get out of line on this, but if the hon. Minister is going to get on his soap box, we have a case too, because it was put to him directly from the Opposition that this is precisely what he would have to do. It was put to him in 1962. Now, he has done it in 1965; we hope the inspection is going to be effective, but there is no indication for

us to believe that it will be completed, even this year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to let that little remark go by unnoticed. My hon. friend in the Opposition here reminds me—with his very charming personality, a very handsome young gentleman—reminds me of something that I recall in connection with the Royal winter fair. Last year I was out there. Indeed it was the night the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) officially opened the fair. There was a young lady there engaged to come into the ring to provide a demonstration of Roman riding—a very charming young blonde lady from the United States, I believe. She came into the ring riding two white horses, driving four ahead of her—six horses. They came into the ring and apparently someone in the ring had got his signals crossed and let her come in too soon. There was a great deal of trouble. However, she managed the horses exceedingly well and finally got them under control. She did a magnificent job of riding two horses at the same time. This is reminiscent of what my hon. friend from Brant said tonight, because I know of no one in this House who has done a better job of riding two horses at once than my hon. friend from Brant in this matter of meat inspection.

And I say this, that he stood in this House—and he knows as well as I do that the dead meat scandal had nothing to do with meat inspection in this province, absolutely nothing.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, the hon. Minister never thought of it before that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I said nothing to the hon. member when he was talking. We amended The Dead Meat Inspection Act and we have not had an instance of that problem developing from that time to this.

Now then, meat inspection has been provided in the federal plants for inter-provincial and export trade. And it was only natural that the consumers of the province of Ontario should ask for meat inspection to be extended to all the slaughterhouses in this province. This we have attempted to do, but the hon. member has stood in this House and he has pleaded on innumerable occasions that we should pay attention to the position of the small slaughterhouse operator in the economy of this province, and rightly so. I agree with him that this is the thing to do. Now what would my hon. friends have said to me tonight if I had brought this in here quickly and had said to the small slaughterhouse operators, "Get your plant in shape or you are out of business"? That is what the

hon. member was intimating I should have done. We believe that what we are doing is in the best interest of all the people of the province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me to put the record straight and to clarify the muddled thinking of the hon. Minister, I would say without any doubt—and the record will bear this out—that the first speech I made as the member for Brant—where I must admit that the scandal having to do with meat began—was that the government should bring in provincial meat inspection because the people required the safeguard. And, second, the hundreds of operators who were providing a quality product would thereby be safeguarded. I well remember that my first touch of the political lash came from my friend to my immediate left who said there should be absolutely no compromise with quality and that federal inspection should be applied to everything.

Now, down through the years of debate and deliberation, every member from a constituency representing people who are making a living in the slaughterhouse business, has been adamant that if a slaughterhouse operator is living up to reasonable standards, he should not be put out of business. From the very beginning I felt—and I told the hon. Minister and I told the House—that the way it should be done was with provincial inspection. This is what he has done, and I approve of it, but it began in 1961 or even on the hon. Minister's timetable, in 1962, and it will not be complete this year.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask what I hope is a rather harmless question in this connection. I want to have clarified for me the confusion in my own mind that exists in connection with the stamping of the meat.

At the time when the bill was originally introduced by my hon. friend, I understood that all the meat that was inspected was to be stamped with "Canada approved." Now that we are going to do our own inspecting, I wonder what the stamp is going to be. Is it going to be "Ontario approved"? What exactly is it going to be? I think at that time it was felt that if there was one stamp, it would avoid confusion in the public mind, that the consuming public would feel that we had one standard of meat inspection. I would be interested to know what is going to happen in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, my hon. friend likely gets the *Ontario Gazette*—if he had he would have seen the stamp. Here it is right here—“Ontario approved.” I must confess—the hon. member for York South suggests “Province of Opportunity,” and I would like very much to include that somewhere—but this is “Ontario approved.” It provides the coat of arms within the sign here and the plant number will be in here. This is left blank. It is exactly the same ink as is used on the federal stamp; it will be stamped on the carcass in the same place as the federal stamp and I think there will be a little difference in shape between the two.

Vote 116 agreed to.

Vote 117 agreed to.

Vote 118 agreed to.

Vote 119 agreed to.

On vote 120:

Mr. Spence: Under this heading, under Western Ontario agricultural school, I wish to commend the hon. Minister for recommending to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) to expand the men's residence and the dining hall in the Western Ontario agricultural school. The hon. Minister is well aware that the conditions there are crowded; with this expansion it will make it possible for more young men interested in agriculture to take courses here. I hope that the hon. Minister will see that that expansion is completed this year. Western Ontario agricultural school will be helped a great deal.

Vote 120 agreed to.

On vote 121:

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this vote. If my hon. friend were to ask me if I were going to be brief I would tell him yes; I think we are going to be brief. I will not be over 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a well known fact that pesticides and insecticides are here to stay. The economic pressure for them is tremendous and their use is certainly going to be continued in this province by the farm people, and those who are connected with the pesticide control programme in one form or another.

I want to make a few comments about the fact that they have done some rather interesting work in the United States in this connection. Initially, at least, it was in the form of experiments; later on, it has gone beyond

that experimental stage and is now in the stage of being quite a practical programme.

Instead of controlling insects through pesticides and insecticides, in some parts of the states they do it by introducing parasites of the particular insect that they are trying to control. They have had a great deal of success with this particular programme. I can cite a number of cases where this has been so, and I wonder if we have reached the law of diminishing returns in our use of pesticides and insecticides—that is to say, the insects eventually build up an immunity to certain types of pesticides and insecticides. In the United States they have found that this programme has worked much more effectively than has the use of pesticides and insecticides, simply because there is not this build-up. I can think particularly of the house fly and the use of DDT in its control. Over the years, the house fly has built up an immunity to DDT and I am told by my research friends that this is the result of an enzyme within the body of the house fly which changes the chemical organically, apparently, and makes it into a harmless element within the body and so the house fly, for instance, has become almost immune to DDT. So we have a situation where increasing amounts have had to be applied in order to control it.

I mention the introduction of parasites as an interesting theory—at least, I found it so when I first read about it. I studied it further and I find that they are enjoying great success with it down in the states. I am interested in hearing the comments of my hon. friend about it, because I do think it has possibilities. Granted, we have to be careful, and I think it has to be used intelligently. But I repeat that they have had a great deal of success with it down in the United States. I would be interested in hearing the comments of my hon. friend in this connection.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, there is really nothing new about the introduction of biological control of one insect over another through the introduction of parasites. This is a fairly old science that has been going on for a long time—I was going to say centuries. It is practised right here in the province of Ontario. One particular illustration I can think of—and there has not been a great deal of publicity attached to it, because it is relatively of minor importance when you consider the broad aspect—is an effective means in certain instances. It does not go as far as one might think that it should.

It seems to me that the whole matter of pesticides is one that we must come to live with. We must recognize the potentials, both from the standpoint of its hazards, as well as its great usefulness and effectiveness. Man-kind, I believe, has approached to the place where he must learn to live with the dangers that are inherent in the unwise use of pesticides. On the other hand, I am sure we would all agree that without insecticides—in fact, all types of pesticides, including herbicides—that today we could find life a great deal more intolerable. I feel that with the study that is being given to this matter of pesticides throughout the world, a quite lengthy article on pest control chemicals in world agriculture, published in the *Agricultural Institute Review*, is most revealing. It is important to note the outstanding people throughout the world who are associated with this problem of pesticides and the control and the use of them.

I believe that with the co-ordinated approach that is being carried out by the governments of Canada, the United States and ourselves, so far as North America is concerned—all the governments of Canada, for that matter—we are aware of the problems that are involved and we are taking appropriate steps to see that abuses do not creep into the use of this particular product. I compliment my hon. friend for having brought this other method up. It is a method that has been tried and proven, but I do not think we should attach undue importance to it because, frankly, I do not think it is as widely applicable as might be believed.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, last year we appropriated some \$250,000 for blackbird research studies. I wonder how much of this money has been expended to date, and if there are any encouraging results of the studies to date.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I understand that \$50,000 of that appropriation has already been invested in this study, and that the detailed study of actual damages by blackbirds is being carried out. The study of the hatching areas of the birds in southwestern Ontario is being examined in some detail to see if an approach can be made there.

As for the study of devices to keep the birds away from the crops, I am not too sure that is the best way of handling the situation, because I think you are just driving them away from one crop to another. The control study of chemical compounds that may cause sterility in blackbird eggs is perhaps one of the most promising avenues by which the

problem may be brought under control. I would point out that our people at the federated colleges at Guelph are working closely with authorities in the United States who have had this study under way for a number of years. I think we are going to have a breakthrough. It is going to take some time, but I think we will have a breakthrough.

Mr. Paterson: A second question is in relation to a speech made by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in Fergus. I will quote briefly from remarks contained in the press:

The new programme will place emphasis on technical and business courses useful to our boys planning to remain on the farm. It will include, in expanded form, a science-based course in agriculture introduced in 1962.

This is in relation to the four-year agricultural course.

Recently, sir, in our local press, it was remarked that our district high school board planned putting in a greenhouse as part of the educational institute there, but they ran into difficulties in that they did not think they could handle the financing of the operation. I wonder if the hon. Minister and the hon. Minister of Education might give this some consideration, because this area has the largest concentration of greenhouses in Canada, possibly in North America, and there certainly is a need for well trained greenhouse workers, especially in the field of soil and plant testing. I was hoping that some consideration could be given, and that your department would co-operate more fully in this regard and be of some assistance to the area of greenhouse operators.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, in the debate of this department in the last session, I raised the question of educational facilities for French-speaking students, particularly from the eastern Ontario region. In the past few months I have been advised that conditions have not improved in the past year. At a time when we are discussing areas of poverty in this province, has the hon. Minister not noticed that the income of the farmers in the counties of Russell, Glengarry and Prescott is among the lowest in this province? Can that be attributed to the lack of educational facilities in that area? Can it be attributed to the shortage of qualified, bilingual agricultural representatives who are able to speak the language of the predominantly French farmers in those counties? Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, that

many of the young people do not go to Kemptville or Guelph because of language difficulties?

I have not consulted the authorities of Ottawa University on this subject, but I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture to discuss with the hon. Minister of Education and Minister of University Affairs and talk with the authorities of the University of Ottawa about the possibility of opening its facilities for the training of bilingual, agricultural representatives. That would probably contribute considerably to the development of that greatly neglected part of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, this matter is one of concern. I remember the hon. member raising this matter last year and I referred him to the fact that there are schools in the province of Quebec where there is the opportunity to take agricultural education—Ste. Anne de la Pocatière near Montreal, and in the school at Ville Marie in northern Quebec opposite the Timiskaming area. Some of our students from Ontario have gone to these schools. The students in Laval University agricultural course are in their second year now and we would hope that French-speaking students from Ontario would avail themselves of the opportunity in these French-language schools.

We are continually faced with the very great difficulty of obtaining agricultural representatives and people to work in the extension branch in its various aspects, who are bilingual and who have the agricultural background and training and desire to get into that particular field. On the other hand, I think my hon. friend would agree that it is most difficult to develop such a school where one would have the personnel to teach in the French language within the province of Ontario. There just does not appear to be that much demand from that many students. Admittedly, there are some, and we have encouraged them to take the course in the other schools, wherever it is practical to do this.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question of the hon. Minister under this vote and that is concerning starling control. Are there any experiments under way with the hope of relieving the cities of the starling problem that they are confronted with during the summer months? I know that my own community has an awful time with starlings from the month of June right through to September.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the problem is not confined to the urban areas; we have problems with them in the country, too. It is all part of the overall blackbird problem and we would hope that the studies that are under way will reveal control methods that will be satisfactory.

Mr. Newman: So when we are talking about starlings we are also talking about blackbirds?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister—now that the University of Guelph has been established—is it anticipated that any of these grants will become university grants through The Department of University Affairs in future years, or is it expected that what is generally listed in vote 121 will continue to be an agricultural vote?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Vote 121 covers everything: teachers, maintenance, teaching maintenance and research, right up to September 1, 1965. After that it will only cover research and services and they will be paid by grants to the university from The Department of Agriculture.

Vote 121 agreed to.

On vote 122:

Mr. MacDonald: On vote 122 I will not prolong the agony for the hon. member for Kent West unduly, but in view of the hon. Minister's statements on a number of occasions during the last year, he was not able to provide assistance to applications for loans beyond the \$100,000 limit that is now in the regulations of The Co-operative Loan Act. I am not raising this point with specific reference to FAME, but as a general proposition whether or not it is sadly out of date to have that sort of limit. If I might go back to the debate on vertical integration from the bottom up, it may well be that in the development of co-operatives in conjunction with our marketing board, to give the farmers a greater control of the market and establish greater stability in marketing, there will be need for underwriting credit requirements. It is quite conceivable, in many instances, that this limit of \$100,000 is completely unrealistic. I believe I am correct in saying that this was a limit that was fixed 30 years ago. I do not know whether it has been changed even in the intervening years. I wonder if the hon. Minister could indicate to the House whether or not there is any possibility of introducing

a greater flexibility, or perhaps taking the limit out, and judging the merits of each application.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no consideration given to doing either one. Frankly the \$100,000 loan seems to be quite adequate for most of the co-ops that have come to us. I know of none that would want more than that, except the FAME co-operators who came to us and wanted much more. I do not have the figures before me of the co-op loans; they are here some place in this book, but generally they seem to fit in pretty well.

There are several loans up to \$100,000 on the books, and in talking to the co-op people who have been in to visit with us concerning the United Co-operatives of Ontario and the application of the loan to various individual co-ops, there seems to be very general acceptance that this is a very excellent programme and a source of credit. It does enable co-ops to modernize their plants and to consolidate operations generally and to provide exceptionally good service to the farm people of Ontario. I would say that it is generally pretty good.

Loans for the last year ending March 31, 1965, amounted to \$198,000 and the largest loan was \$65,000. There are approved loans—I see there is one here for \$100,000. The rest of them range from \$15,000 to \$85,000 and that is about the range.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not arguing with the hon. Minister that the great majority of them would likely be far below the \$100,000—for small, struggling co-ops—but I am just raising the point, and I put it to the hon. Minister for his consideration in whatever idle moments he may have to consider these points, that there may well be occasions on which a ceiling of \$100,000 is unrealistic. Am I not correct that that ceiling has been there for 25 or 30 years?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think it has been there ever since the Act was brought in; I am not sure about the date.

Vote 122 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education) moves second reading of Bill No. 153, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we from our side believe this bill in general has been an advancement and an indication of the desire by the government to provide opportunity for skills and training to young people throughout the whole of Ontario. I know that there have been two points of view expressed about the community colleges, hinging really on the question of parallel courses for university. I think the proponents of both arguments are more moderate in their views than are the views being made about them.

One position that has been made is that we have the presidents of "ivy ghettos" who are terribly concerned that the walls and ramparts of their castles of intellectual aristocracy may be stormed by the democratic mobs who are wanting to come in and take the academic opportunity there. They look on any new avenues or approaches as being a danger to them. I say that these are extremes in the argument, and I suggest, having talked myself to presidents of the universities, that their real concern is that they maintain a quality as well as the maximum quantity we can get into the university, and that they maintain the integrity of their courses in the universities.

I have mentioned "ivy ghettos," and this intellectual aristocracy argument. On the other side is the fact that we believe that education is the right of anyone and that universities should have every type of avenue open into them. Perhaps when an instance of this is given, sometimes the question of quality is forgotten and so is the purpose of university. But I would suggest, sir, that between those two extremes are the university professors and the presidents. They are wanting the universities to be open to everyone.

With the community colleges, we were all

concerned on which side the hon. Minister might come down. He has shown himself again not only a man of moderation but I would also say a man of some subtlety in that at first glance it might be hard to tell which side he has come down on, whether he has really held to one side or the other on this thing. But I have concern because of the very title of his community colleges. He calls the colleges, "colleges of applied arts and technology." I would suggest that this shows a certain emphasis, "applied arts and technology." I can appreciate that he might not go to the extent of calling them "colleges of liberal arts," but at least he could, I think, emphasize arts in this title. I suspect that some of the emphasis that he is making on these community colleges may be because of the structure of financing. He recognizes he has a chance to receive from the federal government—if he talks of retraining, training and technology—a 50 per cent grant.

When we think of the imagination of this new approach throughout the province, I would hope still further imagination might have taken place in tackling the federal government to extend its financial arrangements to include liberal arts to be taught if this was necessary.

The hon. Minister has said, Mr. Speaker, that one of the justifications for his community colleges and one of the justifications for an emphasis on applied arts and technology is the fact of the enormous advance that is taking place in this industrial age. We must train people, and he refers to the Deutsch report. Professor Deutsch had mentioned what was certainly emphasized in the manpower study, about which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is so well acquainted, that in the future, and it will not be too far away, every man, no matter what his specializing, will have to retrain into some other vocational approach. Professor Deutsch suggests, I think, that there may be quite a number, and I think with many cases that it will almost be obligatory to do this.

But apart from this, sir, in this manpower commission, the representatives from industry emphasized that a broad knowledge, a broad base was so essential in entering industry. I notice that both at Oxford and Cambridge, in the first year they are emphasizing a broad approach rather than a specialization approach. I suggest that with young people moving into community colleges, particularly if they are going to be specialists in the trades and in new technology, they may be starting some of them at even 15, 16 or 17

to move into this area. There is the ferment of having a liberal arts approach, the ferment of intellectual curiosity being developed from knowing not only how to do certain trades, how to do certain technical things, but also to ask why we do these things.

That is very important because I do feel that often in professional training today there are men—and I refer to engineers and to others—who perhaps would have had much more value from their education if there had been open to them the stimulation of questioning, of philosophy and other courses. I think all of us in this Chamber, if we had the privilege of taking some kind of liberal arts courses, would have in some way been encouraged to assess the values in our society and perhaps we would have been better for this. Certainly as we look at certain trends in industry, we find that the kind of person wanted is not only the technician, the highly skilled technician, but also the man who can question and can make value judgments.

The hon. Minister, and it is only by inference, because he has always had a qualification when referring to the courses, but by inference and by the title of the community colleges, seems to emphasize the know-how and not know-why. I even would suggest that this may mean that there could almost be a lack of opportunity for many young people out in the rural areas, who have been looking forward to getting a first experience of the stimulation of working with professors, and of questioning the values. This is going to be denied them. There are many communities without the opportunities of larger and richer communities, without the arts, museums, theatres and so on. This stimulating environment would be particularly important to them, and yet this seems to be a cold, efficiency approach that is being taken in the enunciation by the hon. Minister of this very challenging new approach which reaches out across the province.

It seems to have downgraded the liberal arts. I would suggest, sir, that even the hon. Minister, in his own pronouncement and statement to the legislative assembly, almost has avoided the word "academic." I do not see it very much in his opening statement. He does say that the exceptional student, of course, will be recognized and could go to the universities, and he leaves it up to the universities themselves, to take the initiative in saying who can come into the university courses.

But again, from my own experience with the manpower commission, we met representation from Ryerson, and representation

from other technical training programmes. They expressed frustration in trying to break down the barriers into the levels of higher learning to get some recognition for the students. Some of the universities were accepting them, but the representatives were trying to ask us for our help. I can appreciate that the government should not be interfering with the freedom of the university, but when you have such a challenging concept as community colleges, although the hon. Minister again, as I say, has left qualifications; I would have hoped that he would have given an emphasis to the academic background and to the liberal arts, so that all young people could have not only the opportunity to learn skills and trades and higher technical approaches, but also the opportunity to have the stimulation of social thought and learning about social values and how to question, as well as how to do.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, on first reading of this bill I expressed on behalf of our group, almost unqualified enthusiasm for the principle. However, there are a number of questions that I think require some answers and some exploring. I hope to raise some of them now, being quite conscious of the fact that we will be exploring many of them for many years to come. This is really the beginning of a rather lengthy process.

In the course of his introductory comments, the hon. Minister made the observation that the first of the community colleges might have their doors open in the fall of 1966, in time for the first graduates from the four-year courses under the Robarts plan.

Mr. Speaker, if this is the case, it is more by accident than design. I think what has happened here—and I think it is necessary for us to face it rather frankly—is that this has been growing like Topsy. In fact, the Robarts plan anticipated that you were going to have two courses in each of the streams, one of which would go through grade 13 to the university, the other one of which would go through grade 12, either to the technological institutes for post-secondary training, or directly to the labour force.

The fact of the matter is that events have been marching so quickly in the intervening four years—three years it is; four years by 1966—that the Robarts plan has become out of date in terms of being able to meet needs, because a gap was emerging. On the one hand, there is an increasing tendency for our technological institutes to require grade 13, rather than grade 12; and secondly, as the hon. Minister indicated almost with a note

of surprise in his voice, following his visit to California, that he was astounded to discover the extent to which there is a consistent demand on the part of industry for at least junior college graduates, not high school graduates.

In other words, we were running into a gap beyond grade 12, even in terms of the technological institutes, and also in terms of the growing proportion of our young people who required post-secondary training before they could effectively cope in the labour market. Clearly, we must do something to fill this gap. So the community colleges have been introduced as a new system which is going to gradually develop across the whole province. I think one should have no illusions that it is going to take a fair amount of time before it will develop across the whole province, so you are going to have a rather serious gap for a number of years. That is the first point to which I would like to draw attention.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there is this controversial issue that the hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to—the question of whether or not the community colleges are going to be dead ends in terms of educational opportunity, or to what extent they will lead to further education at the university level. It is interesting to note that as far as the university presidents are concerned, they argued almost for a dead end—that the community college would be an alternative to the university, but to the extent that there would be an opportunity for young people to go from the community college to the university. It would be on an ad hoc basis, each case to be judged on its own merits. The council of university staffs in the province of Ontario, significantly, disputed this. They felt that it should be on something of a more clearly defined basis.

I think it is interesting to look at the specific recommendations that they made. They said:

We think, however, that there should be a clearly announced policy about transfer, for we see certain disadvantages in leaving it up to the university admission committees to deal with them on an individual basis.

They then refer to a comment of the report of the grade 13 study committee and they say:

We agree with that committee's view that grade 12, plus two years of community college, should not be rated any higher than grade 13 matriculation year. This being so, we see no great difficulty in the universities agreeing on and announcing a policy of admitting to first year—of such

courses as do not absolutely require a knowledge of certain subjects at matriculation level—students who had completed two years community college with a certain proportion of academic subjects, and of a high standard of achievement in their community college work. The standard required should be known. It should not be so high that only the occasional person can meet it, nor so low that half or even a quarter of the students would meet it. We suppose that not more than ten per cent would be the “late bloomers” for whom this route to the university it is intended to provide.

Interestingly enough, the hon. Minister, in that supremely adept way that he operates when he is dealing with a controversial issue, has come to no conclusion at all. He has handed it to a committee.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): But I referred to the fact of the association brief on page 28, where I have set forth the principle of establishing some recognized criteria for admission.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. I appreciate the hon. Minister's interjection and clarification on that. I had forgotten that he had made specific reference and the conclusion that one might draw from that reference. I think it is imperative, in trying to decide at what point one comes down in this argument about—if I may put it in personalities—the Bissells and the Rosses—in the direction of not raising barriers for the “late bloomers,” so-called, to go on to universities. I am content to leave the matter rest there in the hope that the personnel of such a committee will be balanced enough that we can be certain that we come out with the conclusion that I judge the hon. Minister is seeking. That I would support. Another point that I think is rather serious and that we should give some consideration to is one to which I made passing reference in discussion on first reading. The hon. Minister saw fit, perhaps for political reasons—in the more acceptable use of that term, namely, relationships with the universities and a lot of other groups—to suggest that we were not going to be invaded by any alien institutions, or the introduction of alien institutions as part of our educational set-up, and that the junior college in the United States perhaps was not worthy of emulation.

I will be the first to say that there are some things about junior colleges in the United States that should not be emulated. I have for some time wondered whether we

were not being a little smug in our attitude towards them, the greater democratic opportunities for education that they have provided, and that there were not some factors that would be worthy of emulation and integration into our new community college set-up. Indeed, I am wondering if the hon. Minister, as I intimated on the first reading, does not himself concur, and if he has not left the door wide open. For example, on page 29 of the mimeographed version of his statement, I quote:

Moreover, I have no doubt that where circumstances warrant it, some of our universities will make arrangements with particular colleges of applied arts and technology, as provided in the proposed legislation, to conduct one or two years of their own degree courses within these colleges. The present university extension courses leading to a general arts degree might be a logical beginning point.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this may be the way in which, over the years, we are going to reconcile this. There is one point in the basic case that has been presented by the university presidents, which I think does not really stand up to analysis, and that is the argument that we have provided for enough university spaces for the foreseeable future in the province of Ontario. Indeed, in this they are only parroting what the government has said, and they are using this argument on which to base their case that since this is so, why then do we need to give consideration to any significant number of two-year university places in the community colleges?

However, Mr. Speaker, I think we are ignoring the fact that the figures upon which we have based our expansion for universities, and the number of university places throughout the 1970s, are based on a calculation which anticipates that by 1971 we will have reached a stage where approximately 20 per cent of the age group of 18 to 21 is attending our universities. The fact of the matter is, that in the United States, 43 per cent, I understand, attends universities or junior colleges.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is not right. There is quite a distinction; I will explain it in my reply. There is a major difference.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me for one moment underline the point that I want to make to the hon. Minister, and I will do it from a source that I am sure he will consider to be unimpeachable, namely, Dr. Robert W. B. Jackson. In his speech to the central

educational association convention in Quebec City, in September 1963 he made this point:

As a matter of fact, admission requirements have been steadily raised to the point where, for some universities, up to 40 per cent of the candidates acceptable in my time are now being excluded, including outright rejection of myself, and university authorities have openly stated their intention of raising entrance requirements and standards for each year to even higher levels, understandably enough, perhaps, in view of the increases in knowledge during my lifetime.

In other words, as was pointed out by the *Globe and Mail* in one of its editorials on community colleges, the only reason why our universities have been able to cope with the population explosion at their level, is that they have been raising standards. This is disputed sometimes, but as a matter of fact, I do not think it can be disputed. Here is Dr. Jackson frankly stating that the standards today are such that would exclude 40 per cent of the people who could have got into university when he was entering, and they would have excluded him. As I said on an earlier occasion, two or three years ago, for reasons with which I will not bother entertaining the House, they would have excluded me too.

Dr. Jackson goes one step further. If we have these pressures, as undoubtedly they will develop, on universities not to close their doors, but to leave them open as much as possible to every student who is going to be capable of absorbing a university education, then we are going to be driven beyond having 20 per cent in our universities—which was set as the objective in the calculations of Dr. Jackson for 1971—toward the 43 per cent, or whatever it is, in the United States. This simply brings us to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite possible that our universities are not going to be able to cope with the number of students seeking a university education.

Indeed, I will say without any reservation that in my chatting with the university presidents, a significant number of them said they believe what I have just stated. The general argument of the government, and the general argument on which the university presidents' case is predicated, is that we will be able to accommodate all who are likely to go to university, but it simply is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, if this is what is likely to happen, then I think we are going to discover sooner than we think that universities are not

going to be able to cope with the flood of students, and will resort to the escape that the hon. Minister has put in the bill, where they can make arrangements with colleges of applied arts and technology to conduct one or two years of their degree courses within those colleges. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if it is done under this kind of situation, in effect an affiliation of the liberal arts, or the arts wing of the community college with a certain university, it seems to me that one can protect the desired standards. We could make certain that we are not going to have an ersatz university, as the term has come to be used in reference to the community colleges. I think we could protect the standards ultimately that will carry through from those students into the universities themselves.

Therefore, I venture the prediction that in the years to come, the kind of pattern that will emerge because of the pressure on our universities because of the number of students who will be demanding an opportunity for education at that level, will force us to make use of this escape. If, in the meantime, the community colleges have become firmly established in the field of providing what is the most desperate need, namely, a post-secondary education at the technical and the technological level, we will end up ten, or 15, or 20, or 25 years from now with balanced institutions. They will not be so oriented to the technical side that they will lose an appreciation, and a transmitting to others of that appreciation of the liberal arts that the hon. leader of the Opposition was referring to. They will become institutions that will assist all our communities across the province of Ontario, those communities that are out in what some people rather unkindly refer to as the cultural wastelands, far away from the cultural opportunities normally to be found in the larger cities.

There is one further point that I would like to raise and seek some specific comment on from the hon. Minister. Let me make it first by referring to a couple of observations in his introductory comments. He said:

Our efforts here could, I suppose, be considered also as a co-ordination and culmination of all previous work in this area, a welding into a coherent whole, so to speak, of the parts which sometimes seem fragmented and unrelated so that we have a complete system extending from kindergarten to the post-graduate level.

I should have stated this comment was made in particular reference to the vocational centres and the technological institutes—and

other institutions of post-secondary education at the technical and technological level.

He also stated on page 25:

We must decide what part our present institutes of technology, and trade and vocational centres will play in the new plan. It may well be that the provincial council of regents will recommend the complete integration of existing institutions and effort, using the present buildings, staff and programmes as nuclei for the development of the new colleges.

What, in effect, the hon. Minister has said is that we have in this growing-like-Topsy development of the last few years—incidentally, a very belated development, long after it was needed in the province of Ontario—of technological institutes, to the point where we now have eight of various kinds across the province of Ontario; of vocational centres to the extent that we have two, and the prospect of a third one emerging in the Soo and one sort of emerging in conjunction with the rebuilt institute in Hamilton.

The significant thing, Mr. Speaker, is that these vocational centres are a new name for an old idea—a trade school. I concede a broader concept than the original trade school, but as I have so often said in this House, the trade school development in the province of Ontario was envisaged by Dr. John Seath in the first decade of this century. The legislation authorizing it was passed in 1911. We built one trade school in the succeeding 50 years, until the kind of programme that I am talking about began to emerge—technological institutes and vocational centres.

I was interested in some of the news stories that emerged, and were somewhat more enlightening—if I may say so to the hon. Minister—than his original comment, in that they suggested, for example, that the first of the community colleges might well be centred around the vocational centres or the technological institutes in various places. Indeed, I think it was suggested that the first six or eight might be in those communities where these institutions are now to be found. This seems to suggest, and I do not know why there should be any particular hesitation on the hon. Minister's side to be rather frank on this, that what is happening now is that we are going to forget the vocational centres programme as originally envisaged as a separate system across the province of Ontario, and we are going to forget the technological institutes as they were envisaged as a separate system across the province of Ontario; all of them are going to be inte-

grated into a single institution, with these various facets in one large campus—conceivably, a number of campuses—within a single city.

If this is what the hon. Minister has in mind, if I am correctly interpreting the comment that I quoted, this strikes me as plain common sense.

We have been going through a really unplanned development of recent years. We have been rushing madly to catch and keep up with the needs after neglecting for generations the provision of technological education. If we got off to a start of vocational centres to realize, two generations late, the concept of Dr. John Seath, broadened because of the needs of the second half of the 20th century, and if we really got started rather late in the technological institutes, now is the time to wrap it all up in a more integrated kind of fashion. If this is what is envisaged in the community colleges, once again I personally look forward to their development in this province with a great deal of enthusiasm.

I have one final point that I would like to raise, more in the form of a question, seeking the comments of the hon. Minister. That is the point that was raised in the second editorial of the *Globe and Mail* in comment on community colleges—with regard to what they describe as the portability of the credits which you can get from these various institutions. Once again we are developing almost on a day-to-day or year-to-year basis with these institutions; we are having difficulty in establishing the portability of credits from institutions within our own province. What are the transfer arrangements, for example, going to be from a community college to a university? But this is a country in which our people move frequently from province to province, and it is desirable that we should have as great a mobility of labour at all levels as is possible. Therefore, we should have some clarification, as soon as possible, of the standards of these various institutions in all of the various provinces—particularly when we have such significant variations emerging in the western provinces as community colleges which, by statute have been fixed with the responsibility of providing the first two years of university, something which in Ontario is fought pretty vigorously by the university presidents, so that the hon. Minister has to go through this compromise transition period. I predict we will ultimately end up pretty close to what they have out in BC and what they have in many junior colleges on the American side of the line.

I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would make some comments on that particular point. There are other details; perhaps we can get to them in committee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister introduced this bill it was hailed as a historic landmark. I believe that it eventually will be recognized as such. With this in view, we will support his recommendations as far as we now understand them in the introduction of the bill.

But I must say that I am a bit disappointed in my understanding of the new institutions as they are presented in the bill, and in the further explanation given to it by the hon. Minister. As you know, sir, the new institutions were long heralded. I remember reading in several newspapers the report from the hon. Minister's press conference in late November, in which he said that a statement of policy on these community colleges would be available within two or three months. I suppose that is more a commentary on some of the difficulties that arose while he was not only drafting the statute, but getting his own thoughts in line with those that would be adaptable to the many pressures that are exerted on the hon. Minister. We now see the hon. Minister in much the same position as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) indicated I was in a few moments ago. Although he is not riding two horses, he is riding one very firmly, but his feet are touching on both sides, because he has certainly given provision in this bill for courses that would be equivalent to university courses if, in fact, some arrangement can be made with an established university. I am rather disappointed that no university president or any authority at this level has come forward and said they would look forward to doing this in conjunction with the community colleges when they are established. As far as I know, there has been no comment on this; all we know is that the general feeling on behalf of the academic community at the university level is that these new institutions should be left with only applied arts and, in fact, not encroach on the academic preserves of the university in any way.

My hon. leader a moment ago said something about the naming of the institutes and the fact that using the word "applied" would indicate the general point of view that the hon. Minister at the present time has towards the institutions. I feel his point is well taken. By using the word "applied" he is, at least in the beginning, hamstringing the development of these institutions, so that the academic life within them will be something less than

it might be. I have a special axe to grind, I suppose, but I have felt that "community colleges" was a rather cumbersome name—in fact, even a bit precious, if I am using the word correctly as the hon. leader of the NDP has used it in the past. Although I may be accused of having a vested interest in it, I would suggest that these institutions might be called Ontario colleges, and I would look forward to the day when there would be an Ontario college at Brantford; if anybody wanted to shorten that they could call it Brantford College. I hope the hon. Minister will look into that possibility rather carefully.

Speaking of a community like Brantford—and there are many of them across the province—the hon. Minister's intimation in the press conference that the first community colleges would be established around an already existing nucleus would mean that these communities would once again be passed over for a period of time that might, I submit, go up to six years and perhaps more before the funds would be available. I understand it would require \$6,000,000 to establish a new college before the funds would be available to make the system properly available, as it should be, to the citizens right across the province.

While I am on this point, it has already been mentioned that there are certain drawbacks to the fact that the community colleges might actually gather together all these sundry chickens in the educational field, either parallel to secondary education or post-secondary. In this connection, my understanding was that both of the vocational centres would take students who had shown some adaptability in the occupational courses. I know the hon. Minister does not want anything in his system to be termed terminal, and I presume that if a student shows some merit in an occupational course it would be quite possible for him to go on to the vocational centre. I remember visiting the one at London some weeks ago with the educational committee. Although most of the classes we visited had students who had junior matriculation, I was informed that there were facilities for younger students and students with much lower academic qualifications. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very difficult indeed to use these sundry institutions to form a community college if the intention is that these students with lower qualifications would be permitted to enter. I suppose some other accommodation would have to be made for those; that is quite possible.

I was very impressed with the vocational centre in London; a beautiful building, and I was impressed with the work that was going on there. I thought at the time that it might well be adapted to some more extensive application, but there is this difficulty that I wanted to bring to your attention, sir.

In the hon. Minister's remarks introducing the bill, it was quite clear that college parallel courses would be excluded and the emphasis would be on applied arts, where arts subjects appear. Some compensation for this was found in the possibility that universities could take part in a more or less separate programme, in an individual college. Then the hon. Minister went on to use a weasel expression; an expression that carried with it an attempt to rationalize what in fact was a decision on the community colleges, that they would not lead to universities and that in fact, they would be terminal institutions.

He said that no student of ability would ever be denied the opportunity to continue, and this was met by thunderous applause in this Legislature. I well remember reading a similar statement made by the president of the University of Toronto, when he said that at the present time, no student of merit from Ryerson institute is denied the opportunity to continue his education even into the University of Toronto.

But the fact remains that the hon. Minister has said that no parallel courses will be presented, and it would indeed be a rare student who would be able to self-educate himself at the same time as he was taking some other course at the community college, and in fact, pull himself up by the boot straps to the point where his ability would be recognized by the authorities at the community college and by the registrar of some university. I think this would be very difficult indeed, and as a matter of fact, I feel that a great disservice would be done if this Legislature were to establish the community colleges with this terminal aspect in mind.

It is not enough to say piously that no student with ability will be denied an opportunity to continue. There has to be a clear pathway, whereby these students can take a course that will lead them to placement in university.

If these institutions are going to be established across the province, and we must assume that in time they will, there are going to be many people who would otherwise be denied, perhaps not for valid reasons, but denied all the same, the opportunity for academic post-secondary education. We are

going to be dealing with what has been called first generation students, whose parents, for economic and other reasons, had not gone nearly so far in the academic process as they would have done at this time. These people are going to be forced, I would say, into the community college system, through the fact that the institute will be close to home and it would obviously be cheaper to go there. They will lose the opportunity for higher academic work that we would hope would be made available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something about staffing difficulties in the new institutions. The hon. Minister mentioned these. He said he recognized the problem and certainly did not dispose of it with those words. I know he did not intend to give the impression that it was disposed of, but there is no doubt about it that the specialists at the high-school level, already in short supply, are going to be attracted to the community colleges and it is doubtful whether a properly high standard of instruction can be maintained if, as the hon. Minister suggests, people in the community itself, without any training in teaching techniques are going to be called upon to fill the breach, as it were, in staffing these organizations.

It seems to me that if there were a parallel academic curriculum offered, the suggested trimester system that is already coming into some use in our university community, might well be used to upgrade the community colleges, by having some of the professors at the university level spend a third of the year at the community college, to give this leaven of academic capability that would really give the new proposed institutes the academic background and environment that the students must be permitted to take part in.

Another point I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the fees. It was indicated by the hon. Minister that a nominal fee would be charged. If a graduate of grade 12, who has the option of going into the matriculation year, or grade 13, as it probably would be called for some time, and who takes this option would pay no fee under the present circumstances, and I doubt very much if the hon. Minister would contemplate charging a fee. On the other hand, if he takes the easier course, and goes to the community college, as the hon. Minister has said, there would be a fee chargeable and I would think that this is surely something that is not reasonable or consistent and it is something that the hon. Minister might reconsider.

I feel myself that we have been giving 13 grades of instruction at no direct charge to the students of Ontario, and that it is time this was extended to 14 years, which would permit the instruction at the community college to be given without any direct fee. I hope that the hon. Minister would consider this seriously. Now, I do not feel myself in a position to come down on both sides of the important issue that we are discussing. I feel, without any equivocation on my part, that the community colleges must be constituted with an academic parallel course that would in no sense make them terminal and would in fact give every student who decides to make this choice, an opportunity to go through the community college system and receive, if he is successful, advanced placement at university.

I feel that we are, in this bill, setting up what I might call a caste system in education. There is the feeling in some academic circles that there must always be an intellectual aristocracy. I am not ready to admit that tonight. We have heard of the hewers of wood and drawers of water. I submit that this bill will leave this group intact. They will now be able to hew the wood with power saws and draw the water with complex pumps, but essentially they will be the servers in the community, those who have not had the experience of real academic achievement, or even exposure to an academic community.

With this in mind, I feel that we may be creating an institution of perhaps practical accomplishment, but intellectual apathy, and I would trust that the hon. Minister might make some reconsiderations in his position on that account.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, my comments on this bill will not be very lengthy, but having had the opportunity to visit the junior colleges in the state of California, and likewise in the state of Michigan, I had my eyes opened. I hope that in the application of this new method of education, we take the better features that are present in the California and the Michigan systems.

I was most impressed with the fact that the graduates of the California system of junior colleges, or community colleges as they are known, do have the opportunity to attend the universities. The junior colleges work on a Bell curve system so that one-eighth of the students—the top eighth—is accepted at the university level after having completed two years of the junior college. The top third

may go to state colleges and these students go right into the third-year programme in both the state university or the state college.

They are not held back a year or two, as may be the case with the setup as is contemplated at present by this bill. In Ontario this is primarily a result of the bypassing of the academic phase of education.

The graduates of the junior colleges in the United States, after having completed their university education, found that they were just as well qualified and were as great a success in later years as were those who attended the universities directly from high schools, bypassing the junior or community college. Another fairly good feature—I hope this is adopted in the Ontario system—is that any individual over 18 years of age is eligible to attend junior college in California. They are given admittance provided their standings for the first semester are satisfactory. If they are not satisfactory then they have to drop out for one semester and are allowed a second chance. Were they to fail a second time, they would drop out for two semesters, and so forth. Naturally, an individual who would drop out for two semesters, more than likely would not return to the junior college. He would realize his limitations and get into some type of industry.

The California system did give the opportunity to the late bloomer to further his education. We in Ontario are in a hodge-podge when it comes to post-secondary education. As it is today, we have a grade 13; we have the junior colleges which will be two years of post-secondary; we will have the institutes of technology which will be three years; and then we will have the university course of four years. There should be a little more clear-cut definition and reappraisal of the purpose of each of these various facets or schools of education.

There is another phase of education that should be taken into consideration in the junior colleges, and some provisions should be made for it. I do not know whether it would go into junior college level; it may go into the institute of technology. That would be the retraining or the scheduling of programme five. An individual attending programme five should be given the same opportunity to further his education and complete his education and eventually obtain admittance into a Canadian university. I prefer the name of junior college to either community college or applied arts and technology, because this college actually is a junior college, it is not a full-fledged, four-year college; it is only half-way there.

It is hoped by many that the government will consider, as my colleague the hon. member for Brant has mentioned, a little further stress on the academic side of education, so that the individual attending this junior college does not find himself attending a terminal type of education as we have today in the four-year programme—the two-year, the three-year and the four-year programmes in our secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, this is the limit of my comments on this bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps I might reply to this very briefly to sum up the observations raised by hon. members opposite. I might say that the statement I read initially to this House was the subject of very careful preparation by several people over a fairly substantial period of time. Because one of the hon. members opposite suggested that we were endeavouring to come down between positions taken by groups or by individuals, I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case. We are taking a position that we believe to be academically correct; we believe it to be educationally sound. It is not a case of endeavouring to come down between positions of any individuals or any groups.

I should further point out that as for the question of name—I am not sure how significant it is—it was felt that we should adopt a name suitable for our own province. The term junior college did not, in fact, accomplish what we envisaged. We felt that the term community college did not encompass what we envisaged with these new institutions, and so the name college of applied arts and technology prefixed—of course, by the name of the region that it would serve—perhaps came as close to suggesting the concept of this institution as we could come.

I would point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition that I think his phrase, when he referred to the university presidents living in “ivy-towered ghettos,” is perhaps somewhat unfortunate. I think I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the university presidents and the academic people have a genuine interest in and genuine concern about the development of an institution of this nature in this province. I think it is proper that their views should not only be heard but should be very carefully considered.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the study of this particular type of institution has been going on for some two years now. While we have been definitely assisted by the representations that have been made

to the department, I want to assure the House that the concept and the overall statement of policy reflect the policy of this government. I think it is one that, over a period of time, will certainly stand the test.

I want to refer to the comments from the hon. member for York South, Mr. Chairman. I think he grasped one of the unique features, and I do not recall using the term alien in my remarks when referring to the American junior college, or community college, system. What I attempted to do was explain that we wanted to develop something in Ontario that suited the needs of this province; it was not a case of a pure importation of the junior college, because if you look at the junior college carefully and its traditional history in the United States, hon. members will find out that it is changing from primarily—the hon. member for Brant will be interested in this later on—primarily an academic institution to more of an institution that gives a composite or comprehensive type of programme. I think the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville must have observed this in his trip to California.

The unique aspect is the possibility of an agreement with an existing university to offer in the college the same programme that is offered in the university itself. I think this is important, Mr. Speaker, because there is a misunderstanding about the parallel course. I might as well get into this now, because I am somewhat disappointed to hear the hon. member for Brant say that he does not appreciate the significance of the parallel course, and the problem that we face here within our own province. The parallel course in most American jurisdictions—and I distinguished this from the transfer course—is the same course that is offered at the university itself. Take the state of California; this is perhaps as good an example of an American jurisdiction as could be chosen. I should point out that they have had community colleges or junior colleges—they use both terms there—for some 50 years, Mr. Speaker, and they are still the subject of substantial debate.

The University of California, which is the state university, is obliged—I cannot recall whether it is under statute or under regulation—to accept 11.2 per cent of the high school graduates from grade 12. They have no grade 13. The students entering the junior college, in many instances, have the same qualifications. In fact, we were told that in some cases they had even greater, or better, qualifications than the students entering the University of California. So the question of movement from one institution to the other is relatively simple, because they

offer more or less the same type of course. The authorities there, over the years, built their system on the basis of the state university accepting a small percentage of the total graduates who are qualified to go to the university. Therefore the junior college system has grown in the state of California in order to accommodate the vast numbers of students who could not get into university. In our own province here—and I have made a point of this—our plans are in fairly good shape until 1970—I state that if it is necessary to change the concept to handle the 1970s we will do so immediately, but the present planning in this province is to accommodate as close to 100 per cent of the qualified students as we can within the university itself.

Let us take a concrete example, Mr. Speaker. Take the city of Toronto. Let us be very frank about this. Ryerson, certainly at one stage—whether it has gone beyond this stage I am not sure at this point; this will require further study, but certainly Ryerson, at one stage, if one were to add academic content to the course—such as the liberal arts programme and perhaps one or two other related areas—is as close to a prototype of an excellent community college as you will find anywhere south of the border. If one were to add to this institution, a university parallel course—and this is what the hon. member for Brant is suggesting—one would have students taking the same work at Ryerson polytechnical institute as they are taking at the University of Toronto, with perhaps a duplication of facilities or an unnecessary expenditure of funds.

There is just no purpose in having a parallel programme in many areas of this province where the university is in existence, and I want the hon. member for Brant to understand this. This would be almost an identical programme, where the existing university is in a position to accommodate the number of graduates who are coming out of the high schools. The high schools are, and I think will remain for many years, the prime preparatory institution for the universities. I think this is essential to our system. When one gets into the question of transferability, one can get into many permutations and combinations as to how this is to be achieved; one can take grade 11, grade 12, even grade 13 graduates, and this is why I am suggesting that a committee must be established to lay out some recognized pattern of movement from the community college or the college of applied arts and technology to the university. But these are students, Mr. Speaker, who probably do not fall under the qualification of being qualified grade 13 graduates.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: He has made definite the difference between "transfer" and "parallel" in his original statement when he emphasized the fact that there would be no parallel courses in the colleges. The meaning I took from that was that there would be no courses permitting a person to go from one institution to the other. If he would permit me, my understanding was somewhere between his meaning of parallel and what he has also said in referring to transfers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think this is essential, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad the hon. member for Brant will give a little in this area because the question of movement from the college of applied arts and technology is important. The recommendation that the hon. member for York South read from the academic brief is the one that we really have adopted as far as our concept is concerned—that there must be a recognized pattern and that an ad hoc acceptance of an individual student by the university is not in itself acceptable. There must be some recognized pattern. I think we are talking about perhaps ten or 12 per cent, perhaps, of these young people, while this is very, very early to judge. This is the area of transferability or progression from one institution to the other on which I am sure we can all agree.

But about the completely parallel programme, I suggest to the hon. member that if he studies it carefully, he will accept the fact that we do not need in Ontario, at the moment, a parallel programme per se.

Mr. Nixon: I hesitate to do this and you can rule me out of order perhaps—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no, I want it very clear—

Mr. Nixon: Just one question. When the hon. Minister talks about parallelism and transfer courses and the fact that he is going to select perhaps ten or 12 per cent of those students—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not selecting, I am just saying that this could be—

Mr. Nixon: —that these people will be selected in some way, that they will continue. Surely there must be some sort of course at the community college which they can take. They are not going to be picked right out

of an electronic lab or something and be told, "You are the kind of person we want because you have shown that you are a hard worker." There has to be some sort of course that I would call parallel—perhaps the hon. Minister would call it something else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. Mr. Speaker, let us take a student who goes to high school, completes his grade 12, goes out to work for a period of time, wishes to go back for some further education, but feels the secondary school is no longer the place for him because of age. He goes back to the community college. At this institution he is able to pick up whatever the appropriate amount of work would be, and through a recognized path, move on to the university. But the parallel programme, if you had it, Mr. Speaker, would be the exact duplicate of the first year, or the first and second year, of the regular university programme.

Mr. Nixon: What name is the hon. Minister going to give to the other one he described, then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no name being given to it.

Mr. Nixon: That is our trouble.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We cannot use the word "transfer," really, because even in the U.S. the popular conception of the transfer course even could mean a duplication of the university programme. We are concerned about the students who really do not have the qualifications at this stage to get to university; we want to assist them within this new college. I think it is very important we recognize this.

We feel there may be areas in this province where it may be necessary in the future, as the hon. member for York South points out, to have the identical university programme available at these institutions, and this is a unique feature—we did not find this anywhere in our trips south of the border—that we have introduced into this particular piece of legislation. We think there are actually one or two areas in the province where this might have application at this present time.

I would like to make one observation on the question of percentages. The hon. member for York South is quite correct, we hope to have roughly 20 per cent of the age group, say 19 to 25, in the universities by 1970. Whether we will achieve this it is early to guess, but this is our hope.

The universities in the United States, we

think, at the present time, have approximately 24 per cent of the same age group in universities, but the figures that are used by the U.S. schools will include the junior college, which is the equivalent perhaps of our grade 13, and in some instances equivalent to our grade 11. So the hon. member for York South has to take the age group, say 19 to 25, to find out the percentages that are in post-secondary institutions. There is some debate even within U.S. circles as to whether the 24 per cent figure is in itself accurate. We do not know. But this is probably as close an approximation as we can reach, and in discussing this with some of their eminent authorities I would say they expect they will maintain this 22 to 24 per cent average for some number of years.

They are moving now into the comprehensive programme within their community colleges because they have discovered this is really where there is a substantial need. If we look carefully at the history of the development of junior colleges and community colleges in the United States, we see that they are moving rather rapidly from the almost straight academic approach to the composite or comprehensive approach, to include technician training and technologist training—and I will get into this in my estimates of The Department of Education, but we may find this filtering down into actual secondary school programmes as well.

I think it very important that we realize that really the figure is probably close to 24 per cent in the United States, and this figure is probably close to eight per cent in the United Kingdom. We are now somewhere between 12 and 14, the U.S. is at 22 to 24, the United Kingdom is probably in the neighbourhood of between eight and ten.

Two or three other questions were raised, one on the matter of staff. We discovered this, Mr. Speaker, in our research in these other jurisdictions, that in fact people can, particularly in the technology field, come from industry and immediately move into the teaching area. California has many highly qualified people, because of the type of industry there, who come on the basis of perhaps two or three hours a week to lecture in these rather complex fields and it has been found that this works out satisfactorily. But I do not minimize for a moment the difficulties that we shall face as far as staffing these institutions is concerned. I can think of several other difficulties and, Mr. Speaker, if I had waited until they had all been resolved, we would not have had this bill here for many years. I think we accept the fact that

this type of institution is absolutely necessary and we recognize the difficulties we face and accept these, and move onward to try to solve the problems.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have covered most of the points raised by the—

Mr. Nixon: Would the hon. Minister say something about the fees?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have to take issue on the question of fees as it relates to the free year of grade 13. I think an essential part of this new concept is that the community colleges be regarded as institutions of integrity and stature. They are not to be regarded as second-rate institutions or excuses for universities; they are to stand on their own feet.

One might successfully argue that we should eliminate all fees for education, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as long as there are fees for universities, as long as there are fees for institutions such as Ryerson, this new concept and new type of institution should be treated in like manner.

As I suggested in my remarks, the fees themselves are modest. The students will be eligible for bursaries and for federal student loans, so we question whether the financial obligations on any student would, in any way, deter him from attending. We question this very definitely.

Mr. Nixon: The fees are there just to give stature.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this is not the principle, just to give stature. We feel the colleges should be treated as other post-secondary institutions are at present treated, and if I can leave no other message with hon. members of the House, this is really essential to the new concept of these colleges. That is, they must be recognized as institutions on their own basis, institutions of integrity, and I think, institutions of very significant stature.

There is some question about the cost and whether we should approach Ottawa on a 100 per cent basis. I can assure hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that the question of cost has been very thoroughly explored with the officials in Ottawa and if the hon. leader of the Opposition wishes to add his own efforts toward Ottawa's paying 50 per cent of the total cost of the development of these institutions, I would be most grateful.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the debate on Bill No. 136, which will be followed by the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Sixth report, standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, Mr. Evans	3481
Interim report, select committee on mining, Mr. Brunelle	3481
Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. Allan, first reading	3482
Medical services insurance, bill respecting, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	3482
Recess, 6 o'clock	3518

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre), from the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills, presented the committee's sixth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 146, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Mr. R. Brunelle (Cochrane North): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the interim report of the select committee on mining, copies of which are being placed on the hon. members' desks.

As the House is aware, the mining committee was established on May 8, 1964, with very broad terms of reference, which enabled us to probe into many matters not directly related to actual mining operations. Of the many briefs received to date, some were received by mail and others were presented in person. Though all of these dealt with subjects related to the mining industry, many also reflected concern about matters affecting the welfare of the people residing in mining communities.

The members of the committee appreciated the broad terms of reference which allowed them to examine every phase of the mining industry. Of all the natural resources with which Ontario has been endowed, I think hon. members will agree with me that our mineral wealth is to be envied. The people of Ontario can be justifiably proud of the fact that our mining industry has become one of the major world suppliers of many metals. Few Canadian industries have as long a history as mining, and many men prominent in the development of our mining industry and its laws have sat in this House. For instance, James Conmee, a former mayor of Port Arthur and a member for the riding

then known as Algoma West, had an undying faith in the future of mining in northern Ontario. Mr. Conmee can hold claim to being the father of The Mining School Act, and in 1894 he became the first president of the Ontario mining institute.

These few historical facts have long been forgotten by the Legislature and by those in the mining industry. Today the mineral industry ranks second only to agriculture in our economy. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that in our lifetime we will see mining reach the top position.

Select committees are, by their very nature, dependent upon others for information and assistance. This committee is indebted to mining companies and associations, municipalities, service organizations and many others for their splendid co-operation in arranging for us to tour mining properties, plants, mills and the various town sites. In June, 1964, we were fortunate in acquiring the services of Mr. George J. Mason as secretary of the mining committee. Mr. Mason has had many years of experience in government service and his administrative ability has proved to be a valuable contribution to our committee. In January of this year, William D. J. Hunter, associate professor of economics at McMaster University, was retained to act as consultant and adviser to the committee in matters related to the economics of mining.

We frequently called upon the services of the various departments of government for information and technical guidance. A special word of gratitude is extended to the Hon. George C. Wardrope, Minister of Mines, whose open-door policy enabled the committee to make full use of various branches of his department. The hon. Minister also arranged for departmental geologists to accompany the committee on its field trips, to act as consultants. On behalf of the committee I want to express our special appreciation to Mr. Donald Douglass, deputy Minister of Mines; Dr. M. E. Hurst, director of the geological branch; and Mr. Ralph Scott, director of the mining lands branch, who were most co-operative and helpful in providing information and technical advice.

During 1964, the committee held public hearings in eastern and northeastern Ontario. To date, we have not yet visited the vast territory of northwestern Ontario, although we have had correspondence indicating that several mining companies located in the area are most anxious to present briefs to this committee.

The many factors affecting the economics of mining have yet to be examined by the committee. Studies of this nature are presently under way and some months will be required to analyze them.

Mr. Speaker, there is still much work to be done by this committee. In our interim report, you will find listed the many subjects being studied. In contrast, you will note that we have made but three recommendations, since much of the information we require is not yet available. I am satisfied with our accomplishments to date which are due largely to the co-operation I have received from the members of this committee who represent all parties. I am proud of the interest and dedication displayed by them in their sincere determination to make a lasting contribution toward the improvement of the mining industry in Ontario.

The committee still has much unfinished business to deal with and I respectfully request, sir, that the select committee on mining be reappointed to continue its work through 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the raising of \$150 million, which, together with the amounts that have been authorized and not used, is adequate for the current fiscal year.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, notice of which I have given.

The question is as follows: With reference to Bill No. 144, would the hon. Minister please explain to the House why there is a tax of 5.07 per cent on domestic tobacco and only approximately two per cent on imported tobacco under this bill?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to point out that the question infers that the bill specifically discriminates between domestic and imported tobacco. This is not the case. The bill does not differentiate between domestic and imported tobacco. Indeed, this would be virtually impossible, since the large bulk of tobacco, or a very great deal of the tobacco, is blended.

In the studies leading up to the drafting of this bill, the experience of eight other provinces that tax tobacco products was considered in some detail. It was found that the modern tobacco tax Acts invariably taxed cut tobaccos on the basis of a rate per ounce. In developing our schedule of tax, the department was concerned in not reducing the rate of tax, as it is currently applied under The Retail Sales Tax Act, on higher-priced tobaccos, which incidentally, are likely to be imported. I am satisfied that the schedule as drawn up, does have this effect.

I would point out again that the bill was not intended to discriminate for or against imported tobacco and the figures cited by the hon. member are not representative of the very great bulk of tobacco sales. I would also like to mention that the entire tax formula, as set up in the bill, is expected to bring in a tax of 2.9 per cent, which approximates the rate of tax currently imposed upon tobacco products by The Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister?

This bill does not correspond with the programme that is carried out by The Department of Economics and Development, "Buy Canadian," does it, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would point out to the hon. member that it does not discriminate against our domestic tobacco.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE (continued)

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate today, I do so with a keen sense of disappointment that this government has not seen fit to follow the lead of so many other democracies around the world, and introduce a genuine medicare bill.

Over the past years, there has been a great deal of discussion all around the world, on this whole field of serving our people in the field of medicine. I have been delighted to see that my hon. friends who occupy the Liberal benches, are now willing to concede that a better bill than this could be brought about, and that a plan which has been outlined by Mr. Justice Hall, and is now in effect in Saskatchewan, should be implemented in Ontario.

I am disappointed that over the years they have not seen fit to do the job that we felt they should be doing, and they are now undertaking.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Together we can do great things.

Mr. Young: Yes, I quite realize that together we could do great things, if that togetherness could be meaningful. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) the other day, expressed his disappointment that we—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is Mr. Speaker against togetherness?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member now would try to get on with the principle to this bill and the amendment. There are a number of principles connected with it, but I do not think the member is on any of the principles just now.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the principle is fairly fundamental here, but, I am just saying that I am delighted to find that these people agree with us in principle, so that in effect this is on the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Vote for our amendment then.

Mr. Young: We will vote for your amendment, because we believe that this is progress along the line that we want to see.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, this educational process has been going on, even here, and I think we have come to the conclusion across the world that medical science can now largely meet the needs of our people. There are some fields in which we have not yet been able to find solutions. Cancer is one of them. But, by and large, for the majority of our people, and in the majority of illnesses, medical science has come to the point where it can meet the needs of our people, that when sickness occurs, we know how to handle it, and when that sickness becomes serious, emergency measures can be taken to overcome it.

One of the things which has been quoted time after time in this House, is the fact that, as Mr. Justice Hall pointed out, the gap between our knowledge and our performance must be closed. There is a very simple thing here which we ought to face up to, and we need only to ask these questions: What is the need in the field of medicine? And what are the available instruments to fill that need? As far as medical science is concerned, that need is filled, by and large. As far as financing is concerned, we have the means by which to do it.

Just this last year, we were told by the last economic survey published by this province, that the gross national product of Canada has gone up by 9.7 per cent—over \$4 billion increase in our gross national product in Canada, during this past year. A plan giving us complete medical care would not cost more than a quarter of that amount. So over this past year, we have added to our nation's wealth four times what we need to put into effect a full-scale Medicare plan across this land. So the financial base is there.

Some time ago in the *Financial Post*, an article by J. D. McGeachey pointed out this fact—that the total of about four per cent of Britain's gross national product was used to carry out their full-scale medical plan, and this includes rebuilding their hospital system. In Canada, we are now spending something like five to six per cent of our gross national product in medical care. In other words, we are spending the money now, but we are not getting the care that we ought to have. We have the financial resources, then, to put this plan into effect. It is feasible. And then we ask the question, why these halting steps?

Time after time, hon. members of the government have told us that this is a step in the right direction. It has been called a timid step by various people, but they say it is a step.

The question we would ask is, why this halting step when it is possible to go the whole way as far as doctor and specialist bills, and part at least of our druggist bills, are concerned right now? It has been proven in one of our provinces that it is feasible, and that it is possible. Democracies around the world which are much less affluent than we are have proved that a full-scale medical plan is a possibility, and that it is feasible. So why do we in Ontario take this halting timid step at the present time?

We must recognize first of all that medical care should be a right for all our people, and this should be a financial right as well as

any other kind of a right. As long as we put a financial barrier between people and medical care, then they have not that right in its true sense.

So we have proposed that a minimum premium be charged, which has been outlined by our hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald); that this be supplemented according to ability to pay; and supplemented from the general revenues of this province in certain ways. This will bring the whole Medicare plan within reach of our people, and it ought to be done immediately.

The gap which we have heard so much about is being closed for certain members of our population. We are closing the gap for the elderly and the poor, about a million of them in Ontario. But the fact is that that gap is already largely closed for these people—municipal welfare and the medical welfare plan is looking after the vast majority of these people who will be covered in this way, this million of our lowest income people who pay no income tax.

The other 800,000 will be helped in various measures if they can afford it—and we are putting up a financial barrier here—and if they ask for it. Above this is the standard contract, which amounts to what we now have, private insurance, plus the delineation of a couple of standard contracts, which, if they are bought, cannot be cancelled and which must be sold to the applicant. The risk, if there is a risk here, will be spread among the insurance carriers. In this pattern need does not become a paramount issue. The needs of our people are pushed aside.

It seems here that the needs of the insurance companies and of the doctors, assumes far more importance, Mr. Speaker, than the needs of the people of Ontario. This is indeed a dream of the insurance companies come true, but it is going to be an administrative nightmare for the province itself and for the Minister who administers it. In the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dymond's) own department, as has been pointed out, there will be many people who will be in this plan because they have less than \$1,000 of taxable income. There will be others who will go to the private carriers to get their insurance. These must be sorted out. This is true right across the board, in company after company and industry after industry across this province. These people are going to be classified as those who will be helped and those who will go to private insurance companies.

I presume, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the rebate, if and when it comes, will come back to the person con-

cerned and not to the company to supplement whatever contracts may be signed here.

Now, the machinery to administer this plan is already available and this is the part which seems incredible to me and to others. The Ontario hospital services commission will have the names of all the people of Ontario, or nearly all of them. The cards are there, the families are delineated, the cards are punched, the records are kept. It would be a very simple thing to expand that office and to put the extra tab on the cards so that these people would now be covered by medical care as well as through the hospital services commission for hospital services and for medical care. If the Medicare plan were a universal plan, this could be done and done readily. But instead of that, we are going to set up a duplicate system, across the board, with duplicate offices and duplicate costs. And the costs of this extra administration will have to be borne by the premiums and by this province.

Some of the administrative nightmare that this will present is illustrated by a case which I have tried to trace out for the benefit of the House. I have given the hero of this story my middle name with the "s" removed. My mother's family, Irish Loyalists—good Tories, I presume, in those days when they came up from the south—their name was Matthews. When I was christened they gave me for my second name, Matthews; so I am going to cut off the "s" to make it easier, and I am going to use this case. I want to trace it to the House just to show some of the problems that can be met.

This man's name is Matthew; he has a job with a small business at a low income level. He has a taxable income of \$200. This means that his medical-surgical premium is \$29 a year. He has no insurance, because at his income level he has found it hard to pay premiums. His employer has no union and he provides no fringe benefits, so Matthew now comes into his inheritance. He is covered by medical care by the payment of \$29 a year. So he decides to pay the \$29. He applies, and he gets the insurance coverage. The following year Matthew gets a part-time job to supplement his income, he earns an additional \$800. This means his taxable income is now \$1,000. On this he would pay \$149 for his medical premium. This would be, of course, in the following year. I presume this is an administrative detail that is worked out through the income tax return.

But by the time the premium is due, the extra job has petered out, so he is back on

the \$200 taxable income, but now with the smaller income he has to pay the \$149. True, he has had the \$800 extra but that went for furniture and a little holiday which he needed desperately in trying to handle all the extra hours of work. He cannot find the \$149 for the premium, so he just tries to take a chance as he had done before, and not bother with the insurance.

Then Matthew loses his job; the plant, marginal at best, closes down. It is winter and Matthew cannot find employment. Someone tells him when he applies for unemployment insurance that he is eligible for free medical coverage so he makes an application. This goes for consideration to the council set up under the Medicare bill. The council deliberates after it meets and finally recommends that Matthew and his family be placed once more in the files of the medical insurance commission.

But, in the meantime, a sickly child has had to have more attention and Matthew has had to pay the doctor himself up to this time. Maybe this would be refunded to him; at least he hoped so. Finally, Matthew finds a job, a better one this time and his wages are higher.

This put him just into the \$1,000 taxable range. He is coming up in the world now. His free medical care has stopped and he is told that, by paying \$149, he can carry it on with the public plan—but where is the \$149 to come from? The sick child worries him and his wife. They decide that the premium must be met and they make the first payment. Then hard luck strikes again. The child dies, and he finds that not only does he have the expenses of a funeral but now one of his income tax exemptions has gone; he is above the government subsidy line and he can no longer be in the public part of the plan. He gets a polite note from the Minister that his subsidy has terminated and that he should make private arrangements for his insurance. This means \$175 a year. He and his wife look at each other. The child is gone, the one who most needed attention. The rest of the family are fairly healthy. Perhaps they should let it go for a while.

Then he gets a call from an insurance man. I think he must have been from High Park, I do not know. If the government is really concerned about having everyone covered of course, they will surely release to the trade all the names of people going off the public plan. We take for granted this will happen. We do not know. The insurance man wants to call around; an appointment is set up. They discuss policies. He is told about the

standard policy at \$175 a year. "But I have been sick," he says. "I am in debt to the undertaker and to other people. How can I pay the \$175?" The enthusiasm of the agent cools appreciably. "Well," he says, "we have other policies, cheaper ones, with less coverage, of course. You might consider one of these." But Matthew decides to wait. He cannot afford anything just now. Perhaps after a few more pay days something can be arranged.

During the following week, Matthew is deluged with insurance calls. Everyone, it seems, wants to sell him some sort of policy. Some are better than the standard, at a higher price of course; some are minimal at slightly lower rates. One persistent salesman sticks to him and finally persuades him that he has just the thing he needs. It is a policy which covers catastrophic bills. The subscriber pays the first \$50 of doctor bills each year and 20 per cent of all the bills thereafter. It has some little added feature, so it will not exactly be the alternative standard contract.

Matthew is not told, but this means that the policy may be cancelled by the company at any time, as opposed to the standard policies, which are non-cancellable.

Matthew settles for a co-insurance policy. It has some protection, but he hopes that he will never have to pay those first \$50 of doctor bills. So he does not go to the doctor when he develops a severe case of indigestion. He tries to cure it with baking soda, that old tried and tested remedy. It will go away soon, he thinks, because he cannot afford the medical bill.

But it does not go away. He has been worried and under severe strain for too long. Finally, his wife calls in the doctor and he is put to bed. He not only has the added medical bills, but he loses wages as well. The doctor sees him again. X-rays are needed. He has insurance, but nothing is covered. He is a statistic on the Minister of Health's records. He is one of the 83.8 per cent the hon. Minister proudly points to as already under the health umbrella of the insurance companies. But he will have to drop even that leaky umbrella, because by the time he is better and back to work, he will be still more desperate financially.

The doctor advises him to drop the insurance he has and take out the standard policy. But if he does this, there is a waiting period, and he has not the money anyway. So he worries, and that does not help his illness. Finally, his boss sends him word that if he does not get back to work, he will have to

find a replacement for him. The boss is sympathetic, but he cannot carry him forever. The doctor will not let him go back. So once again Matthew is unemployed and now he can apply for 100 per cent coverage in the medical plan.

So, after the appropriate routine and card punching, the hon. Minister of Health has Matthew as a customer once again. Matthew has a right to health care now, because of his very tough luck.

A bit overdrawn? Perhaps. But this is what can happen to people on the borderline of poverty, and this is what can happen to hundreds of thousands of Ontario people under this medical care plan. The people like Matthew, who live on incomes such as this government pays to so many of its own employees, to these people an extra medical bill, or any other bill for that matter, can start a chain reaction which can spell disaster. A proper medicare plan, such as we in the New Democratic Party propose, could be afforded by every family. It could cover every citizen. The present administrative machinery handling the Ontario hospital services could be expanded to cover the medical plan. The hardship and uncertainty which the proposed Act will inflict, especially on borderline cases, would not occur.

The added expense of all this filing and counterfiling; of the checking and the policing of this incredible hodge-podge of subsidies and standard contracts will add immeasurably to costs. The duplication of staff and organization, when the Ontario hospital services commission organization could be simply and readily expanded to meet the need, is inexcusable.

The cards are there for every family, as I have noted. The names are on them. They are up to date. Yet we face the setting up of a parallel organization, with different offices, staff, machinery, a sheer duplication of costs, which must be reflected in the rates we pay. This is the reason why Mr. Justice Hall says that the private plan such as is being proposed, will cost up to 28 cents for administration, where the public plan will cost about five cents.

So I bring before this House today, this problem of administration, and I have tried to illustrate it for the benefit of the House and for the benefit of the hon. Minister.

We have a multiplicity of contracts, when a standard contract, covered by the province, would do the job. We have divided administration and multiple administration. The cost is not controlled, as has been pointed out so often, by the administrative machinery.

It is controlled in large measure by the doctors, by advertising of the private insurance companies, who will go out on a selling spree to sell plans for their own companies. Then, the means test that is set up, is bad administratively. It is going to be cumbersome, and you will find people like Matthew, moving in and out of the plan, filed and refiled, discouraged and wondering what it is all about.

This plan is being administered for the insurance companies and for the doctors, and not for the needs of the people. It is high time that we, in this province, began to think in terms of what is possible, to meet the needs of our people, in the field of medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this House support the amendment to the bill.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, we were talking about cows and bulls yesterday, and there is something I ran across in connection with this bill, Mr. Speaker, and it reads like this:

Definitions: Socialism: You have two cows. You give one to your neighbour and keep one. Fascism. You have two cows. You keep the cows and the government takes the milk. Nazism. You have two cows. The government takes the cows and gives you the milk. New Idealism: You have two cows. The government takes both cows, shoots one, milks the other, and pours the milk down the drain. Communism. You have two cows. The government shoots you and takes both the cows. Capitalism. You have two cows. You sell one and buy a bull.

We have heard quite a bit of debate on the medical insurance bill up to date. I must say that I am not too much impressed with what the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) had to say. As a matter of fact, I was going over his speech and he certainly is condemning the government. In one part he says:

It is almost incomprehensible that the government should have the nerve to bring in a dead-end bill like this one.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Read the rest of it. It is a good speech.

Mr. Cowling: Well, there is a good piece here that I think you would all enjoy. He says:

And that is not all. Earlier I called Bill No. 136 a patchwork and an administrative nightmare.

The hon. member for Yorkview was talking about a nightmare. I am afraid the Opposi-

tion will all have nightmares before this bill passes.

The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) was getting really fanatical—I am sorry that he is not in his seat—and during his comments I thought he was going to leap right over on the other side, at one point. But he made a great issue over the fact that the Conservative government have done nothing about the care of the people so far as medical care, hospitalization, and so on, are concerned.

I thought I would refer to this piece, and what the hon. Minister had to say:

To sum up, the government has contributed extensively in health services through mental hospitals and clinics, public health and preventative programmes, tuberculosis prevention and treatment, school health programmes, maternal and new-born care, general hospital construction grants and hospital care insurance.

Which is not bad for health care of the people over the years. I would not say that our government has ignored the people.

The NDP has some great ideas—that was a terrific story, incidentally, although I lost you about half way through it. They say we can give everything to everybody, as long as we put a six per cent surcharge on income tax, and a three per cent corporation tax, and we increase the sales tax. They mention this ability to pay, which I maintain is just a pipe dream, because you are not going to be able to tell who has the ability to pay. Everybody lives in a different way, and thinks in a different way, and spends money in a different way. So how are you going to say, Mr. Speaker, that you pay according to your ability to pay?

People to whom I talk every day say that the taxes are pretty high right now. They look to me, as one of the lawmakers, at least as the representative for High Park riding, to do something about lowering the taxes. So I cannot be impressed by people who say that they will give you all this medical care but it is going to cost a lot more in taxes, Mr. Speaker.

Our plan, on the other hand, says to the 82 per cent or 83 per cent, that if they have taken care to provide their own medical coverage they will simply continue to provide it. And for those who do not have the money, we will pay the premium, which makes sense to me because I have many friends, and I am sure that many of the hon. members have friends who want to make their own decisions. Maybe they do not want to buy a

medical insurance plan at all; and if they do not want to, they do not have to. And maybe they do not want to buy the standard plan; maybe they want less or maybe they want more. They have the privilege of making that decision without the government making the decision for them.

Of course, as far as the insurance salesmen are concerned, I think they do a great job in our province too. They make a great contribution; they provide jobs; they provide income tax; they pay their way, and just because they happen to be enthusiastic about the product they are selling, that is no reason to deride them or their product.

Incidentally, I was at a meeting with some of the other Toronto members a while ago, sponsored by the Toronto and district labour council. It was a nice friendly meeting; we had dinner and some refreshment and I met some old friends. I have always been active and interested and close to the work of the Toronto district labour council ever since I was on the Toronto city council. They had a very nice pamphlet. A copy of it is here and I have read it over several times to try to get something out of it, which I cannot seem to get, but they say here:

Write your member in Queen's Park. Tell your doctor to have his association stop opposing any universal plan. Pass this along to your friend or neighbour and do what you can about it.

For the information of the NDP, I have not had one call on this in High Park. I have not had one call from anybody.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They know there is no point in writing to the hon. member.

Mr. Cowling: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, you might be interested in knowing that in all this talk and discussion on medical care—and I go right back to the last election in 1963, when medical care was supposed to be one of the big issues. Believe me, in High Park it was not; it was about number nine on my list of things that were important. I had people talk to me every day about many, many things but it was on a very rare occasion when they got really serious about medical care insurance. So I am not impressed with what the Opposition has to say about it; I am impressed with what we have to say about it.

Mr. MacDonald: More particularly, the hon. member is impressed with what he has to say about it.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion about the Hagey committee and the Hall commission.

Mr. Singer: That was astute of the hon. member to discover that.

Mr. Cowling: Yes; are there any calls the hon. member could make now for a little while?

The difference is that the Hall commission was set up in Ottawa and the Hagey committee was set up by our government. Now as far as I am concerned, I am much more interested in what the Hagey committee had to report than in what the Hall commission had to report. I am very serious and very interested in the Hagey report. After all, the federal government in Ottawa some day may institute a universal medical plan on the basis of the Hall committee report but, boy oh boy, Mr. Speaker, if we waited for something like that to happen in Ontario, we would all have long white whiskers in this House.

Let us give our government credit; we are proposing something now—today. We have finished with the report and have taken note of the recommendations and now we have come up with a bill, and this bill contains all the things we think it should, within reason.

Now, let us forget about this Hall commission, because in this Legislature we are only talking through our hats on the Hall commission report. It is up to Ottawa. They could consider it for the next 15 or 20 years, as they do on most things—with the present government, that is—but we are moving forward.

I think one of the best—and I have read volumes, as everybody else has in this House about medical care insurance—was an article written by George Hogan about a week or so ago. He talks about Hagey versus Hall in the medical debate, and I think some parts of it would be worth reading here. He says:

First of all, it will be said that this plan is iniquitous because it involves a means test. This is both inaccurate and irrelevant. It is inaccurate because it does not involve a means test but an income test, a very different thing. Every Ontario citizen undergoes an income test every year when he files his income tax return. That test determines whether or not he pays income tax and how much he pays. Exactly the same test, and no more, will determine whether or not he gets a medical care subsidy and how much.

It is irrelevant because any social security plan which requires the payment of a premium, no matter how small, will always

find people who cannot afford it. Even Saskatchewan's compulsory medical plan makes provision for complete subsidization of those receiving public welfare. To receive public welfare, you have to pass a means test.

By extending complete subsidization for a much broader group, Ontario's voluntary plan does much more than Saskatchewan's compulsory plan to help those who really need it. But to determine who needs it, Ontario will use an income test for exactly the same reason that Saskatchewan, for a more limited group, uses a means test.

Now I think that lays the means test right on the line.

The second charge will be that for people not receiving a subsidy, the premium will be about \$175 a year. This can only be described as deliberate misrepresentation. One of the features of the Ontario plan is that it requires all medical insurance carriers to make a standard medical plan available to anyone who applies for it. This means that many people who cannot now buy medical insurance at any price because of their health record or age or some other factor will now be able to buy it.

Just think about that one.

Mr. Singer: How much will it cost?

Mr. Cowling: About that.

Mr. Singer: About what?

Mr. Cowling: About \$175 for a family man.

Normally, the cost to such people would be prohibitively high. To protect them, the bill provides the establishment by the government of a maximum premium which no carrier can exceed. The Hagey committee recommended a figure of about \$175. Obviously, only a few people will pay this maximum premium, the vast majority will go on paying the premiums they are now paying under existing plans, which often are reduced still further by employer contributions. There is no reason why anybody who now has medical insurance should have the premiums increased by the plan, but a very large number will have them reduced.

A third charge will be that this plan is simply a means to give more profits to private insurance companies. This is the one I like. If the original Hagey proposal had been followed, there might be some argument for this, but under the government's new legislation there is none whatever, not one cent of public money will go

to any private insurance company under this plan. All subsidized coverage will be handled directly through the government's own agency, administered by The Department of Health.

Now we have heard an awful lot in the last few days, Mr. Speaker, about all the money the insurance carriers are going to make out of a new plan, and we have heard an awful lot about the doctors, mostly bad. I think the Opposition has really dwelt mostly on the poor job that the medical profession is doing, and the profits that the private companies are going to collect.

Did the hon. member want to ask something?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): If the hon. member will permit it.

Mr. Cowling: I do not mind.

Mr. Bryden: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has read Mr. George Hogan's column of April 13, 1965, in which he advocated that the government should take over and operate PSI as a basis for its medicare plan, and if so, would the hon. member care to read some of that into the record and comment on it?

Mr. Cowling: As a matter of fact, I did read that article. I read most of Hogan's pieces, some are good and some bad. I was not impressed with that suggestion, I might say, Mr. Speaker, not nearly as much as I am with this piece. Incidentally, the division of the health care dollar—I think this important—quite consistently has been shown to be as follows: Hospital care is the highest, followed in order by physician services, dental services, other health services lumped together, and prescribed drug service. I think that is important, and it was in the piece read by the hon. Minister.

But to go on with this article:

It is true that private insurance companies will still compete in the non-subsidized field, but a big part of this coverage is now provided by non-profit carriers such as PSI and AMS.

Because the plan is voluntary, anyone with the doctrinaire objection of dealing with a private insurance company is fully at liberty to deal with one of these non-profit carriers.

The fourth charge will be that establishing this voluntary plan will interfere with the establishment of a compulsory national plan such as the Hall commission recommended. If the Ontario plan is successful,

as I believe it will be, this could very well be true, for if Ontario's people are satisfied with their voluntary plan there is no reason why they should trade it for something else. This is precisely what the advocates of compulsory medical care are most afraid of.

But if Ontario's people decide at a later date that they do want to change over to a Hall type plan, there is absolutely nothing in the present legislation which makes this more difficult. On the contrary, by setting up the machinery for government administration of coverage, and by establishing uniform standards, Ontario is taking important steps to make a national plan easier to implement if ever they want to.

Of all the arguments against voluntary medical care, this is possibly the silliest. The Hall commission itself did not foresee the possibility of a national compulsory plan being in effect in this decade. This opinion was reinforced by the economic council of Canada in its last annual report. Those who say we should wait for a national Hall-type medicare plan are simply saying that we should have no medicare at all.

In the coming weeks, you will hear these four points over and over again, but when you analyze them you will see that each is not a criticism of the Ontario plan, but simply a misrepresentation of it.

I think that sets the stage pretty well.

This bill, as hon. members know, makes coverage available to everybody, regardless of age, state of past or present health or financial status. I think that is very important. It is guaranteed non-cancellable and renewable, which many insurance policies are not today. In other words, if something should happen of a catastrophic nature under the new standard plan, you will continue to be paid as long as you are not able to work.

There are one or two other things, Mr. Speaker, that I think are worthy of note, and that is the criticism of the insurance companies, although in some cases it might be true. But let us give them the benefit of the doubt. After all, it was the private insurance carriers who originally made medical insurance available to the people. It was not the non-profit organization, and it was not government. It was done through private insurance people. They began this system of medical care insurance. Certainly they did not expect that they would have the best type of plan. It was on a basis of trial and error in the early days many years ago, but

I think they have brought it up to such a condition at the present time that most people have medical care insurance—and I would venture to say that every hon. member in this House has some form of medical care insurance.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that at every opportunity I get to discuss medical care insurance, I always ask those in the audience if they would mind raising those hands, those who do not have some form of medical insurance. It is amazing to find out how few people in any audience do not have medical care insurance of some kind.

An hon. member: Did the hon. member put their names and addresses down?

Mr. Cowling: Yes, I see what the hon. member means there.

So, the situation is not nearly as serious as the Opposition would lead us to believe that it is. I was very much impressed, as other speakers have been, with the series of articles by Joan Hollobon in the *Globe and Mail*. I read this booklet and I also read the articles. I think she sets it out very fairly and squarely.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say this, I congratulate our government—I support this Bill No. 136—I think it is a great start in the right direction.

As far as I am concerned, we could move into other areas. I think that, as someone has already mentioned here, that we could extend the services to include optometrists, dentists, the chiropractors and others. I think of optometrists, particularly. There are many, many small communities in our great province where medical doctors are just not available for eye examinations. This could be done by the optometrist.

Everybody has occasion to go to a dentist from time to time, and they do good work. The chiropractors are an important part of our society, and thousands and thousands of people swear by them. But I think we have made a real start in the right direction.

Basically we are leaving the medical care insurance with those who can provide it for themselves and for their families, and we are going to pick up the tab for those who cannot. And as a beginning I just cannot possibly see that we are going to have too much objection to it.

So I support the bill. I certainly could not support the amendment as proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I urge all hon. members to let us stop talking, and let us get on with the job.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that I am disappointed that the government has not seen fit to bring in a compulsory comprehensive government-sponsored medicare programme.

I was very interested in the comments of the hon. member for High Park as he attempted to rationalize the attitude of the government in bringing in this bill in its present form. He made some rather startling statements there, and I was very interested in hearing the hon. member trying to rationalize the whole affair.

I was also interested in listening to my hon. friend from Yorkview, as he pointed out the administrative difficulties in handling this particular Bill No. 136. I think it would be fair to say at this point that this bill will be an administrative monstrosity. I think that the problems that the hon. member for Yorkview pointed out, are very appropriate, and I would say that it will be a very difficult job to administer such a bill.

I was very interested, when we were on this debate before, some few days ago, to listen to the arguments for and against compulsion. I know my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Health seems to have a dread, an inborn fear, of the word compulsion, for some reason or other.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Distaste!

Mr. Gaunt: Distaste. Well, in any case, whatever it may be, the hon. Minister does not want to move in that direction. At least the hon. Minister is unwilling to do so in this particular bill. I would say that the government is not very consistent in this area, because we have had compulsion in a number of areas. I can think of OHSC. I can think, in the agricultural field of the hog marketing board. Every farmer in the province, every hog farmer at any rate, has to ship his pigs through the hog marketing board. That is compulsory.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I want the debate to continue along proper lines without too many interjections, because it does not add anything to the debate, and it is very difficult for the member giving his speech. So I would ask you to give the member your attention, and not interject.

Mr. Gaunt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying, before I was interrupted by some of my hon. friends, that this government has not been very consistent in the aspect of

compulsion. In the hog marketing field, we have compulsion. Every hog producer in the province has to ship his hogs through the hog marketing board. As I mentioned, OHSC is compulsory, and in our school system we have compulsion. Every child under the age of 16 has to attend school. It would seem to me at this point, that this government almost considers the educational needs and the need for training of the mind, more important than the health needs of the people of the province.

I want to say that as far as I am concerned, in my speech today, on second reading of this bill, I want to make a few comments, based partially on my own experience. I feel rather strongly that chiropractic services should be included, as I said in my Budget speech a little earlier. The value of chiropractors has been well established over the years. There are a number of injuries, such as back injuries, and so on, that the chiropractors can treat very efficiently and very economically—I would say even more so, than the medical doctors can.

I would like to speak to the amendment which was proposed by my hon. leader. In particular, as I have said, I would like to point out to the hon. members of the House why we, in this party, have seen fit to include, and press for the inclusion of chiropractic services as ancillary health care services to be phased into our programme.

Dr. J. N. Mennell of the physical medicine and rehabilitation service, Veterans Administration Centre, Los Angeles, California, stated, and I quote:

The public soon came to realize that they would find greater relief more quickly and more economically from osteopathic and chiropractic treatment of their backs than they would from orthodox medical treatment.

Also, in an article in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* of July 15, 1958, Dr. W. B. Parsons, of the Parsons Clinic, in Alberta, stated and I quote:

The reason we took up manipulation was an interest in backache with the early discovery that many patients who failed to respond to routine medical treatment went to a manipulator and received immediate relief. This discovery was followed by the acceptance of the classic advice, if you can't whip 'em, join 'em, at least to the extent of borrowing their techniques.

Even a number of the doctors have admitted that there is benefit to be derived from chiropractic techniques, as is pointed out by Dr.

Parsons. However, there are two major reasons why chiropractors should be included, should be phased into the proposed medicare legislation. Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with each of these for a moment or two.

The first reason is that it is important in its own right as a health service. Statistics show that in Ontario, one of every six people utilizes chiropractic services, at a cost of about \$6 million annually. This implies that over one million people are now using chiropractic treatment in Ontario and the Ontario chiropractic association reports that they, on the average, have 82,000 new patients per year. Surely these figures in themselves indicate that the profession of chiropractic is important enough as a health service to come under the auspices of the government-sponsored medicare plan.

Saskatchewan, for instance—and I mentioned this in my Budget debate—Saskatchewan included chiropractic care in the Medicare programme last April 6, by a unanimous vote of the Legislature. The governments of Alberta and Manitoba provide chiropractic benefits to recipients of welfare and pensions. Closer to home, right here in the province, we provide chiropractic services under The Workmen's Compensation Act without suffering financial penalties.

In the face of these facts, I think that we should make absolutely sure that there is a place for chiropractic services in the gamut of the health services available to the people of this province. If the patient has the right to choose his own doctor, under a medicare programme, surely this should be extended, so that the patient can choose between the doctor and the chiropractor, without suffering financial loss. A decision by this government which falls short of that aim, would imply nothing less than that the government was making a value judgement about the type of treatment the residents of Ontario deserve. And surely this is not within the powers of this government, or any government.

So the first reason I believe that chiropractic services should be included in the Medicare programme is that it is important, and is increasing in importance.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, is that we are now experiencing a critical shortage of health care workers. Now, and in the immediate future, I believe we should make maximum use of our paramedical personnel, and thereby reduce the strain that the general practitioner and other physicians are going to face. In my Budget speech, I pointed out, I cited cases where medical people had stated that they worked upwards of 85 hours a

week. I also pointed out at that time, that under those conditions, often the doctor suffers, the patient suffers, and everyone connected in the health service field eventually suffers.

An increase in chiropractors would facilitate more adequate and more extensive health services for all the people of Ontario. The *Financial Post* of November 14, 1964, reports that in 1957 there were 57 per cent of physicians in general practice. By 1961, the percentage had dropped to 50 per cent, and in the past four years it is estimated that the percentage has dropped even further, to approximately 47 per cent. The percentage of general practitioners is decreasing and at the same time, we are insisting that their responsibilities increase. It is a well-known fact that most of the general practitioners, as I have already pointed out, work extremely long hours. If that is the situation today with the general practitioner, then the handwriting is on the wall. The situation will get worse before it gets better. Under pressure of this kind, as I have already stated, either patients or doctors, or both, will suffer in the end.

I outlined this situation, as I said before, in my Budget debate, but I just want to reiterate what I have already said in the Budget debate. This situation is obviously the responsibility of the government and the government should therefore do everything possible to reduce the pressure on the doctors. In line with this, we should not hesitate in bringing the chiropractic profession under our plan.

Speaking as a citizen of the province and as a member of this House, I can say that if people in Ontario want to go to a chiropractor, then there should be no financial penalty inflicted upon them for doing so. I believe that the chiropractic profession is eager to have its role in health services defined more accurately. I know that at the present time it is not recognized as a health service by The Department of Health, but the Canadian memorial chiropractors college, which is the only chiropractors college in the British Commonwealth, is recognized by The Department of Education. It is listed in the department's publication, *Horizon*, and it has been made eligible to receive loans through The Canada Student Loan Act, so there is a certain measure of recognition, even though the college must meet all of its operating costs through the profession itself. It cannot rely on government assistance, as can other professions and professional schools in this connection.

The enrolment of the college is about 200, and there are about 450 practising chiro-

practors in Ontario. So we are faced with a situation where the people accept chiropractors; part of the government accepts the chiropractic profession and part does not; and the medical profession, as a profession, is pitted solidly against them.

In the face of this, I say that if the people want chiropractic services phased in under a medicare programme, there is no excuse not to do so. Chiropractic is an important profession. It will relieve the pressure on the doctors. I think it should be phased into the programme as quickly as possible.

In this same connection, I believe that optometrists should be included in the plan. I know that my hon. friend from High Park mentioned the optometrists and the chiropractors, but I would just like to say a word about the optometrists.

At the present time, optometrists perform 65 per cent of the refractions in Ontario. Beyond welfare cases, 2,151,250 Ontario residents and dependants require vision care services on a continuing basis. Six hundred thousand refractions are performed by optometrists, and they have more than 1,700,000 patients in the province.

It is obvious that if the optometrists are not included, this will mean that more than 1,500,000 residents of this province will have to pay for that service themselves, or they will attempt to get the same service by going to an ophthalmologist, and, as I will point out later, the ophthalmologists are already overworked. My hon. friend says that you have to wait three months to get an appointment, and I believe that is so.

However, the fly in the ointment is the fact that 63 out of the 110 Ontario communities with a population of 3,000 or more have optometrists as the only practitioners available to provide the refraction benefits. The same will be true of perhaps all of the communities numbering less than 3,000. This means, in effect, the ophthalmologists will be presented with a work load which will be a physical impossibility for them to carry. It will also mean a transfer of the ophthalmologists' time from the necessary medical or surgical eye care to that area of vision care that the optometrists are already well qualified to perform. It means, in effect, that the patient is not in a position to make a completely free choice of practitioners.

In one case, the patient has to pay out of his own pocket, and in the other, he is covered by his medical insurance. Surely, the hon. Minister of Health must recognize the importance of vision care for the well-being of the people in the province. That

being so, I would urge the hon. Minister to include the optometrists, along with the chiropractors, in the bill as soon as possible.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, much has been said regarding Bill 136, and it is very difficult to say anything which will not be, to a certain degree, repetitious. One of the advantages of following other speakers, is that one has the advantage of dealing with some of the statements which they make.

I listened with interest to the hon. leader of the Opposition as he outlined the Liberal plan for a medicare programme in Ontario. He pointed out that the plan would cost in the neighbourhood of \$200 million, and told us very blandly that we could afford it. Unfortunately, I did not hear him mention where the money is to come from, and we are reminded of that other famous Liberal in Ottawa, who was reported to have made the remark: "What's a million?"

It is a simple matter, Mr. Speaker, to stand up in this House and with arms outstretched cry for a compulsory Medicare programme for Ontario. But the big question that we must ask ourselves is where would the finances for such a programme come from. Certainly, this government cannot print their own money. Reliable sources estimate a full-scale compulsory Medicare programme would cost well in excess of \$200 million. Welfare, education, municipalities and other departments of government all require increasing financial assistance.

There is a cliché to the effect that talk is cheap, but all the loud talk in the world cannot supply the vast financial sums which are necessary to provide the services of this province. Faced with the heavy burden of financial management, the government cannot set up a province-wide Medicare programme in a dream programme of financing, and just hope it works. They have responsibility to provide the best possible health service within the bounds of the available finances, and in Bill 136 the government is doing just that.

The hon. member for York South presented an interesting argument in outlining his proposals for a Medicare programme for Ontario. The hon. member it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, has the ability to almost make two and two add up to five. But as I listened to the hon. leader and other hon. members of this party, I find that once again, everybody is in favour of a Medicare programme, only at least in the case of the NDP they propose a dream programme of financing.

In analyzing this NDP financial programme—which it is reputed will provide a Medicare programme for Ontario for \$165 million—one gets the impression that the hon. member for York South must actually be capable of stretching two and two all the way up to seven.

I had the opportunity of discussing and arguing medical health costs with some very respected actuaries during the past couple of months, and I found this expert opinion at great variance with the NDP programme costs. Even the public Medicare programme costs in the province of Saskatchewan, the very home of Medicare, do not agree with their Ontario counterparts' proposals. Medical records show that Ontario's costs are at least 25 per cent higher than Saskatchewan, and on this basis a Medicare programme based on the actual cost in that province would cost Ontario well in excess of \$200 million.

The hon. member for York South made a great deal of the problem of a means test, which he claimed would be used—the government using income tax as a basis for subsidization. In checking over the NDP proposed method of financing, I find that they refer to a six per cent surcharge on income tax. This is not an additional six per cent on your income, but a direct six per cent charge on the actual tax paid, or at least is as I understand it. I wonder who is to collect this tax, and how the persons involved are going to declare just what their income tax is?

It seems to me that this programme of financing is also pretty well tied up with a declaration of income tax. I must admit that I never before realized that there was anything particularly secret about whether or not one paid income tax. This subject quite often becomes quite a topic of conversation among workers in industry, as to how much a man paid, whether he paid and if not, why not.

The argument that Bill 136 contains a means test is, in my humble opinion, quite wrong. If we agree with this argument, it could be suggested that every citizen with a taxable income in Canada takes a means test. Every citizen in Ontario is responsible for filing his income tax return, and the same income tax return will determine whether or not he receives assistance in paying his medical insurance premium and how much.

It is a recognized fact that to secure public welfare, a citizen is required to pass a form of means test. The nationwide income tax return cannot be considered on the same basis and in the same category, I suggest, Mr.

Speaker. This argument is not feasible. I submit that the overall plan of assistance as contained in Bill No. 136 is the fairest possible plan which could have been presented at this time and should not cause any citizen embarrassment.

During the past few weeks that this bill has been under consideration, I have argued, along with some other hon. members on the government benches, for the group in what is termed the grey area and I refer to those citizens in the \$3,000 to \$4,200 income bracket. I felt that for the family man in this income bracket there should have been a larger measure of assistance. During this debate I have noticed that various speakers have also referred to this particular area of income. It is, of course, a fact that regardless of the point at which the assistance was cut off, there would also be a considerable hardship. The programme which is now before us is as far as the government felt they could go unless federal financial assistance was forthcoming.

Statements have been made, Mr. Speaker, to the effect that the medical health programme as outlined in Bill 136, eliminates the possibility of Ontario entering the national health programme. This, of course, is definitely not true. The present plan has been set up so as to make it adaptable to integration into an overall Canada health plan if and when such a plan is proposed. It is interesting to note that even the Hall commission itself did not foresee the possibility of a national health plan in this decade. The recent report of the economic council of Canada supports this thinking. What the future will bring as far as a Dominion-wide health plan is concerned, is difficult to predict. If the day comes when Ontario decides they wish to join such a plan, there is nothing in the present legislation to prevent this. Setting up the necessary government administration to look after 25 per cent of our people is an important step which will make a national plan easier to implement.

Today across this province there are many, many thousands of organized workers and their families who under union agreements are enjoying excellent medical and hospitalization coverage. Union negotiators have made splendid accomplishments in this fringe benefit field through the past several years. In this regard, I feel we are no doubt far ahead of the other provinces in Canada.

I would be among those in this House who would readily agree that a truly effective Medicare programme which would provide

all the various health necessities for our people, is an essential objective. But the logical question would appear to me to be: What would the average industrial worker in Ontario achieve under a Medicare programme? Thousands now enjoy excellent medical coverage, some already enjoy a drug plan and many unions are aiming at achieving such a plan. Even the Opposition in this House admits that the shortage of dentists eliminates a large-scale development of this field of health in the immediate future.

On pages 6 and 7—and I found this very interesting, Mr. Speaker—on pages 6 and 7 of the New Democratic Party programme for Medicare, it clearly states that their programme will be introduced by stages and that the first stage will provide “general and specialist medical services in addition to universal hospital care.” There is no reference to a drug plan or a dental programme—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member has not read later editions.

Mr. Walker: There is no indication as to how long the first stage may take.

Mr. Bryden: Immediately.

Mr. Walker: So I repeat the question, what would thousands of workers in this province achieve that they do not now enjoy? Under the New Democratic programme of financing, they would achieve the right to pay a 6 per cent surcharge on income tax where they now pay nothing. In my area this would amount to an average of \$25 to \$35 a year. There would also be of necessity an increase in some area of provincial taxation—likely sales tax—to help cover the cost of the Medicare programme.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member has not read the plan.

Mr. Walker: Certainly I realize that the industrial workers I have mentioned do not comprise all the people of the province. I am also aware that there are pocket areas where medical health coverage with a modest premium is indeed needed, but on the other hand this bill provides free medical health services to approximately one million of our people. Could these people afford to pay even a modest premium?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this word Medicare has been exaggerated out of all proportion as it actually refers to the situation in this province. There are people, unfortunately, who have been led to believe that if a Medicare programme were intro-

duced, all their health problems would be over. They would pay a few dollars premium and have nothing more to worry about. This is, of course, not true. A Medicare programme in order to be truly effective must not only provide a comprehensive medical coverage to all citizens at a low premium cost, but must include a dental programme and a drug plan. If I may be so bold as to express a humble opinion, I would say to this House that I do not think we will ever have such a programme in this province until the federal government presents a co-operative financial programme to assist in the financing of such a programme.

Before we cry out in a loud voice that "Medicare is wonderful; it is the be-all to end-all; we can afford it; there is no reason why we cannot have it," let us stop and consider the situation in all its ramifications; let us tell Mr. Average Citizen in this province just what the exact situation is. Let us tell him what he can actually expect to get from a Medicare programme that he is not getting now. Let us tell him how much a Medicare programme is going to cost him from all angles against what he is now paying. Then and only then can our citizens clearly understand what this present argument is all about.

As I previously stated, a great many words have been spoken on this subject, the debate has contained figures, statistics, predictions, comparisons and so forth, but while all these arguments hang in the air of this House. What we are really debating is the basic difference in the opinion as to the best method of producing a health programme for our people. I am sure we all agree on one point, that it is desirable to aim for a programme of the best possible health care for the people of this province. There are various ways of attaining this goal, and here we differ. It is the responsibility of government to determine how the goal is to be achieved. Newspapers across this province, have spoken generally in favour of the government's medical plan. Statements such as, "first phase, and a good beginning," have been repeatedly used.

I submit that Bill No. 136 is a logical step forward in a progressive programme towards achieving this goal. The bill we are discussing here today, puts first things first. The poor, and those who live on low incomes, will be assisted by the taxpayers of the province. This is as it should be; 83.8 per cent of our people are covered at the present time, and there will be no interference with these existing voluntary plans. The legislation proposed in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is not

the last word on the subject of a medical health programme for Ontario, but I submit that it is a good beginning, a sound, logical beginning.

In conclusion, I would ask the hon. members of this House: Can we afford to cast aside this medical health programme, which will provide free health services for nearly one million of our citizens, in the low income brackets, and wait until the federal government is in a position to present a Dominion-wide health programme, some time in the future? Frankly, I do not think so.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in approaching a plan for Medicare, my thinking has been based on the answers as I see them, to two questions.

Question one: Are all the men, women and children of Ontario worth providing with Medicare? If hon. members believe, as I do, that the only possible answer to this question is yes, then question two must be, how can we provide this essential service? How can we be certain that every Ontario citizen is protected?

If a Medicare plan is to meet everyone's needs, it must contain the answer to question two. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the plan as proposed by Bill No. 136, fails to provide this answer. Perhaps the creators of the plan started from a different point. I think they did. I think they planned coverage for a certain group of people: those who need its protection the least, the high-income group, and, to give it public appeal, those people who are poverty-stricken. The plan really provides no new protection for a family or individual on welfare because they are already covered under our welfare provisions. The cost for protecting this group of people is simply being taken from a different pocket of the same pair of pants. It is my understanding, and I am sure the hon. Minister will correct me if I am wrong, that persons on welfare were receiving free medical care through arrangements between the government and the Ontario medical association at a special rate.

Under the Act, I have to assume that the medical profession will collect larger fees, since benefits are to be set according to the general physician tariff of the Ontario medical association and that when the patient has been referred to a specialist, he will be paid at the Ontario medical association specialist tariff. Barriers have been erected to those who live on the fringe of poverty, and the middle income group must help to pay for the higher income group.

The Ontario federation of labour, in a recent study of poverty in Ontario, considers an annual income of \$1,000 for an individual or \$2,000 for a family of husband, wife and two children, to be destitution; an annual income of \$1,500 for a single person or \$3,000 for a family, to be poverty level; and an annual income of \$2,000 for a single person or \$4,000 for a family, to be on the fringe of poverty.

Believe it or not, a man, his wife and two children, with an annual income of, let us say, \$2,800, who live at poverty level, as defined by this report, will be required to pay a partial premium for their proposed Medicare. As soon as his annual income is \$3,701, the man will have to pay the full premium, in all likelihood, \$175. This is an enormous amount for a very limited coverage, more than he would have to pay for PSI—\$159 for instance, and PSI provides better coverage.

What portion of this cost is borne by the same family with an annual income of \$20,000, which is the average income of doctors in Ontario, a group who have most strenuously opposed providing the people of Ontario with complete coverage at a cost set according to their ability to pay? Why, this \$20,000-income family pays exactly the same as the one who is making \$3,701.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will have to be proved to me that there is no barrier to the low-income group's obtaining this insurance. They have the biggest barrier of all. It is made of dollars and cents. Dollars and cents, which a family of four, trying to shelter themselves, to pay for utilities, food and clothing on \$65 a week, just cannot find. They have a grim task just existing. There is no area in which they can economize. They cannot say, "We will do without this luxury item or that luxury item, to buy medical insurance," nor unless they give up the bare necessities of life.

Is it not obvious, then, that the high-income group is not paying its fair share of the medical insurance costs? They are not paying according to their ability to pay while the low-income group and a large portion of the medium-income group is paying in excess of their ability to pay. Because of this situation, it is really the high-income group which will receive the greatest benefit.

It becomes increasingly obvious that large numbers of Ontario citizens cannot afford it and therefore will not benefit under the plan. If every Ontario citizen is to be provided with medical services, then such a plan must be universal. Those who criticize universal plans, do so in the name of

freedom. They cry out against what they term "compulsion."

Well, do we not live a great deal under compulsion? We are compelled to send our children to school at a certain age and to keep them there until they reach a certain age. We do not seem to hear any objections to this type of compulsion today, although when the idea of education for everyone was first introduced, this same type of objection was raised. We think now that everyone must be educated. In fact, we spend considerable time in this Legislature, devising ways and means of encouraging ever greater numbers to go on to higher education. There is compulsion in the field of education, but no one considers it to be a denial of freedom. Instead, it provides us with greater freedom to choose our life's work.

We are compelled to pay for the education, but it is paid out of the public purse and that purse is filled by the ability of the individual to pay. It comes from the provincial share of our income tax and the local area share of our real estate and other civic taxes.

This very government introduced compulsory hospital insurance for the mandatory groups of 15 employees or more. A revolutionary process for a Tory government, I agree, but it did introduce a hospital insurance plan which is largely compulsory. Its major fault is that it is not income-related, but since it was largely compulsory, it was at least possible to keep the premiums low and most of the people who were not compelled to join, could afford to do so voluntarily. What surprises me is, that having come up with such a popular scheme, the government does not use practically the same one for medical insurance.

When the hon. Minister introduced his bill, my hopes were high at one point, when he stated:

Since the first step has been taken, viz the provision of hospital care insurance, it appears logical that our next step would be in the area of physicians' services, and that is the purpose and will be the effect of the bill.

Unfortunately, that is where his logic ended and doctrinaire Toryism took over. And now we are stuck with legislation which does not deserve the name Medicare. Instead we should call it "doctor-care" or "insurance-company-care."

A year ago last February the Hagey commission was advised by the United Church of Canada and the Ontario federation of

labour that most Ontario residents polled in two separate studies conducted by these organizations favoured compulsory, tax-supported medical insurance. Every public opinion poll in the last 15 years has given clear indication that the majority of Canadians want universal Medicare.

In June, 1964, the Canadian association of social workers met in Hamilton and they urged that a national health programme be financed by taxation to give full health care to all Canadians. Last February, just three months ago, the Ontario association of social workers, in a brief presented to the Hagey committee, stated that: "Universal coverage is essential," and recommended "a government-administered plan financed from taxes."

There could hardly be a group of people more concerned or better informed regarding the needs of the people of Ontario. Their findings and opinions are not to be lightly discarded and, for this reason, I would like to refresh your memory by reading into the record portions of their brief:

The Ontario association of social workers includes in its membership 1,016 professional social workers in Ontario. Our provincial organization is affiliated with the national organization, the Canadian association of social workers.

Members of the association, through employment in government departments at all levels, private social agencies, public and private hospitals and treatment institutions, encounter daily the social and emotional consequences of illness, as experienced by persons who are sick or disabled, their families and relatives, and the communities in which they live. Our professional concern is for the social, physical and emotional well-being of all people, and we hope that our knowledge and the experience gained in helping numerous people with their social problems will prove useful to the inquiry in its deliberations.

As stated in the national brief, social workers support the democratic philosophy that every person should have the opportunity to develop to his full potential, and to make his most effective contribution as a member of society. We agree that physical and mental health is essential, and that all people suffering from ill health should have the opportunity for the care appropriate to their physical and mental conditions. We know that good health is costly, but we consider that the poor health of its people is even more costly to society. We cannot approve of the provision of

health care through a health plan which divides the nation into first-class and second-class citizens on the basis of their ability to pay individually for the medical care they need.

We maintain therefore:

(1) That society has the responsibility of ensuring that the opportunity for adequate health care is provided to all its members.

(2) That a plan to provide comprehensive health service should be established.

(3) That there should be no difference in the kind, quality or form of care available under the plan based on the ability of the patient to pay.

(4) That universal coverage is essential. One of the reasons for recommending a government-administered plan financed from taxes is that it would achieve our goal of universal coverage. We recognize that if the plan is administered provincially, flexibility in the method of financing may be necessary, as in hospital insurance. We would hope that such flexibility might be regarded as a stage in development toward the goals of a tax-supported programme.

(5) That the services should be available to all persons domiciled in Canada without distinction. We recognize that a plan for one province cannot fully achieve this objective, but it should come as close as possible to doing so.

(6) That the plan should be administered in such a way as to provide citizen participation in the policy-making body. While medical decisions must be left to the medical profession, provision should be made for participation in policy-making of the citizens of the country. The consumers of health care have a right to be represented in the administrative body.

Mr. Speaker, the Hall commission reported that the cost of a medical insurance plan with private insurance companies as carriers would be 22 per cent higher than if the plan were operated by the government. These figures are based on a plan covering Canada, but I do not believe they would vary a great deal here in Ontario. The opportunity for profit to the private insurance companies is clearly demonstrated in any case.

Actually, the private carriers of Ontario's medical insurance are in a much stronger profit position, because the basic principle of insurance—the pooling of risk and spreading the cost over the whole population—has been flouted by this government. It has taken

unto itself most of the poor risks, and handed over to private companies the good risks.

In looking at some material I have collected over the years I came across a clipping from the Toronto *Daily Star* dated November 1, 1961. The newspaper reported that the Canadian health insurance association told the Royal commission on health services:

A government-sponsored national health plan is not needed, because its 117 member insurance companies are preparing to drop the uninsurable ban that now denies health insurance coverage to many of the elderly, the medically impaired and those engaged in hazardous occupations.

Dr. James C. Emmett, medical director of the Imperial Life Assurance Company, who presented the policy statement for the Canadian health insurance association told the commission:

The present voluntary plans can be modified and improved to provide this same high standard of medical care through voluntary health insurance at a reasonable premium cost to all Canadians, regardless of age, health or occupation, and accomplished without involving governments at either the federal or provincial level in substantial new costs and extensive new administrative machinery.

The association is aware that some segments of the population are not in a financial position to pay even a most reasonable premium for voluntary medical insurance.

Such persons will continue to require financial assistance from the governments or others. It is unrealistic and unnecessary to institute overall, compulsory, government-sponsored plans applicable to the entire population just to take care of this relatively limited group.

It seems odd that these insurance companies were not prepared to remove these exclusion clauses until it seemed possible that governments were prepared to introduce some type of medical insurance.

One could well believe that Dr. Emmett, an executive member of one of the private insurance companies, had laid down the blueprint for Bill 136. We must give Dr. Emmett, and the Canadian health insurance association, credit for realizing insurance companies were cutting their own throats if they stayed with their exclusion policies, and for endeavouring to keep their industry in the profitable area of health insurance while persuading the government to subsidize the unprofitable area. They did indeed render a service to their industry, as events have

proven, but by no means have they rendered a service to Ontario residents.

Pierre Berton called the 1962 Bill 163: "Little more than a minor amendment to The Insurance Act," and he was so right.

This newer version has been improved very little. In some instances it is even worse. It is still obvious that the interests of the insurance industry have been protected, to the detriment of the citizens of Ontario.

Now, I want to lay to rest some of the apparent fears of the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) regarding the reaction of trade unionists. It is a change, and rather nice, for a government member to express this type of concern for labour, even if it is done with tongue in cheek.

First of all, I want to point out that it is a historical fact that the trade union movement has pioneered a great deal of our present social legislation, among others, old-age and other pensions, paid holidays and vacations, shorter work weeks and complete health insurance, including hospitalization. They are leading supporters in the field of health insurance, and have been so for many years.

Trade unions have had considerable success in obtaining this type of protection for themselves in negotiation with their employers. However, the trade union movement has always had a wide social conscience, and they have never limited their efforts to their own narrow interests. They have continued their efforts to obtain social welfare legislation to benefit all the citizens at all times. But to get back to their own particular interests, they will not suffer if they are required to pay as individuals. There is nothing that I can see to stop the employers from paying a negotiated share of the premium cost on their behalf. There is nothing to stop them acquiring extra protection during negotiations.

Hon. members must realize that when union contract negotiations are completed, so much money is available for a package deal. In the past, a large percentage of this has been used for fringe benefits, including just such items as health insurance. The balance, perhaps now, could be changed and more of the available increase be assigned as a direct wage increase.

However, as I said, it is nice to see the hon. member more concerned now than he was last September. At that time, there was a general protest because PSI had announced an increase in their rates, and the hon. member was able to shrug it off—a bit hard-heartedly, I thought—with these words: "If you want such services you have to pay for them."

Well, we all know that. What I am concerned with is that everyone pays only according to his ability, and that the burden be shared in a manner that will allow the people of Ontario to have the medical services they need, when they need them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this bill, I would say it is a generally accepted fact that the voice and opinions of the people are reflected in the newspapers and magazines across this province. I would also point out to you that my hon. friends in the Opposition agree with this statement; whenever anything appears that is unfavourable to the government they are quick to quote it verbatim at their first opportunity.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the record the opinions of many of the newspapers from all sections of our province, and one from our sister province, Quebec, relative to Bill 136.

From the Brockville *Record and Times* of May 15. They comment:

The approach to Medicare taken by the provincial government on a gradual basis is a wise one. Costs of medical plans can mount rapidly, along with other difficulties. This plan is a first step, a masterpiece of compromise, leaving the way open for future developments.

And from the Guelph *Daily Mercury* of May 14, I quote the following:

It is hardly to be expected that initial legislation in the immensely complex field of Medicare can meet all wishes and supply all needs. The at-long-last bill the Ontario government has now placed before the Legislature is imperfect, but in average it is an excellent beginning.

Then we move over to the St. Catharines *Standard* of May 13:

This is the type of programme that many have recommended, for it includes medical services, annual checkups, maternity care, psychiatric treatment and surgeon's care. It is a bill under which every resident of Ontario can obtain medical health insurance, regardless of health or age, and one which provides for those unable to afford such protection.

Then let us go to the other part of the province and quote from the Windsor *Star* of May 13:

Premier John P. Robarts wisely emphasizes this plan as not the be-all and the end-all of medical insurance. Such insur-

ance, government-sponsored, is still in its infancy on this continent. There should be room for development and improvement.

And from the Kitchener-Waterloo *Record* of May 13:

No one is claiming that the proposals are perfection. In fact, the opposite seems to be the case, but it is something substantial to cover an area in which nothing is currently available. It is worth a fair trial, subject to constructive criticism, based on facts rather than doctrinal theory.

The Montreal *Gazette* had this to say:

The plan is being attacked on the grounds that it is not universal and compulsory, but in several ways Ontario appears to be proceeding wisely. Some of the critics of the Ontario plan have called it "timid." Perhaps the plan might better be called "prudent." There is much to be said for doing first things first, step by step.

From the Fort William *Daily Times Journal* of May 14:

Great numbers of Canadians like to feel free and independent. They rebel against regimentation, resenting growing lists of things they must do or must not do. All this is a background for an opinion on the proposed Ontario medical services' insurance Act, introduced in the Legislature.

That is based on the fact that the plan is not compulsory. They end up by saying: "That is good."

The Port Arthur *Chronicle* of May 14 has this to say:

The encouraging aspects of the legislation are that a step has been taken to provide the needy with the means of paying their doctors' bills and Dr. Dymond himself has emphasized that the scheme is only one step in developing the health programme of the provincial government.

The Barrie *Examiner* of May 14 says:

The medical services insurance Act, introduced in the Ontario Legislature this week, is a step in the right direction. Whether it accomplishes what it hopes to achieve remains to be seen. At the moment there is no indication as to the cost to participants, one of the key factors in any scheme of this nature, largely because of the opposition to a government-sponsored plan being handled by commercial enterprises. Mr. Robarts has compromised in his new bill. In doing so, he has accomplished some basically sound results. He has assured coverage for low-income groups and standard contracts for others.

And from the *Ottawa Journal*:

Even though Health Minister Dymond has emphasized that this is only one step in the developing health programme of the provincial government, it is a momentous step. The government of Ontario has been careful to recognize from the start that a successful medical insurance programme should have the co-operation of the medical profession.

It has taken pains to achieve this without subordinating the general public interests to narrow professional advantages.

And now, closer to home. I quote from the *Toronto Telegram*:

The Ontario government has moved firmly and with solid strides to bring medical care insurance to the people of the province. The Ontario government is acting sensibly to put first things first. It is a good beginning.

And from the *Globe and Mail*:

As a first phase, it is a big phase and a fast phase. However, as Dr. Dymond again said, "It is a beginning." From beginnings one continues to move forward.

The *Stratford Beacon Herald* of May 13 has this to say:

We believe the Ontario government has made a good start in the field of medical care in the bill introduced in the Legislature on Tuesday by Hon. Matthew Dymond, Minister of Health. The bill has weaknesses, but it represents an effective entry into an area that needs the attention of the government.

The *London Free Press* says:

As first displayed, the plan is a masterpiece of compromise, avoiding most of the pitfalls which have beset other schemes and leaving the way open for further development.

And from the *Brantford Expositor*, we have this:

The government scheme thus is a cautious approach in circumstances where caution may be just as much a virtue as compulsion and comprehensiveness. It will not stay the demand for state medicine which is an inevitable part of the welfare state to which, willy-nilly, Canada is moving, but at least, it will ensure that the Medicare march in Ontario is begun at an orderly pace rather than in a disorganized stampede.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a report from the *Hamilton Spectator* of May 13:

The chief virtue of the medical insurance bill introduced in the Legislature the other

day is that it fulfills the basic requirements of any worthwhile Medicare scheme. It ensures that no person may be deprived of care in sickness nor suffer impoverishment as a result. Retention of the voluntary principle ensures that the general practitioner will keep his independence. This is important, compulsory government schemes could turn the profession into another arm of the civil service.

Part of the wisdom of the government's bill lies in its flexibility. In the future, it may be changed in the light of experience or even be merged with the national scheme; in the meantime, it answers the need for medical care to be made available to all irrespective of income and without hardship.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this new Act differs considerably from the Saskatchewan plan in two main areas. In Ontario, medical insurance will remain voluntary as opposed to a compulsory plan in Saskatchewan, which led to the 1962 doctors' strike and set father against son, family against family, and neighbour against neighbour in a bitter struggle which will take generations to heal. Secondly, everyone in Saskatchewan must pay a premium, but under the Ontario plan those who are in need will be entirely looked after by the government; even those of limited income will have part of their premium paid by the government.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on Bill No. 136, an Act respecting medical services insurance, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House the stand taken by the city of Windsor with respect to this topic. However, before I do this may I inform the House that the world health organization states in the preamble to its charter, and I quote:

Enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition. The health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security and is dependent upon the fullest co-operation of individuals and states.

The Hall commission report states:

The commission is convinced that, quite apart from humanitarian considerations, the health of Canadians is a matter of concern to us as a nation, and that no enlightened government can ignore that the economic capacity of its citizens to be

productive depends upon their health and vigour as much as upon their educational attainment.

We accept the statement of Sir Arthur Newsholme.

"Civilized communities have arrived at two conclusions from which there will be no retreat, though their full realization in experience has nowhere been completely achieved. In the first place the health of every individual is of social concern and responsibility. And secondly—as following from this—medical care in its widest sense for every individual is an essential condition of maximum efficiency and happiness in a civilized community."

Ever since 1919, all political parties have talked about implementing a national health insurance scheme. While Canadians talked, other countries acted. Britain in 1948 implemented their national health service and it has remained in effect since then, even though there were many years of Conservative government rule. Successful plans have also been operating in almost every western European country for many years. Therefore there is plenty of evidence that government-operated and controlled plans are effective. Medicare was dramatically introduced in Canada in 1962, when the Saskatchewan government, in spite of doctor opposition, implemented their plan. Even with the short time that it has been in operation, and in spite of this opposition, it would appear that the Saskatchewan plan is here to stay.

The Hall commission report has established a blueprint for the early implementation of a national plan on a progressive basis. It is our duty as citizens to see that it is implemented. Mr. Speaker, the Hall report continues:

The second most revealing piece of evidence was the sickness survey of 1951. It showed the appalling social and economic cost to Canada of ill health, proving that the family and the nation pay heavily in terms of lost production for failure to make available to all Canadian citizens the standard of health services we know how to provide. Nor is it only in loss of production that we pay. Many of our so-called welfare expenditures are the end result of illness, disability and premature death. Not all of these expenditures are avoidable, of course, but clearly many of them are.

To the extent, then, that health expenditures prevent or shorten periods of sickness, reduce the extent of disability, postpone

death and contribute to the productivity of citizens, then to that degree health expenditures are investments in our human resources with the prospect of rich dividends.

From these few quotations, Mr. Speaker, it is easy to see why the Hall commission, after its three years of intensive study on a national basis, came to its conclusion that for the greatest public good a public-sponsored, universally controlled, prepaid Medicare scheme is a must.

Mr. Speaker, turning to my own community, the Windsor Medical Services Incorporated offered one of the first, if not the first, non-profit, prepaid Medicare programmes in North America. Since its beginning in 1939, it has pioneered in relieving the burden of medical expenses from the pocketbooks of the residents of Windsor first, then of Essex and finally the counties in southwestern Ontario. It has been so highly regarded by the medical profession that very few doctors today practise outside the plan. It has been so highly regarded that study groups from many universities, cities, provinces and states have visited its offices to get more details as to its operation. In spite of its fine operation and excellent management it has had over the years to raise its fees time and time again to cover its costs for services. The fee increases have been justified, especially since Windsor's aging population is disproportionately large and as a result, demands for health services have been much greater.

Thirty years ago Windsor had one of the youngest populations in Canada, because of the boom in the late twenties when younger people flooded into our community. Now Windsor has one of the oldest populations, well above the provincial average; as of 1961 the provincial average of people 60 years and older was 11.7 per cent. Windsor's as of 1961 was 15.9 per cent, or an average of 36.6 per cent greater than the provincial average. Such large numbers of senior citizens belonging to the Windsor medical services, would only naturally cause the fees for such medical services to increase. In September, 1964, a rate increase of 30 per cent was instituted. Because Windsor is a highly unionized community, a large percentage of its residents have their medical premiums paid by their employers. In addition to medical services, many industries also pay for employees' prescription drugs under a Green Shield prescription plan.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, read to the hon. members of this House, just what the Green

Shield prescription plan offers. I will read only a very small portion of it:

What does it offer you? The following medical and dental prescriptions and prescription services are available to subscribers and their dependants from member pharmacies of their choice, subject to conditions listed under waiting period and exemptions.

1. Prescriptions written by a licensed medical practitioner or dentist, which are dispensed by a member pharmacy.

2. Newborn children are eligible for all benefits from birth.

3. If vacationing, travelling or temporarily residing outside the area in which member pharmacies are located, you will be reimbursed the same amount of money as would be paid to the member pharmacy for similar services in your own community.

4. Prescriptions may be repeated but only in such quantities as, and as many times, as are set forth in the service agreement.

These are only a few of the benefits from this Green Shield prescription plan.

Mr. Speaker, you can readily see that Windsor's residents had a very good Medicare plan. However, the Windsor city council, in its wisdom, on March 16, 1964, adopted the following resolution, and I am reading the resolution:

Whereas the enjoyment of the highest obtainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social conditions, and whereas a high standard of health must include hospital care, preventive medicine, health education, diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation of the disabled, administration of drugs and appliances and a whole range of health services to foster and preserve the physical and mental well-being of each man, woman and child, and whereas a voluntary privately administered government supervised medical plan would not achieve these aims and would, in fact, have serious defects, namely, (1) would not provide universal coverage; (2) provides for a means test which is degrading because it fosters first- and second-class citizenship and, therefore, is extremely difficult to regulate and enforce; (3) leaves Medicare in the hands of private insurance companies, eliminating the possibility of providing care at cost, and makes health a matter of private profit; (4) ignores the

problem of research, preventive medicine, rehabilitation, drugs and medicine and development of facilities and adequate staff; (5) makes no provision for the encouragement of group practice; (6) does not include a staging provision for a full health insurance programme; (7) represents a complete departure from the principle that was followed by government in its establishment of the hospital care programme;

Therefore be it resolved that the government of Ontario proceed as quickly as possible with the establishment of a universal government-sponsored and controlled medical insurance programme. The plan to be based upon the following principles:

(a) The medical profession will make medical decisions without government interference.

(b) A doctor may conduct his practice completely outside the plan if he chooses.

(c) Doctors will be free to choose their patients, and patients will be free to choose their doctors.

(d) A full and careful consultation with the medical profession in all stages of the development of the plan.

(e) A medical services commission with a varied representation will operate the plan.

(f) A staging provision for eventual full and comprehensive health care.

(g) The plan must be universal in scope with no means test.

(h) The highest possible quality of services must be available to all.

After the adoption of this resolution, the Hall commission submitted its final report. The Windsor council followed by adopting in its June meeting, in 1964, the following resolution:

That the city council endorse, in principle, the proposed plan for a universal government-sponsored controlled medical insurance programme as recommended by the Hall commission on health services.

It was quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that government-sponsored Medicare insurance was in the offing. The Windsor Medical Services Incorporated foresaw this, and so offered an extended health benefits plan in an attempt to ward off public pressure for a government-sponsored comprehensive Medicare plan.

In a very recent advertisement, in fact, May 22, 1965, the following official survey

proves that long-term health care costs are divided in the following fashion: Dental care, 10 per cent; general health care, 19 per cent; prescribed drugs, 18 per cent; doctor care, 25 per cent; Ontario hospital services coverage, 28 per cent.

Thus you can readily see, Mr. Speaker, that Windsor medical services, plus hospitalization coverage, covers only 53 per cent of the total costs of long-term health care. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Speaker, the Windsor medical services gives greater protection than do most other medical services plans in Ontario.

Thus, 47 per cent of the remaining costs of a total health plan, or long-term health care, must be borne by the individual. Such limited medical and hospital services coverage is not sufficient. Even the Windsor medical services realize that 53 per cent of health service coverage was not sufficient, and so instituted what is called the extended health benefits plan.

The extended health benefits plan will cover 19 per cent of the general health care, and 18 per cent of prescribed drugs. That, combined with the 25 per cent for doctor care, and 28 per cent for hospital care, would now give approximately 90 per cent of the total health care. This new extended health benefit plan pays for prescribed drugs, dental care as the result of an accident, special nursing services, crutches, casts and braces, artificial limbs, eyes, ambulance services, wheelchairs and hospital-type beds, oxygen and equipment for its administration, laboratory services, care in a licensed private hospital, difference between private and semi-private room in a public hospital, and lastly, emergency accommodation of injured or ill away from home.

Mr. Speaker, having brought to the attention of the hon. members of this House the feelings of the council of the city of Windsor, a city that has pioneered in more social welfare programmes than any other Canadian city, a city with one of the best, if not the best, non-profit Medicare plan in Ontario, this same city now suggests a comprehensive government-operated universal health care programme. I respectfully suggest to the hon. members of this House that they vote for the amendment to this bill as proposed by my hon. leader.

The amendment suggests:

(a) A comprehensive government-operated universal health care programme.

(b) The patient shall have the right to be treated by a doctor of his choice.

(c) Doctors shall be paid on a fee-for-services basis, and shall be free to practise within or without the plan.

(d) There shall be no means test.

(e) Mental illness shall be treated on the same basis as other illnesses.

(f) Dental and optical services for children up to 18 years of age shall be included.

(g) Other ancillary medical and health care services, such as home nursing or orthopaedic appliances, chiropractic services, and so on, shall be phased into the programme as independent health services, in order that the programme shall be fully comprehensive by 1971.

(h) The bill in its final form shall be of such a nature that the programme can be readily integrated into a national health-care programme for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude my remarks by simply asking that we have no second-class citizens in Ontario.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this bill there have been quotations from many sources and newspaper articles, magazine articles, and so on, or references made to various sources of information. Now, there is no point, and I think we all agree, in repeating and going over this same territory again. For that reason only—this is a tremendously interesting subject to me and to my hon. colleagues—but for that reason, the fact that we have had all these quotations from various sources, I propose to make my remarks very brief. But I would like you to feel, Mr. Speaker, and those hon. members who are in the House, that I am very sincere in that which I will have to say.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the Medicare health plan introduced by the CCF-New Democratic Party government in Saskatchewan has been—and I think by many hon. members of the government—has been pretty thoroughly investigated; and I think, even against their wishes they are basically in agreement with the fact that it is completely workable, practical and desirable.

Now, in connection with that, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko)—who leaves his chair—to recall the last election campaign in Fort William. I think he remembers the incident very vividly, too, and, I hope, these facts, as I think I do. He was speaking, of course, definitely not in favour of Medicare because that was part of our political platform and still is, but the hon. Provincial Secretary on the platform in

Fort William or in the environs of Fort William held up a little bottle, I think, of aspirins, and a band-aid. And he stated to the people gathered—and I hope I have these facts correct, sir, and that he will correct me if I am not absolutely right—he held these two little articles up before the people assembled at this meeting, and he said, “This is what you will get under the New Democratic Party medicare plan.”

I would like to have the hon. Provincial Secretary's explanation.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for giving me an opportunity of giving an explanation on the floor of this House. I was very much interested—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in reading an election advertisement on the part of the hon. member. That ad spoke of medical care and it referred to the medical care plan as had been expounded by the hon. leader of the NDP Party on a number of occasions—it said this: “This will cost you 30 cents a week.”

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And so I got up and I explained to the people that what 30 cents a week would buy was one tiny packet of headache pills and two band-aids. The NDP medical plan is going to cost the people of this province far more than 30 cents a week.

Mr. MacDonald: We have explained it.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Provincial Secretary for his explanation and I regret that my remarks encompassed just one band-aid; he suggested two, very generous of him.

However, the hon. Provincial Secretary has a right to his own opinion and as a member of the government he is naturally going to fight strongly in retention of that opinion and he hopes that it will get over to the rest of the people. However, I do not agree with him and with the thinking of many of the other hon. members of the government.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the plan that we have is completely workable, completely practical and desirable. Now I would say too, Mr. Speaker, that as far as Bill 136 is concerned, I think, regretfully, that if this bill carries in its present form, the people of this province will very soon realize that

what they have had wished upon them is extremely low-quality medicare at extremely high cost.

I believe, as do my hon. colleagues—and, I think, our hon. friends to the right—that we must have a universal health plan under complete government direction and management. There is no real alternative. There should be no compromise under any circumstances. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people should not have foisted upon them this pale and utterly inadequate legislation.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglington). Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this particular debate on Bill No. 136, may I say that my first thought is that I would be inclined to favour a comprehensive compulsory medical plan for all the citizens of Ontario. And then, Mr. Speaker, I found that when I began to delve into the particulars, I found that it was absolutely impossible to provide a completely comprehensive plan for the citizens of Ontario, regardless of cost. As a matter of fact, this government, Mr. Speaker, has done a great deal and has taken a step forward, a strong, long step forward—

Mr. Sopha: Where is the evidence of that?

Mr. Reilly: —in providing a plan that is making available to all the people of Ontario a medical health insurance service at a maximum amount of money.

Mr. Sopha: At a maximum fee.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, this is true.

What we have said in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, that we will help those who cannot afford it; to those who require assistance we are prepared to give it and those who are able to pay for it themselves, we will ask to pay for it themselves. And under those circumstances, we say, regardless of your age, regardless of your vocation, regardless of your medical history, we will make it possible for you to purchase a plan to cover your medical health service requirements.

Mr. Sopha: Now the hon. member has lost me.

Mr. Reilly: And not only that—so that the hon. member for Sudbury will be understood and will understand me—we said to them, “We shall not allow anybody to cancel this plan except you, if you want to cancel it.” We said, “This will be an uncancellable plan and it will be irrevocable; the only person who can revoke it is the person who is insured.” We have gone a long way in Ontario,

and I will agree with the hon. member for Fort William that we have a long way to go.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a number of the hon. members in this House have been talking about a proposed income test versus the means test. I know that every hon. member in this House knows the difference between an income test and a means test, but surely you would not understand that by what we have heard in this House. There is no embarrassment from the standpoint of an income test. This is a regular form. It is adopted widely right across Canada; everybody knows what an income test is for and how it is used. It is accepted right across the country. We prepare it each year and all we have asked in this bill, under the circumstances, is that a copy of the income tax form be made available. Now, surely no one under those circumstances can suggest that we are trying to probe into somebody's income or into somebody's assets or suggesting to people that they make disposal of certain assets in order to qualify. All we suggest is, "Here, show us your income tax report and if you qualify for assistance partially or totally it is done on the basis of income tax."

I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition, a man for whom I have a tremendous personal respect, suggest that this was a monstrous fraud on the citizens. I am inclined to think that this language was somewhat intemperate and certainly unfair, because it is an avenue in which he is particularly interested and I think, like most hon. members in this House, he is anxious to do something for the people of Ontario in relation to a medical health or services bill.

Mr. Sopha: He feels the same about the hon. member for Eglinton.

Mr. Reilly: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sudbury suggested to this House that if education was the care of the mind then perhaps the medical services bill could be considered as care of the body. I will go along with him, but will remind the hon. member for Sudbury that when they started with public schools some 100 years ago they did not start out with a comprehensive scheme for education. They started out with a little red schoolhouse. We have added to that since in the public schools including textbooks and secondary schools and universities; all of this has been done over a period of time.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Ryerson did it in the last century, and so do you.

Mr. Reilly: And now I hear my good friend, the hon. member for Parkdale. The thing I found out about the hon. members of this House is that they can twist certain things to suit their own particular purposes.

Mr. Freeman: Is that nice?

Mr. Reilly: It may be not nice, but it is true. For instance, in this House last year, during Health estimates, I heard hon. members of the Opposition stand up and say: "What are you doing to us with this OHSC? This is unfair. You are taking our money. We are subscribers. You are not delivering the goods. There is a shortage of nurses. There is a shortage of hospital beds. There is a shortage of doctors." And during this debate, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Sudbury stand up and say: "I never heard any constituent of mine complain about the OHSC." I heard the hon. leader of the Opposition stand up and say: "I am proud of the OHSC." I heard the hon. member for Parkdale stand up and say: "You know, the Ontario hospital services commission have 99 per cent who have subscribed. Unquestionably, they are satisfied with what is being received." Then you see what I mean by twisting it to suit their own convenience.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the strongest criticism that has been suggested here has been that the proposed bill is a bonanza for the doctors and for the insurance men. The reference that has been made by many hon. members of the Opposition in this regard, has been the retention ratio. They have suggested that the Hall commission report indicates that it should cost only about five per cent to administer such a plan. With the insurance companies, they suggest their costs are some 28 per cent. On the surface, this sounds like a logical argument until, of course, you delve in to find out what a retention ratio is. I plead not for the doctors and I plead not for the insurance men; I am thinking in terms of trying to be fair in connection with the requirements.

So we have the Hall commission report where it suggests it might be 28 per cent. But what is in this retention ratio of 28 per cent? Perhaps I should explain to the hon. members of the House that if the cost of medical services is \$150 million, and if the cost of acquiring this amount is \$15 million, the ratio is ten per cent. Under these circumstances, our government and other governments require insurance companies and also some doctor-sponsored groups to have a retention for specific purposes. They must retain a certain amount of funds available to

avoid automatic increases all the time, as in the case of an epidemic of some particular kind.

Now, in addition to that, the Hall commission report said nothing from the standpoint of the cost of advertising. Now surely the hon. members of this House realize that if the government was to institute a plan of this nature, they do not go out and institute a plan without making it known to the people of Ontario. It must be advertised; the details must be brought to their attention. It is going to cost money to do this the same way as the insurance company does it.

I agree that from the point of administration that perhaps five per cent might be a fair way of arriving at it. Then we go on from the five per cent and say: "If it has to be advertised then we have to have extra dollars for this purpose." If we are going to say to PSI or if we are going to say to the indemnities companies that you must have certain reserves, then let us not build up the retention ratio on the basis of building-in those reserves unless we do it for the Hall or for the other types of reports.

I see that my friend the hon. member for Sudbury has got a worried look. Perhaps I should explain. Let us think in terms of this five per cent, and let us be fair about it. PSI, in the last report of the Hall commission, have showed that they had a retention ratio of some 17.8 per cent. But of that 17.8 per cent, approximately ten per cent was in there for reserve. So the actual retention ratio for cost of administering was 7.8 per cent, not 17.8 per cent. If we are going to say that you must have reserves, then we must show the difference between the cost of acquisition, the cost of administering a plan and the cost of advertising and so on, in connection with it.

In a government plan, you say there should or should not be a reserve. I am suggesting that there should be a reserve. Experience has shown us this; it has shown us in Saskatchewan, it has shown us in the UK, it has shown us everywhere. It is not only a question of administration, because what has actually happened, as we were told in the UK, is they started out not on a guesswork, but on an actuarial basis where they figured it would cost £170 million, and within five years it was £809.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us be fair now, it is a smaller percentage of the greater wealth of the country.

Mr. Reilly: And what we must do, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Trotter: The hon. member ignored that.

Mr. Reilly: No, I did not ignore it. As a matter of fact, I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would ask the members to desist from interjecting. The member is trying to present his point of view, and I have watched him very closely. He did not interject very much when some of the other members were presenting their points of view, so if you would give the speaker your undivided attention I am sure the chair, as well as the speaker, would appreciate it.

Mr. Reilly: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am partially responsible for it, maybe I have aggravated some of the hon. members. Maybe it is good natured banter, and I am prepared to accept it in this way. I was suggesting that we have to build in reserves if we are going to pay any kind of attention to the experience that other nations and other provinces, such as Saskatchewan, have had. We should learn from them, and one thing we are going to learn from them is that invariably it costs more money than they ever estimated, or they ever actuarially counted on. This is natural. If you will permit a personal observation I have a plan for my employees in which I have said to them that anybody who is single pays 50 cents a week, anybody who is married pays 75 cents a week, and anybody who is married with a family pays \$1 a week, and Len Reilly picks up the tab for the balance.

Some hon. members: Good old Len!

Mr. Reilly: But among them I found that no sooner had the plan been instituted than there were people who made use of it who had had no intention of making use of it before. This happens in every instance, in every type of plan. As soon as it is made possible, many of us will take advantage of a situation. Why? Because we feel that we are subscribers to that plan. We do not care what it is costing everybody, we know what it is costing us individually, and under those circumstances, if we qualify as subscribers, we want to be able to take advantage of the situation. This is human nature.

My friend, the hon. member for Woodbine, has suggested that perhaps \$175 is too much money for someone to pay for a medical health insurance scheme, and particularly he was referring to someone in a lower income bracket. Sometimes I am inclined to share his viewpoint; \$175 seems like a lot of money

for somebody in a low income bracket to pay for medical health insurance.

Mr. Bryden: It is too much.

Mr. Reilly: And so they say it is a lot of money; in fact it is too much money.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member should not argue himself out of it now.

Mr. Reilly: Now, is it too much money, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MacDonald: He is setting up the straw man, then setting it down.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reilly: And then the hon. member for Woodbine says, "We will take \$175 and we will add to that the cost of \$6.50 monthly for Ontario hospital services and we will add \$78 a year, approximately \$250 altogether for a person in a low income bracket to pay for health insurance services."

Mr. Sopha: Plus the cost of—

Mr. Reilly: Oh, plus the cost of many things, including a carton of beer if he wants it at the end of the week.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Let us say \$250, and let us say under those circumstances that this is correct, and that the fellow is earning some \$3,000 a year in the low income bracket. Is five or six or seven per cent too much to protect your life and your family and your loved ones from the standpoint of health insurance?

Mr. Nixon: The Hall commission says it is.

Mr. Reilly: The Hall commission does not—not the way I read it.

Mr. MacDonald: Five per cent of \$3,000 is \$150, not \$250.

Mr. Reilly: The Hall commission indicated that somewhere between six and seven per cent seemed to be a fair amount to pay for health insurance, as I read it.

Mr. MacDonald: That is less than \$250.

Mr. Reilly: Under these circumstances, the hon. member for Woodbine suggests that this is a Cadillac and that everybody can buy a Cadillac who has the money to buy a Cadillac.

An hon. member: It is true.

Mr. Singer: Now we are getting down to it.

Mr. Reilly: Actually, see what we have done in this particular case—

Mr. Singer: Good health is only for—

Mr. Reilly: For those who cannot afford to buy it. We will provide it, and we will provide assistance. For those who cannot afford to pay any income tax at all, we will buy all the health services.

Mr. Singer: Better go to work for the hon. member and good old Len will give—

Mr. Reilly: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of "good old Lens" in the province of Ontario; many of them. I had lunch with a chap the other day and I said to him, "With whom are you insured?" and he said, "I have health insurance through PSI." I said, "What does it cost?" and he said, "\$13 a month, \$156 a year." And I said, "What does it cost you?" and he said, "It costs me 20 per cent because my company picks up the tab for 80 per cent."

Under the circumstances he pays some \$31.20 and his company pays \$124.80 to make sure that this man and his wife and his family are covered with a PSI blue plan. The hon. member for Wentworth East said there were some 23,000 workers in Oshawa who did not pay a dime toward the medical health insurance plan.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): What a deduction.

Mr. Reilly: All right, call it what you will, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that there are a lot of people who are covered. The Hagey report has indicated that some 75 per cent of the people here in Ontario are already covered, plus the 7.5 per cent on welfare, for a total of some 82.5 to 83 per cent. I suppose what is true about this, is that in many cases of legislation we find that we cover the many in order to take care of the few.

In this House, Mr. Speaker, I heard a number of hon. members speak about the Alberta plan. They suggested the Ontario plan is on the same basis as the Alberta plan and that there were some 15 per cent of the people in Alberta who really needed it who did not get medical health insurance services. I am suggesting there is very little comparison between the plan in Ontario and the plan in Alberta.

Mr. Sopha: Tell us the difference.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to tell the hon. members the difference. In the first place, we are far more generous with our assistance in the question of subsidies here in the province of Ontario than they are in Alberta.

Secondly, the hon. leader of the Opposition took a case where a man was earning \$51 a week, then he got a magnanimous increase of \$1 and got \$52 a week, and then he had a third child, and the hon. member referred to him as a "three-time Charlie." Do hon. members remember the situation? Actually there was nothing difficult about a situation like this. In the first place, in Ontario, with \$51 a week, he is completely covered if he is a married man with a wife and two youngsters. When he comes into the \$52 range, the hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out he would receive \$2,704 and he runs into a bracket where he would then have to pay something around \$4 a month in taxes. Then he goes back with the third child and he has a further exemption. Under those circumstances he qualifies for total assistance. These are the three steps the hon. leader of the Opposition was talking about with regard to the "three-time Charlie."

In Alberta they do not take the steps on a \$10 ratio that we have pointed out, but they say anybody who pays no income tax will be assisted, and anybody who earns from zero to \$500 is put in a group and assisted. So what happens? In Alberta the man who is at \$2,704 and has only \$4 above a bracket pays the same and receives the same assistance as somebody who has \$459 taxable income. They make no differentiation whatsoever between the chap at \$4 or \$494. What they have done is to group them all together and give them assistance from zero to \$500. And then they go on and make no provision from \$500 on!

Mr. Singer: What provision do we make here?

Mr. Reilly: We make a provision up to \$500 single; then we go from there up to \$1,000 for a married man, then from \$1,000 up to \$1,240 for a married man and a family—a decided difference and far more generous toward people who really need it.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we say to these people: "If you do not want to come into a standard plan similar to the PSI, what you can do is come into a co-insurance plan." I know the hon. member for Parkdale and the hon. member for Woodbine have suggested

that perhaps this is not the way to do it, that they have been left with untold bills to pay. Candidly, I prefer a co-insurance plan as an individual, but what my government has said to me is this, "Reilly, you may have a choice; you may have the first \$1 coverage if you want it, but if you want to pay less premium you can do so by taking some risk yourself!"

An hon. member: That is good, right.

Mr. Reilly: And by doing this they say, "If you want to take a risk and pay the first \$25 for yourself, or \$50 for your family, and if you want to pay 20 per cent of the costs involved, you may do so and you will have a substantially reduced premium to pay." I am interested, as an individual, in this; they are not forcing me to pay an extra amount. I think the co-insurance plan is well built and well planned and is very helpful to those of us who want a choice.

The hon. member for Woodbine—and I think I would have done the same thing if I had been a member of the Opposition—points out some situations here where somebody had to pay \$2,644 on a co-insurance plan, or had to pay 20 per cent or 23.4 per cent. He illustrated some 21 cases. But do you know that what we have done in our case here, Mr. Speaker, is this: We have said to the people, "If you want every dollar, every first dollar coverage, you may have it!"

Mr. Bryden: That is by no means guaranteed in the bill.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, and instead of paying this \$2,644, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Woodbine, the people could have insurance that would cost less than this for ten years or more and cover every first dollar. We have come a long way since 1958 or 1959 when we introduced the Ontario hospital services commission and we said to people: "You have saved up money for your old age and you are not going to allow anything to interfere and dissipate the assets that you have built up." This was a really worthwhile programme, and now we have gone on further and we have said: "If you are going to have any major abdominal or cranial operations that are likely to go into a series of doctors—maybe a battery of five or six doctors where it becomes really expensive—under those circumstances we are going to protect you and we are going to give you peace of mind."

Our government, the hon. members of this House, have done a tremendous job in this field and I think that instead of spending \$70 million on it, if we had \$270 million to

spend on it right now, we could not institute the kind of plan the hon. members of the Opposition are suggesting.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): That is right!

Mr. Reilly: That is quite obvious because commissioner Hall himself has suggested, first of all, it should be on a 50-50 basis with the federal government. Number two, he has suggested that this kind of a plan would last until 1971, until we have all the necessary facilities and our government has already started on those facilities.

You recall we suggested we will spend \$114 million. The hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) has pointed out that some of this money will be used in connection with training in hospitals and some of the money will be used for training dentists, and for training doctors and we will have more medical students at the end of each year for the next four or five years. Under these circumstances, we are planning—and I am surprised that the members of the New Democratic Party who have consistently said: "We believe in planning," now when we start to plan do not endorse such a plan as we have.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the hon. member call that planning?

Mr. Reilly: Yes, because we have said, "Under these circumstances if we cannot deliver the goods, let us prepare for them." And this is exactly and specifically what we are doing.

Mr. Sopha: No shortage of non sequiturs.

Mr. Reilly: There are some alternatives, Mr. Speaker. We could do what has been suggested, and we could do some more talking. We could wait for conferences with the federal government.

Mr. Sopha: One has been called for July.

Mr. Reilly: We could do nothing under these circumstances and sit idly by.

Mr. Young: Saskatchewan did not wait.

Mr. Reilly: We could wait until the government of Canada said to us, "Here is a 50-50 plan, go ahead." But we are not prepared to do this. Under the circumstances we say, "We are prepared to assist those people who really need it, and under these circumstances we will allow these people who can afford it to pay their own." Now, I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for

York South when he has suggested that drugs, perhaps—and the cost of drugs is mighty important and should be considered by the Legislature and should be considered in a plan of this nature.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the hon. member sure he is talking about the government plan?

Mr. Reilly: Now, under the circumstances, I would be inclined to agree that perhaps the cost of drugs could be as high as the cost of the medical services provided. When a doctor calls and suggests that you should get for little Johnny—a dozen pills and they cost you \$7.20—and you do this two or three times a week, or two or three times a month as the case may be, for two or three youngsters—the drug bill can be pretty high. There is no question about it. But until the time comes that we can do something about this and make it inclusive, until we can spend the money and make a plan that is really worthwhile, I think that we have taken a first step and a step that is really worthwhile.

I am going to support this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Not really?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is riding the hon. Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Stewart's) two horses now; he is going to fall; they are getting wider apart.

Mr. Reilly: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce suggested a few minutes ago that one-sixth of the people require the services of osteopaths. He suggested that it was something like \$6 million involved, and this may be true. I do not know how many people require the services of legal men but I judge the lawyers are paid for their services.

Mr. Sopha: Not always.

Mr. Reilly: And I judge that if they require the services under those circumstances they will be available for them. And I am not suggesting that the osteopath also always gets paid for his services. The chiropractors, the optometrists—I think all of these services are worthwhile—but we cannot and it is impossible to have an all-inclusive plan. I think, if you are going to use the Hall commission report as the bible and an indisputable authority on health services, I have to say to hon. members, that Hall has suggested on page 3 that the individual should look after his own medical health requirements.

It is so easy to take something out of context, you see, and use it to your advantage.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: And I am just proving to hon. members how easy it is to do it.

Mr. S. Lewis: We are convinced.

An hon. member: I knew the hon. member was wavering.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Speaker, my first reaction as pointed out formerly was to think in terms of a comprehensive, compulsory, universal kind of health insurance scheme.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member was right then.

Mr. Reilly: And under the circumstances, having had the time to study this and having had the time to delve into all aspects or most aspects of it and spent some several hours and several days in connection with it, I have come to the conclusion that no sane, no thinking person, no reasonable person would try to foist upon the people of Ontario some kind of a scheme that would not work. And what we have done is this: We have put first things first—

Mr. MacDonald: A scheme that will not work!

Mr. Reilly: —and we have suggested to them that we will pay for those who require assistance and we will help those who are in a low-income bracket, and we will allow those who are able to pay to continue to do as they have done for years to protect themselves and protect their wives and protect their families on this basis.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, at the outset of this afternoon's session, I had some equivocation as to the nature of my contribution to this debate. But my soul and verbosity have been strongly animated by the hon. member for Eglinton who preceded me. I should therefore like to deal with some of the contentions he put forth to this House, and end with some specific and more modest points that I had intended to propose initially.

The hon. member for Eglinton, Mr. Speaker, is preoccupied with what he called "twisting of words and of legislation and of proposals." I would say to the hon. member that I have heard him sing a fine tune in this House, and he himself does a very commendable twist. We have had it now for the last little while and I would like to deal with certain manifestations of it.

The hon. member for Eglinton's first instincts, as always, were the right instincts. A compulsory universal plan was justified. It was fascinating that a Tory should have such instincts, Mr. Speaker, and it is a happy fact that the hon. member for Eglinton does so. But he said that after having accepted this inclination to a universal compulsory plan, he then re-examined the financial apportionment of the plan and came to the conclusion that it was not practical.

But, Mr. Speaker, he did not take the time of this Legislature to spell out its impracticality and he did not deny the fact that the figures which have been given in the Hall commission report are accepted, authoritative figures on the financing of medical care services across this country—equally applicable to this province. It is not sufficient to give us a facile dismissal of accounting, without giving some authoritative analysis.

Now, I want to offer a model plan operating in this province, a plan which in effect, reflects the Hall figures very accurately and puts to the lie, I think, the propositions of the hon. member for Eglinton and the hon. member for Oshawa who preceded him.

I have an audited statement of the Medical Care Insurance Plan, working in Sault Ste. Marie. It has a membership of some 18,000 people. That is a very small membership, as the hon. members of this House know. The membership incorporates a complete cross-section of the industrial plant and the community. It includes the pensioners and the high risks and many other elements. In 1964, the total per capita cost of the Soo plan was \$35.57, total.

The direct patient costs were \$27.14, and that includes everything from the proverbial band-aids described earlier in this debate, to direct medical-surgical care. The administrative costs—and I emphasize this for the hon. member for Eglinton—were \$6.41, and that included the physical plant, maintenance, lights and fuel. The balance, therefore, was \$2.02 for depreciation and general reserves: not ten per cent, but \$2.02 of the total \$35.57 cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that figure is in line with reality. It is a figure which is based on a very small proportion of the population, but one which reflects an excellent cross-section. And if I can inform the hon. members of this House, and bring them up to date, in January of 1965, of this year, the figures for the same plan read as follows:

In a total plan population of 17,691, the direct patient cost was \$28.63; the administrative costs \$4.21; and the balance of receipts

and general reserve \$2.16, for a total of \$34.08.

Thus, it is completely within the capacity of the province of Ontario to provide a similar plan, at similar costs, for every single citizen in this province. And with administration costs much lower.

So I think that it is not sufficient to deliver the statements, eloquent as they are, filled with congenial bravado as they are, without backing them up with some authoritative analysis.

The second thing is that the hon. member for Eglinton admitted in this House, and one is glad to hear the hon. member do so—I have no doubt but that his voice is the voice of the government—that there was a shortage of nurses, doctors, ancillary staff and paramedical personnel. Further, that this shortage had plagued the government and the province for some time. We quite agree with him. But what, in fact, this plan is doing by specifically excluding all the paramedical groups in the province of Ontario, is to put an ever greater pressure on the limited medical resources available. Indeed, it is pushing them to the breaking point, and it is completely incomprehensible that the hon. Minister should allow it to happen—unless the general practitioner approach is of the same mentality which governs this plan.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Eglinton said that the retention rate was a matter of great concern, and indeed it is. The hon. member attempted to refute the suggestion that 25 to 28 per cent retention rate was out of line by pointing to PSI with 17.8 per cent last year, of which ten per cent was reserve.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a government does not need reserves in this kind of a plan. The province of Ontario is itself the reserve. To compare it with the inequalities in the United Kingdom, is, I suggest, irrelevant, because although the rates in the United Kingdom have risen and the costs have risen, the rate has remained at precisely the same percentage of the gross national product, four per cent right across the line.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the cost in Saskatchewan in the first year, was somewhat under the estimates, providing further corroboration that quibbling with the retention rate and pretending that it does not in fact mask an exorbitant profit, cannot be upheld.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, we talked about the cost and the hon. member for Eglinton had many interesting things to say. The hon. member asked—I am sure rhetorically—whether \$175 was too much. Then he added

in hospital insurance coverage and asked if \$250 was too much. Then, under the urgings and proddings of some of the hon. members in the Opposition, he included drugs and dentistry and the figure augmented—we must have reached the realm of \$350 or \$400 for total medical services.

The hon. member for Eglinton asked if that was too much, and related his question to the income of a man making \$3,000 a year. The hon. member then suggested that the total outlay on medical services would be five, six or seven per cent.

Well, it is not five, six or seven per cent. It is ten, 12 or 15 per cent. If five per cent is abhorrent, then 12 per cent is completely unjustified—no matter what is calculated. The hon. member for Eglinton cannot pretend that a man making \$3,000 a year income should have to spend \$350 to \$400 a year on medical care services. I strongly suggest that whimsical Tory paternalism is not sufficient to make up the difference. The suggestion that the man can buy a Cadillac and that this government will subsidize the low income groups, is not sufficient in any recognized and rational form of social planning.

That brings us to planning. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Eglinton, that this is not a plan. This is frankly an abortion. You do not dignify this kind of scheme by using the word planning. This is a desperate effort to keep the finger in the dyke of public opinion, and there is no overall working of this plan into a medical health services framework for the province of Ontario.

There is not a hint of what the premiums will be as yet. There is not a hint of statistical analysis. There is not a hint of further phased portions in the future. There is not a hint of the extent of committee study that this bill might get before it goes through the House. There is not even the semblance or shadow of planning, and it is a mockery to suggest it.

The hon. member for Eglinton says, finally that he will support the plan and it is a good first step. I sometimes wonder that my hon. Tory friends do not grow weary of this first step paralysis of theirs, the fallen arches of the first step syndrome that sits up there on the Tory benches. We never get beyond the first step; we are a province of first steps; we are addicted to first steps; and when a government has an opportunity on the basis of reasons and factual documentation to introduce a bill, it should take something more than a minimal first step.

I want to move to yet another aspect of

this plan, which frankly causes me considerable concern—I do not imagine that that concern will be shared by the hon. members opposite, but I shall raise it. There is another principle of this plan which totally flouts all that we wish to have in an ideal medical service, indeed, in any reasonable medical service. I suggest to you that it is a principle which has not yet been discussed on the floor of this House and I want to raise it at this time. It relates to mental health, and it reflects much of the argument and the discussion that has characterized the public press and public opinion for the last few weeks.

This bill, as presently drafted, and with the exceptions it lists, enshrines in the province of Ontario, the distinction between a fee-supported and a tax-supported mental health service. And that, Mr. Speaker, is totally unworthy of any government. It is a serious and unreasoning discrimination against mental hospitals in the province of Ontario. It continues to develop in the public mind and, indeed, in the minds of the practitioners themselves—this iniquitous and odious distinction between mental health and physical health in the province.

One would think, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister who has made the verbal pretensions of the hon. Minister of Health, that “mental health is the number one problem in this province” would use this bill as an avenue to demonstrate the truth of that maxim; to demonstrate the sincerity of what he says. But all we have done again is to maintain the gap and disparity between different kinds of service. It strikes yet another blow at the morale and the kind of service provided and the public response to the mental hospital tax-supported service, as opposed to the other fee-supported service.

What do I mean in actual fact, Mr. Speaker? I mean simply this: That in the private practice of psychiatry in the community and in the psychiatric wings of general hospitals and in psychiatric care in certain community agencies, the psychiatrist will be paid on a fee-for-service basis. In all the psychiatric care in the mental hospitals, we remain on this salaried basis where there is no question that the entire profession and, indeed, the ancillary professions, are grossly underpaid. And this bill contributes strongly to the maintenance of the appalling financial situation in one Ontario hospital after another in the province of Ontario.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it may very well be possible under this legislation for a private psychiatrist to treat a patient in a mental hospital and be paid a fee for service for so

doing, while all the doctors around him are on a salaried basis. Yet again, I say that we confirm in the profession's mind and in the general public mind, that there is inequality of service, that there is somehow a distinction. This contravenes all the protestations of the hon. Minister. Lest the hon. Minister thinks I am giving personal opinions, let me convey to this House the feelings of the profession and the interested individuals involved.

The Ontario psychiatric association submission to the Hagey commission, recommendation 1:

All prepaid medical insurance plans should cover mental illness on the same basis as any other illness.

Recommendation number 5:

Active hospital treatment for acute psychiatric illness should provide medical fees for specialists as for any other illness and according to the Ontario medical association schedule. Services must be available on medical advice to the individual patient, wherever treated. The principle here is that of designation of patients or illnesses, rather than of location.

Thus would be included hospitals operated under The Mental Hospitals Act, The Psychiatric Hospitals Act, The Community Psychiatric Hospitals Act, and so on.

I would also point out the comments adjacent to these recommendations on page 9 of the brief: “This axiom,” say the psychiatrists, “was accepted by the committee as the basis of the established policy and no further justification is made herein.”

Alas, Mr. Speaker, those gentlemen should have made further justification because it did not penetrate the truculent Toryism of the hon. Minister of Health.

And then we move to the submission made by the Canadian mental health association to the Hagey commission, recommendation number 1:

That any legislation respecting medical services insurance in Ontario be so compiled that it provides for medical insurance plans to cover mental illness on a basis no different from that of other illness.

Recommendation number 2:

That since the type of medical service and care which a mentally ill person receives, is often dependent upon the geographic location of his community, thus resulting in one patient receiving a service which is tax-supported while another receives a service which is fee-supported, and since such a distinction between the

types of service is a strong factor in perpetuating the stigma of mental illness, the principle be accepted of insured benefits being made available when and where needed by the patient.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that is something which this bill simply does not do. It is utter folly, I suggest, for the hon. Minister of Health to bring in this type of major legislation at this point in our evolution of mental health services. He neglects the warning of the profession in the field at his peril. It will result in, I suggest, a much more difficult time for his department—unnecessarily.

There is yet another point about this bill, relating to mental health. There are specific limitations placed on psychotherapy; limitations much more severe than the limitations suggested by the profession itself; much more severe than that embodied in other plans already operative across the country.

In the Maritimes medical care insurance scheme, the maximum liability for psychotherapy is nil; in PSI the present scheme is more attractive; in Manitoba medical services the maximum liability for psychotherapy is nil; in Medical Services (Alberta) Incorporated, the liability is at least twice that which is being offered by the government of Ontario.

I say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, that if, in fact, psychotherapy is required, society does not legislate its limitations. Indeed, within the federal civil service where psychotherapy has been included within the the medical services plan, it has worked reasonably as a part of that plan. It has never involved more than 1.7 per cent to 2.5 per cent of the group; it has been of minimal cost, easily incorporated, and is a decent, mature and profoundly important measure in the field of mental health services.

So this bill and the principles which it reflects are inimical to an intelligent evolution of the mental health pattern in the province. I know the hon. Minister will one day have to amend it and I hope when he does, the doctrinaire and myopic attitudes will have departed.

I have one final word to say on this, Mr. Speaker; this business of exclusion and of limitation pervades the legislation. It is not only limited to mental health and it is not only limited to periods of pregnancy and well-baby care and annual checkups—all things which are fundamental and indispensable to a health plan. It also relates to the so-called paramedical groups—and let us clear something up on the floor of this Legislature. Perhaps I can engage in a dialogue

with the hon. member for Eglinton again, to which he will, as before, be kind enough not to give answers. It is simply this: We believe, Mr. Speaker, that where services are listed within the OMA fee schedule, which are presently being provided by optometrists, oral surgeons, chiropractors—other than general practitioners—then that group of people, for that group of services, should be compensated. It is discriminatory and unfair in the extreme that they are not to be.

We are not saying, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister should extend the plan to embrace all the services provided by these groups. We are simply saying that where it is written into the OMA fee schedule that such groups can provide this service, they should be compensated. They all ask for it themselves; it is a principle to which we adhere under The Workmen's Compensation Act in many cases, and under their pieces of legislation by this government. I point out to the Speaker and to the hon. Minister of Health opposite, that it is we who passed The Optometry Act; it is we who sanctioned the college of dental and oral surgeons, it is we who legislate for the operation of these groups in the province of Ontario.

Why, then, can they not receive the fees under The Medical Care Act for services identical to those given by physicians and sanctioned under the OMA fee schedule?

In innumerable ways, Mr. Speaker, this bill is profoundly lacking. I suggest that all the fundamental principles involved; lack of universality, lack of total coverage; lack of reasonable cost; lack of removing gradations of citizens who should be subsidized for medical care—that all these things are inimical to decent medical care legislation. We do not have such legislation, and it is profoundly wrong to call it even a first step, because it is in fact retrograde—minimally retrograde, but retrograde. It erects in the public mind and in the mind of the Legislature a rigid, inflexible and inadequate system of medical care. And it has been presented to us without authoritative financial analysis, without authoritative study and without authoritative, if I may say, Cabinet intervention, which I know is destined to come, but which I think should have come in much greater quantity earlier today.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to you some advantages and disadvantages of alternate schemes of Medicare to try to make you aware of the doctors' attitudes, which have been so poorly presented.

Actually, very few of us have any idea about the truth of the doctors' stand on this matter at all. If I can make a few points clear, perhaps we will be better informed and thus vote not from an emotional standpoint, for it is very easy to be emotional in this debate, but from a practical standpoint. This is an issue which will affect not only this generation, but future generations. It is a well-known fact that any government measure, whether it be family allowances, old age security or medical service, is well-nigh irrevocable.

I want to say this. Are we prepared now to set forth the regulations that will bind us forever? Or are we prepared to take one step at a time and thus avoid costly errors in a field where costly errors can mean millions in dollars and open the way to we know not what?

The hon. Minister of Health is giving us a light so that we can go forward. I shall try to prove to you that the doctors are as anxious as anyone—perhaps they are more anxious than anyone—that all people receive the best medical care available at all times. This only makes sense; the issue is how best to provide this care.

The Medicare furor stirred up so much controversy in Saskatchewan that during that controversy many varied opinions came to light, including much antagonism to the medical profession. So before we discuss plans for health insurance or medical insurance, I would like to point out some areas of discontent in the hope that we can help correct these false impressions, and to correct these half-truths harboured by a great number of people.

One of these is that the doctors treat only patients who can pay for treatment. I have never heard of this happening, and I have a great deal to do with doctors. It is true that some people who happen to be in the low-income group may make unreasonable demands and be held off for this reason, but any sincere individual who is ill and needs treatment will never be turned away by a doctor because he cannot pay.

It is widely reported, too, that people delay going to doctors because of lack of money. Actually, they spend a great deal more on patent medicines and alcoholic beverages than they do on medical care; they spend a great deal more than it would cost to see the doctor in the first place.

Many people are convinced that doctors are against any plan of health insurance because it may reduce their income. This is utterly erroneous. They are in favour of

health insurance, but they believe that certain of these insurance plans will provide inferior care for the people. That this is so is becoming clear from watching the experience of other countries which have adopted such care. It is very true that quality of medical care deteriorates under bureaucratic control. Governments are concerned with masses, not individuals, and they cannot afford to deal with individual cases. It is too expensive, and medicine simply will not lend itself to mass techniques because no two individuals are exactly the same. Government regulations can only produce average care for the average patient in average communities under an average range of circumstances. That is true. And only the above average produces progress, and I feel this is good enough for us. Government regulations change very slowly, but medical knowledge changes and progresses very rapidly.

I would like to know if we want to be tied to a ponderous slow-moving machine, or do we want something more flexible and free?

I was reading in a very responsible magazine the other day that 90 per cent of all medicines and drugs that are used today were completely unknown 20 years ago. I was also told that 90 per cent of all the scientists who have ever lived are living today. This comes under a free enterprise system.

To come back to false impressions, many people have set forth the idea that the number of rejectees for the armed services in the last war was a shocking proof of inferior medical care. But, you know, actually it was the opposite. Most of these young men would not have survived to apply for the army without exceptionally good medical care because they could not afford it during the depression days; they could not afford medical care, and still the medical men looked after them in spite of the fact that they could not pay.

Now, these are a few of the complaints you hear, and all this sniping has undermined the confidence of the public in a dedicated and honourable group. Having had close contact with two generations of doctors, I know of no walk in life which could demand more in self-discipline, tolerance, compassion, self-sacrifice and humility than the practice of medicine. It is difficult to believe that the general public would accept these criticisms unless they were the result of propaganda by a group whose main business it is to reduce all people to a free Medicare level.

However, there is no doubt that this attitude is doing a great deal of harm. One of the things it is doing is deterring some of the most able and self-respecting young men from entering the medical profession. This is being felt very keenly; we are short of medical men and we cannot get young men to go into the profession. You will find this in Britain, and you will find it in medical schools throughout our own country—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The government turned away 255.

Mr. Downer: —and it will do a great deal to lower the grade of medical care which can, and should be, provided in the future.

Now if we can help to correct these false impressions, it will be of great value to all of us.

Let us examine the plans for medical care insurance. In a general sense, there are three, and the details vary in every case. These are the plans. First, voluntary medical insurance, such as they have in Australia, and such as we are proposing here in the province of Ontario. Then you have the compulsory insurance plan such as they have in Sweden, Britain and Saskatchewan. And then you have socialized Medicare—a comprehensive scheme such as we find in the Communist countries. The care is taken over by the state and financed by tax money; all the employers and all the doctors are conscripted for service and on salary. This scheme is only in full force, as I said, in Communist countries. But many facets of the system are found in the British system and the Saskatchewan system. We have to decide, here and now, how far we want our country to progress into a socialist state. Are we sure that socialism is the type of government we want? Or does democracy still hold the same lure for us as for our grandfathers and grandmothers who braved the hardships of this great new land to preserve their freedom? We will agree—we will have to agree—that a government must take over certain areas in our lives to make living tolerable for us—schools and highways and parks and public health. But there comes a time when we must decide on the line between government providing the necessities, or going the whole way and taking control so that our freedom is lost.

This is the issue with socialized medicine. The health of the nation has emotional overtones; it provides a great hue and cry for the politicians. For this reason, the medical profession, it seems to me, is the first with its head on the block.

Then, too, the doctors are too busy with the care of patients to buck this feeling, or even to be aware of what is happening. I want to point out to you again that little-known fact that the doctor's objection to socialized medicine is not that he fears for his income—that is not his problem—but rather he resists the threat to his freedom. He is convinced that such a scheme will reduce the calibre of medical services the people will get.

Let us consider the Saskatchewan medical Act. So few people really know anything about it, even the medical profession. I have been asked on many occasions: "Have you ever read the Act?" I tried to do it last summer, and I tried to do it in the early part of this session when I decided to write this speech. Just a few days ago I looked it up again. It is so couched in legal terms, and thus so clouded, that it is tough going. But the gist of it is this: It is a compulsory scheme whereby every resident of Saskatchewan pays premiums to the Saskatchewan medical care insurance fund. The premiums are collected by the municipalities which are responsible for paying for those unable to do so themselves. If employers have an agreement with their employees for medical care they then advance the premium to the employees and the employer is responsible for any arrears, Mr. Speaker.

Now comes the rub. The Act is entirely administered by a commission appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which simply means the Cabinet. Hence it is beyond the control of the Legislature and of the courts and this commission has complete jurisdiction over the medical services of Saskatchewan. It goes far beyond insurance in the normal sense. It actually provided for the control of the practice of medicine in the political, economic and legislative sense, and left the doctors no area of private negotiations with their patients. It is not beyond its powers to lay down the hours during which the doctors' offices may be open, the number of patients he will see in a day, the number of times he may treat a patient for any given condition, or where he may practice, and hence live. And all doctors, at the beginning, had to practise within the Act or leave the province.

Most people have the freedom to leave a job if they do not care for their employer. That is not true, or was not true, in Saskatchewan when the Act was introduced. In fact, I would say it was the most autocratic piece of legislation ever enacted in a democratic country. The doctors—justifiably, I think—refused to practice under this Act. They had

no way of forcing the government to reconsider but by refusing their services in all non-essential areas until the Act was amended.

They called it a strike. I do not think it was strike at all. The doctors organized an admirable emergency medical service for the protection of their patients during the 23 days of the sit-down, if you like. The tales reported in the press were frightfully exaggerated. No one died for lack of care; inconvenience was the only hardship reported, and the only hardship the people suffered. The reaction of the people was to support the doctors. The results of the last provincial election amply pointed out where the people of Saskatchewan stood on this issue. They repudiated not only the party who introduced the Act, but the leader responsible for it.

Then they made an amendment. The amendment was really a small victory, but the doctors' colleagues all over America are deeply indebted to the Saskatchewan doctors for their brave stand. If such measures were left unaltered it would be a serious blow to humanity and to future medicine on this continent. The amendments were few and dealt with the basic freedom of the profession. The Act now permits any doctor to practise outside the Act if he so wishes. Approved health agencies such as PSI were allowed to continue to insure people, and the Swift Current board of health was allowed to continue; also, the college of physicians and surgeons now has to be consulted before any regulations relating to rates of payment are altered. It was written into the Act that it was not the intention in any future Act, or at any future time, to put the physicians on salary.

The doctors accepted these amendments and now practise under the scheme. However, as you can well imagine, things are far from running smoothly in Saskatchewan. It is estimated that medicine in Saskatchewan has been put back ten years, at least, by this legislation. What is wrong with this scheme? First, it is undemocratic, to the point of denying basic principles of freedom, and giving a political group complete jurisdiction over the profession. There is no doubt that once government has successfully put medicine on this basis it could proceed to some other group and legislate its freedom away, too. This is the thin edge of the wedge. It was compulsory so that people were forced to accept something which, in many cases, they had already provided for in more efficient form for themselves. Seventy per cent of the people of Saskatchewan were already insured for health services, and more comprehensively than the government provided. This scheme

only pays doctors' fees, a very small part of health services. It was allocating large sums of the taxpayers' money in one area which could much better have been directed to more pressing need, such as mental hospitals, more general hospital beds, rehabilitation centres and facilities for training doctors, which the province needs so desperately at this time.

It has been shown to be very uneconomic from an administrative point of view; it is always uneconomical for a government to handle such a service. This is an amazing thing, but during the past 14 years Britain has not built any new hospitals—

Mr. Bryden: They have had a Tory government, that is why.

Mr. Downer: —but she has beautiful buildings to house the administrative staff of the national health scheme, and the staff now far outnumbers the doctors. Private companies can insure people much more economically; competition amongst them keeps up a high standard of services. This has been amply demonstrated in those countries where government has taken over control and administration of health services. There is not the money for research, and finally the quality of health care declines. Britain's health budget has risen from \$600 million, counting the pound sterling at \$3 per £1, 14 years ago to \$2,100 million in 1964. And this figure is still rising.

Mr. Bryden: And what is happening to their gross national product?

Mr. Downer: What other plans are there? I am going to outline to you the one in use in Australia, partly because Australia has an Act very similar to the one we are introducing, and Australia has much the same idea of democracy. I am going to give the hon. members these ideas, because the medical care insurance in Australia is working out very well.

All areas are satisfied with it—doctors, people, even the Opposition parties are in favour, and labour, which originally opposed it, now agrees that it is an excellent idea. It was begun in 1949, so it has had a fair trial; one cannot say that it is something new. Let me tabulate the essential features:

First, it is voluntary. Second, it is non-profit. The insurance companies are private organizations called "funds," subsidized by the government so that the premiums will be kept within the contributor's means. These voluntary organizations are directed jointly by both medical and lay representatives of

the contributors. The only government control is that of audit, hence the safeguarding the contributors' money. In order that the insurance funds will not be called upon unnecessarily, the contributor pays ten per cent of the doctor's fee. The patient thus has some direct responsibility for his care, and does not call upon the doctor for every snuffle. It is a fully comprehensive plan, covering all types of medical services, not just the doctors' fees. There is a waiting period of two to three months after joining before the rights to benefits apply. This increases the incentive to insure.

Lastly, the patient is encouraged to pay the doctor's bill personally, and then receive reimbursement from the fund. Where he is unable to do this, his benefit will be paid in the form of a cheque made out to the doctor rendering the service. This preserves the doctor-patient relationship, so vital to satisfactory medical care.

This scheme costs the government nothing at all for administration, except audit and supervision. This, and the fact that the patient pays a fraction of the cost, ensures that the scheme will not be abused and never reach uncontrollable dimensions as it has in England and as it has in Saskatchewan.

To provide for the incurable group, those over 65, those with pre-existing ailments, chronic illnesses and those who receive the maximum fund benefits, special amounts have been set up by all the major benefit societies. If at the end of the fiscal year payments out of these special funds or amounts exceed the contributions credited to it, the government makes up the difference.

Australia also has a pensioners' medical service, providing free general practitioners' attention to all eligible pensioners who qualify on a means test basis. The profession accepts a direct payment from the government for these, just as they do in Ontario at the present moment, at about 50 per cent of the usual fees.

We would do very well to look closely at this scheme. It seems to be satisfactory to all concerned, and the standard in Australia appears to be well maintained.

By this scheme, several basic principles are preserved. Every individual in society has a basic right to accept some responsibility for his needs and essentials. I think we can accept that, and the state should never completely provide these, because it is not economically sound and it also violates the freedom and responsibility of the individual. But whenever the state does this, it must also control, which makes political

tyranny not only possible but probable. The Communist states claim this right and therefore they control.

This plan also preserves the all-important doctor-patient relationship, by ensuring that the doctor remains free of any outside influence, no matter how slight the influence may be, in order to carry out his uniquely personal and intimate services to his patient.

What have we got here? Since 1935 we have had a medical care coverage, run by the OMA, under contract to the government, for certain groups of people—the old-age pensioners, mothers on government allowances, the blind, the disabled, the veterans. We have many insurance agencies with various plans available to all who can pay for them, such as the PSI, Continental Casualty, Canadian Health and Accident. Some of these were set up originally by the doctors; the PSI is a non-profit organization offering insurance at a reasonable rate to all who are insurable.

This plan is not perfect, by any means. It allows of violation of this doctor-patient relationship I have been talking about by having the doctors paid directly by the insurance company instead of through the patient. In this way the doctor must divulge the patient's records to a third party. This is always a sore point with the doctors. It violates the Hippocratic oath. This we are not in favour of, and this I say very definitely. Our plan does not have little deterrent fees, which would prevent abuse of the insurance. Now, these defects can be remedied.

We still have a group of people who are not insured—about 20 per cent of the population. Either they are uninsurable, or cannot afford to prepay insurance, although they are not indigent. It is to this group, and this group alone, that the government must direct its planning.

Therefore I am supporting this bill. We would like to have a non-compulsory medical insurance plan available to every resident with no disturbance to the 75 per cent or more of the population who are already covered, no disturbance of the doctor-patient relationship. All residents, regardless of age, physical condition or financial position can now obtain full medical coverage, the government providing the coverage of those not able to do so for themselves. A lot of people, of course, shy at the very mention of a means test. But, you know, all of us take a means test every year when we pay our income taxes. There is no indignity by this plan. I think the provincial government is to be congratulated on facing this issue and devising a scheme which

appears to satisfy the many groups of people who will be involved, to say nothing of the general population.

But let us not be pressured into accepting schemes which are neither necessary nor suitable. Let us remember, too, that doctors are not against health insurance. In fact, any of the doctors that I have talked to so far are in favour of it, providing it allows a system which will better the care of the people rather than downgrade it.

Let us remember that the United States and Canada at present provide the finest medical care under the free enterprise sys-

tem, and the best facilities for training doctors of any country in the world. Let us keep it that way. It is to Boston, New York, Montreal, Toronto and Western University and Chicago that young doctors now look for training. At one time they looked to Vienna and Heidelberg, and London or Edinburgh. Now they look to the medical schools on our own continent and to some of the medical schools in our own province. This is a fine relationship. This is a fine record; let us keep it that way. I support the bill.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 1, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 1, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, Mr. Dymond, second reading	3521
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3561

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see this Bill No. 136 introduced into this House on May 14 last, and I was also pleased to see debate begin on this bill on May 25 because I feel that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), his associates and advisers, have put a tremendous amount of thought into the legislation before us now. The hon. Minister of Health is a dedicated and sincere Minister, and I know of no other Minister in any jurisdiction more sincere and more dedicated than our hon. Minister of Health here in Ontario.

There was a time when certain people felt that the debate on Bill 136, or the Ontario Medicare bill, would be one of the most heated and fiercest of this Parliament, and what looked some months ago like a debate to be remembered has disintegrated into one of very weak argument. We have seen little coverage in the press regarding this legislation, and we have heard very little controversy from our people back in the ridings, or on the home-town streets.

The people of this country have taken for granted that this province would shortly be introducing a Medicare bill. People in Canada have waited 43 years for the Liberal Party in Ottawa to bring out a plan on a national level. I would not be surprised that now the leader province, Ontario, has embarked on a Medicare plan, "Pearson the Plunger" will follow us shortly.

I asked myself when this measure was introduced—when this measure was contemplated—why was not Ontario the first province in this country to have the Medicare plan? Why were Saskatchewan and Alberta, who are far behind Ontario as provinces, bringing out progressive legislation, ahead of us, bringing out a Medicare plan? But on looking into the matter a little deeper we realize that those provinces, when they did bring out their Medicare plans, had a very small percentage of their people covered by

a private Medicare insurance. I realize that the banner province of Ontario, with 75 per cent or more of her people covered by private medical insurance, had no real urgency in going into this legislation.

The people of Ontario who I have spoken to, the people in my constituency who have talked to me about Medicare, have mostly one thought in mind: Will your Medicare plan interfere with our private plan? I have assured them that it would not, because this province and this government is not in the habit of interfering with what already is good insurance.

The people of our province do not want compulsory insurance; the people of our province do not want to be compelled. The government of any province or any country never compels majorities. In some cases, minorities are compelled to accept the will of the people, as my hon. friends to the right have known for some time. Consequently, when our Medicare plan comes into operation, it will be introduced and begin operation in an atmosphere of harmony and peace, unlike the civil war that ensued at the beginning of the Saskatchewan plan.

I have to admit that there was a time when I, too, envisaged a Medicare plan as an all-encompassing one, but on checking statistics, I can readily see why my government, in all its wisdom, is adopting the plan that has been presented.

I have to admit, too, that I might have liked to have seen the ophthalmologists, the optometrists, the chiropractors and drugs covered by our plan. The oculists, I feel, could, by being included, save this province much money in future welfare payments by correcting eye problems today. And, of course, the optometrist plays a large part in eye care and in directing clients to an eye specialist.

The chiropractors, too, I feel, should be covered immediately because they, too, have a large number of our residents who visit them frequently for one ailment or another. They, too, are recognized by the workmen's compensation board, and for that reason, I feel that they are an important segment of health care in this province.

I might mention that I feel that the cost of drugs will have to be included in the Medicare plan in this province. We all realize that it is one thing to pay a visit to the family doctor and perhaps pay him \$5 for that visit. Then you are handed a prescription and you walk across the street to the druggist and find that you are paying \$8 or \$10 for the drug that the doctor has prescribed. Twenty-five years ago, what good Churchill's iodine might have done, now we are required to pay \$8 to \$10 for some myocetin or other antibiotic. At one time this province did have a Royal commission investigating the cost of drugs and I feel that that commission did not delve deeply enough into the cost of this commodity.

We consider that this is a strong beginning in the Medicare field in this province and I am sure that in the not-too-distant future, the segments that have been omitted and that I have mentioned, will be included. We will hail his plan as another major step in the progress of this province.

I have made certain observations in listening to hon. members of this House participate in this debate and I was most interested in the statement made by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), when he was mentioning something about being consistent. We all recall that frosty Friday morning in March, 1964, when the then member for Dovercourt, now the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson), rose in this House—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yakabuski: He rose in this House on that frosty Friday morning and made a very impassioned speech with regard to section 14 of Bill 99. As a matter of fact, if the hon. leader of the Opposition ever made a speech, that was it.

An hon. member: What side is the hon. member on?

Mr. Yakabuski: On that occasion, in his best form, he came out against this government and the province encroaching on the rights of individuals, and now, when we are debating our Medicare plan, he feels that we should have a compulsory plan. The hon. member who, a little over a year ago, would not encroach on any of the rights of the citizens of this province, now feels that it is quite in order to do so. I ask the hon. members of this House who is being consistent?

It is easy for the official Opposition and the NDP to scream for this and for that, for schemes of all descriptions that would be beyond the financial ability of our people. Many

are sound businessmen in their own ridings, but as members of the Opposition they become spendthrifts and lose sight of the sources of our revenue and how far they will go toward meeting the most urgent needs of our people. It is quite easy to talk; it is quite easy to advocate many things. If one does not have to put up, it is pretty hard to get them to shut up.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I am supporting this bill completely because I feel that this will be the beginning of the greatest health plan known anywhere on this continent.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this bill, I recall vividly being part of a group of persons who presented a brief to the Royal commission on health services on behalf of the Canadian welfare council. The comments from Mr. Justice Hall and several other members of the commission—and I would like to say that most of the members were either former Tories or present Tories—were very favourable and many of the recommendations of that brief are now included in the final report of the Hall commission. I mention these facts, Mr. Speaker, to show that I was interested in that problem long before fate would have it that I take part in the debate on this bill.

I heard many comments from hon. members on the government side to the effect that the Liberal Party had changed its position over the years on this important matter regarding the health of our people, and I say, why not? Our party is, has been, and will always be the party of reform and we cannot but go along with the Hall report because it is in accordance with the views of our party after very thorough research in this field.

May I make a comment or two on some of the remarks made in this debate by some of the hon. members on the other side of the House? The hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) said this afternoon that the people of Ontario cannot afford the cost of the complete programme of medical services. They receive these services by either paying a premium to a private insurer or a co-operative such as PSI or AMS. Many have gone heavily into debt because of serious illness in their family in order to obtain medical services. The only people who do not have to worry about the problem are those who are now receiving welfare allowances and this bill does not change this situation.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) has succeeded in giving us the Tory approach to this Medicare programme. His

remarks have convinced me that this province cannot afford not to have a comprehensive, universal health insurance plan.

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me commend the hon. Minister of Health for his honesty and his complete frankness in introducing this bill. As he stated in this House last week when he introduced this so-called Medicare, this bill is by no means the final word in health care in Ontario. For recognizing this obvious fact the hon. Minister must be commended, but we on this side of the House are disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister did not have the courage to admit what must be apparent to everyone that this bill is not even an adequate beginning.

To give the hon. members some idea of the inadequacy of this bill I would like to quote now from the May 27 edition of the *Globe and Mail*, on page 7, and show some of the inadequacies in the preparation behind the bill. The report in the *Globe and Mail* reads, and I quote:

In the introduction to the bill, Dr.

Dymond admitted we would still need to know a good deal about the adequacy of insurance contracts in force.

Again:

We have scant knowledge of how much care is provided for those who have no insurance and cannot pay for their health care, nor have we any reliable statistics of the cost of such care. Of course, we could apply national or provincial averages, but there are many factors involved in health care so that at best such averages might be little other than educated guesses, Dr. Dymond said.

Still quoting:

All this vagueness is odd, for as Dr. Dymond declared when asked about certain criticisms of the proposed Act, "This bill was not created overnight, you know. I have been worrying on this exactly six years."

That is the end of what I want to read from the *Globe and Mail*.

The hon. Minister has been working on this Medicare bill for six years, and yet in that period of time he has failed to collect the accurate statistical information that is absolutely necessary to draft adequate and proper legislation regarding medical health insurance. Small wonder that this bill is inadequate.

The hon. members on the government side cannot deny that this bill is inadequate. They probably will deny that this is Medicare. They

will undoubtedly object that this bill is not referred to as Medicare or as a Medicare bill, but as a medical services insurance bill, and that nowhere do the terms Medicare or Medicare insurance appear in this bill. Of course, they are right. Medicare is a word which has been coined and it is not the kind of word which one would expect to find in a bill of this nature.

Yet the hon. members of the government cannot deny that this bill is called a Medicare bill by the press and accepted as a Medicare bill by the public. In this sense the government of the province is deceiving the people of Ontario. This bill is not Medicare, and the sooner the government admits that to the people, the better off it will be. If this is an attempt at Medicare then it is a crazy patchwork attempt, a hodge-podge of ideas, a bill which complicates and confuses basic principles so much that we on this side of the House must wonder whether the government is really that naive about the legislation it drafts or whether it is so much in love with the administrative red tape and outdated philosophy that it consciously chooses the worst methods available to achieve politically desirable goals.

I have said before, Mr. Speaker, that this is not really Medicare and I feel I must explain further what I mean by this. Medicare is an artificial word, and so it has many meanings and many connotations, but one thing which it definitely does imply is universal coverage for illness. By universal coverage I mean that adequate health services shall be available to all the people of Ontario, regardless of where they live, their present or future state of health, their financial resources. This is something which the present bill does not guarantee and so it cannot truly be called Medicare.

I know that in this explanatory note attached to the bill, it is stated that the purpose of the bill is to make medical insurance available to every resident of Ontario regardless of age, state of past or present health, financial means or occupation, and to do this the government intends to provide, through The Department of Health, medical services insurance for those people who are unable to pay the whole of, or part of, the cost of such insurance.

This all reads very well but is this actually what the bill does? I say, no, Mr. Speaker, it does not. There are three economic sections in our economy. There is the lower economic group on relief and on pension; there is the middle group, the low-income group, and there are those in the higher

bracket. The ones in the lowest economic group are cared for. They can get their insurance through the government; whether they will take out insurance or not is another matter entirely, and which I am sure will be discussed in much detail before this debate is over. The fact remains they can get it, they are cared for within their very narrow limits of coverage offered by this bill. What of the higher income group? Obviously, they can buy it, so we have disposed of the two extremes.

When we come to the middle group, the low-income group, that is another matter. Contrary to whatever the government says in that nice little explanatory note attached, so that we will not read the bill too carefully, the low-income group actually suffers under this bill. Why? Because they are making too much money to qualify for government assistance and not enough money to pay for health care. This is not just a theoretical argument, plucked from nowhere, but is borne out by the statistics which abound in the Royal commission on health services report and which the government chose blatantly to ignore.

The information in that report indicates that the total costs of health care, including medical, dental, drugs and other services, is approximately \$346 a year for an average family. The report goes on to point out that the maximum any family should spend on health is seven per cent of its income. This implies that, in order to get full coverage, a family would have to be making \$4,930 a year. The average family with two children must start paying taxes after it makes \$2,700; thus, when its income reaches \$3,700, it is not eligible for any government subsidy at all and yet it is still \$1,300 shy of the income that the Hall commission recommends is minimal to buy adequate health coverage.

And now the truly shocking thing: Over 20 per cent of all the families in Ontario fall in this income group. That is, one-fifth of Ontario's population will not be able to afford to buy medical insurance under this plan—and the government calls this a universal plan! But the fact that it is not universal, Mr. Speaker, the fact that it is not Medicare is only one of the glaring deficiencies of the legislation we have before us. If the government were to admit to the people tomorrow what is certainly the truth, that this is not a Medicare scheme, that it applies to only four-fifths of the province, we would still take issue with this bill and this government.

Let us examine the implications of the government's so-called income tests. I say,

"so-called" because it is a means test and not only a means test but one of the worst kind of means test. A test that determines only income and not ability to pay and a test that is impossible to enforce in any case. We in the Liberal Party are opposed to means tests but, at least, we realize that means tests do determine ability to pay. Income tests do not even do this, they merely determine income and the two things are not necessarily the same in every case. So we are opposed to an income test on this ground and we are also opposed to it because it is impossible to enforce.

Presumably the hon. Minister of Health or his new creation, the medical insurances services division, is just going to open up an office somewhere and say to the people: "Come on in, sign up for free medical insurance; by the way, how much income tax did you pay last year?" The people do not have to tell them, the government has no way of checking; Ottawa will not release the figures. I can walk into the hon. Minister's little office and say: "Look, I did not pay any income tax last year." And he will not know whether I am telling the truth or taking the government for a ride. And what is more, he cannot find out. If the government had looked at Alberta they would have seen that this scheme is full of loopholes and escape clauses. They would have seen that Alberta runs a similar income test and approximately 2,000 people a year lie about their income tax returns; at least they think so. They cannot find out for certain and neither can the government of this province. This is not a nice thing to say about the people of Ontario that they will falsify their tax returns but unfortunately it can happen. It did happen in Alberta, and it can happen here.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Is that a Liberal decision?

Mr. Racine: And if the hon. member does not believe it, then let him go into a liquor store some day and read the signatures and addresses on the order slips.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Racine: So now we have a government bringing down a plan which leaves four-fifths of the province of Ontario no better off than they are now, and administering a test which is clumsy, inaccurate and cannot be verified. In effect they are handing out over \$70 million of public funds a year on the honour system.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): I take it he does not like this bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. member is right.

Mr. Racine: There is another more subtle aspect of basing free coverage on taxable income, which this House should consider. What are the psychological effects on the people of the middle class income groups? We have seen that economically they will not be able to afford to buy medical insurance. The Hall commission report makes this evident. Psychologically the damage may be much more serious. Our whole society was founded and has progressed on the basis of an incentive philosophy. People struggle to get ahead, to better themselves, and this is right and just the way it should be, but now the government is planning to move in and put the lower-income groups on the same level with the higher-income groups with respect to getting medical insurance easily and quickly.

What effect does this have on the small-income groups? They can go down now, as well as up. Their incentive and their desire to get ahead is no longer so important. If they slip back into a lower-income group, it is no longer so bad. In fact, it may be easier for them. This is a tremendous danger which the government has not foreseen. And providing free psychiatric help, as they do in this bill, will not help much in correcting it.

Consider an individual example: Let me quote to you from an article by Pierre Berton in *Maclean's* magazine. This article is dated June 15, 1963. Mr. Berton writes:

Most people don't want charity. Like Terry Louth, a Toronto chartered accountant who had suffered through five major operations for an ulcerous condition, they want to say "It's true," as the medical association keeps saying, "that no needy person has to go without medical care." But must Canadians be beggared before getting help? The Louths are certainly needy today. They spent all their savings, \$3,000, sold their car, furniture, everything, before accepting welfare. Yes, they had a group insurance plan too, and it was not enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here from one of my constituents, in which he relates the fact that his wife was taken ill and had been in the hospital for many months. He was covered by two separate plans of insurance; one, at a maximum of \$15,000 and the other at a maximum of \$5,000. This man has had to spend considerable time minding the children at home, and when he was not doing that he was working in a second position in order to cover medical expenses. This man has been trying to get some relief—he may get it because of some error in the

plan, but this man has certainly suffered considerably because of the fact that he was not covered by a plan such as we are recommending.

Mr. Speaker, you can see what that implies. The broad principle of equality of opportunity which is fundamental to this society is being ignored and even subverted by this government bill. The bill claims to provide equality of opportunity by allowing all people to purchase medical insurance, but what about people like the Louths, people who are just over the limit where the government will help them with their health problems? Are these people getting equality of opportunity or are they being encouraged to give up, to stop fighting serious crippling medical expenses, or to become wards of the state? In its psychological effects this bill is more than bad, it is downright dangerous.

Of course, you know our proposals for a comprehensive universal medical insurance. They have been outlined and will be outlined again in this debate, but I would just like to go over a few points in the programme of the Liberal Party. First, we will not use an income test, which has proved unworkable in other parts of Canada; second, coverage will be extended to all on the same basis and through the same machinery through which Ontario hospitalization is now available. This will ensure universal coverage, since more than 99 per cent of our people are now covered by Ontario hospitalization and will also eliminate the tremendous wastage that the government plan involves through high administrative costs. These points will be further brought out and explored before this debate is over, of that I can assure you; and as the debate proceeds I can assure you, also, that this fly-by-night bill, this piece of political pragmatism, will be shown up in its true light and exposed as what it truly is, a Medicare myth, designed to alienate no one and satisfy as many as possible, without really doing anything at all to provide universal, comprehensive health insurance in the true sense of the phrase.

Mr. Speaker, together with the other hon. members of my party, I propose to vote for the amendment proposed by my leader, the hon. member for Dovercourt.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before I start to make remarks anent this bill, I would like to deal very briefly with a few things which the hon. member for Ottawa East just said.

First of all, he was quite right in saying that we would tell the public, tell you, sir, and the House through you, that this is not

Medicare. We have never pretended that it was Medicare. First of all, I do not know what Medicare is; I take it that Medicare is a complex of two words, medical and care. No government—I have said in this House many times—no government can provide medical care, because no government is capable of practising medicine.

Mr. Singer: What did the government say on its platform in 1963—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Throughout all of the election campaign, sir, I defy any person in Ontario to find where I used the word "Medicare" as a part of the Progressive-Conservative Party's platform.

Mr. Singer: Not you, but the government in their propaganda.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that running through the fabric of all the statements made by the Opposition, Medicare is used in conjunction with reference to the Hall commission report. Now, from that I have come to the conclusion that what they are trying to tell us is that, in their opinion, Medicare is what the Hall commission proposes—which is a total health care plan, and not only a plan that will insure people against the costs of physicians' services. This is the purpose and intent of Bill 136.

The hon. member for Ottawa East said that four-fifths of the people will be no better off than now, because they have statistics and several hon. members of the Opposition benches have remarked that we did not have enough statistics; we have piles of statistics, Mr. Speaker, but it would not add anything to the debate by reproducing them here, except to fill a great deal of space in *Hansard*. Four-fifths of our population, we know, are well covered already by comprehensive insurance that provides protection against physicians' costs, and by the terms of this bill—as is already evident, and we shall go on to show again—25 per cent are provided for under the terms of this bill.

I was rather interested to hear him say, sir, that the Liberals do not believe—and I think I quote him accurately—in the means test. I just leaned over to ask my colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) if the federal government hands him out all the assistance for his welfare programme without insistence upon a means test and he assured me that this is not so. If the Liberal Party in Ontario does not believe in a means test, it is rather unique in Canada insofar as Liberals are concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the hon.

leaders of the Opposition and the NDP (Mr. MacDonald)—and I tried to listen to them carefully—first of all, I was bound to come to the conclusion that the hon. leader of the Opposition apparently does not understand Bill 136, or if he does, he then, deliberately, I take it, or I hope unwittingly, made some completely wrong statements. First of all, he said that the plan was made to order for the insurance companies. Now, sir, if one reads the plan, nothing can be further from the truth, for the insurance companies are the one group involved against whom we have legislated. We have told them, for instance, that they must provide a standard contract for all of the people, that they must not cancel it, that they must guarantee to renew it, that they must not sell it at more than a government-approved maximum premium—and all of these things they must do on pain of losing their licence.

And then, Mr. Speaker, he said—and reading from a report which I gather he attributed to some labour organization—that the medical services insurance council would ignore the rights of the public. Yet the bill specifically states that the council shall consist of nine members, five to represent the public, two to represent the medical profession and two to represent the carriers, the three groups most intimately involved.

I was rather interested in his hypothetical case, sir. If he had only thought about his hypothetical case himself and read the terms and provisions of the bill, he would have seen that Charlie was all right and would have been well looked after.

I notice that he espoused the word "universality" and I have noticed that word running through the comments of all of his people. I wonder why they so meticulously avoid the word "compulsion." From their statements, I gathered that by "universality" they actually meant "compulsion." I went to the New Oxford Dictionary tonight and I found that there is no relationship between these two words. With a plethora of words which were very obviously put into the mouth of the hon. leader of the Opposition, he has said to us in effect, "Your plan is not compulsory, it does not go far enough or fast enough."

He, too, cited the Hall report in many instances and he spoke about its recommendations, but he did not point out to the House, sir, that this report is predicated on federal participation, indeed this is the foundation of the report and this is the foundation upon which all the recommendations of this report are predicated. This being

the case, what about recommendation 199? When is the federal government going to implement this recommendation, which according to Mr. Justice Hall was the first that ought to be recommended because it calls for the summoning of a Dominion-provincial conference on this subject within six months of the tabling of that report in the House of Commons.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We were supposed to be in Ottawa now and the conference was cancelled.

Mr. Singer: Is it not scheduled for July 1?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not heard of it yet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And then, Mr. Speaker, the next thing that puzzled me all through the hon. member's remarks was why he has been unsuccessful—or if he has tried, and I presume he has—in selling his beliefs and his gospel to his federal running mate in the same riding he represents, Mr. Gordon, who has a very great deal to say in the councils of the federal government.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) also insisted upon compulsion. He is completely and totally frank about it; he complains of the greater cost. Mr. Speaker, I cannot for the life of me see where there is anything in Bill 136 that will affect the cost of insurance now in effect. There will be no interference—and this we have specifically stated—in the insurance carried now by existing groups or other contracts, be they group or individual. So why he and his colleagues should have a fear of a possible increase in costs because of this bill, I cannot see.

There can be increases in costs if there is an increase in demand for service. The cost is intimately and directly tied to the utilization and this is an inexorable law of insurance life. The maximum premium, the premium that is to be set by government or approved by government, is to be set for the high-risk cases only and it will not automatically mean that the premium for all individual contracts will become the maximum premium. This is a highly competitive business and I can see no reason to expect that all of the insurance carriers are suddenly going to up their premiums just because a maximum has been set for high-risk costs.

The hon. member for York South complained about a greater variety of policies.

Again this Bill 136 only makes provision for one policy—the same policy, be it first-dollar coverage or a deductible co-insurance contract, but it is the one policy and this is all the bill will add. While it will be uniquely identifiable, it will not be any different from many comprehensive policies which are now on the market and have been sold for a long time. The standard contract is the only stipulation of the government bill and it is to provide for the physicians' services by and large required by the average family in a normal lifetime.

The hon. member suggested that the standard contract, in its provisions, was not as good as the PSI blue plan, and I have to differ with him in this because it certainly is. We have not physiotherapy or radiotherapy in our standard contract, but these are already provided under the extended insurance benefits of OHSC, as were approved last year or were announced to the House last year.

The hon. member for York South is afraid that we will find ourselves in the same position as Alberta perhaps has found itself and I can appreciate his concern about this. I was very distressed myself when I read that 15 per cent of the low-income group in Alberta had not been included for some reason or another, but it is not for me or for us here to criticize or find fault with, or to condemn, a programme initiated and carried on by another province.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister did not take that view about Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not criticize it.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister certainly did.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I asked some questions about it. All I said, Mr. Speaker, in the first reading was, "Need I repeat what happened in Saskatchewan?"

Mr. Singer: Oh, now you are playing with words.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am not, read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Singer: Do not look so innocent.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am, of course; you must realize that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What happened was that all parties ended up supporting Medicare—including the Tories.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): The government was defeated.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And the leader of the government was defeated, the first time in his experience. It is rather strange, is it not?

However, I did look, with a view to determining if we could avoid any pitfalls, at what apparently caused difficulty in Alberta. I came to the conclusion that a large number in Alberta had been excluded because of the fact that the government assistance was not high enough. They have not at any time provided total coverage for the non-taxable income groups.

Indeed, sir, this is one of the reasons why we diverged from the recommendation of the Hagey committee, which proposed that the earners who were in the non-income-taxable group should be subsidized to the extent of, say, 70 per cent. There is not much use, Mr. Speaker, in saying to a man, "Here is a loaf of bread for 10 cents," if he has not got the 10 cents. We did not think that it mattered very much where one drew his money, whether from welfare assistance or other social assistance, or whether he earned that amount of money. If he were in receipt of an income not subject to income tax, we believed that he should have 100 per cent coverage. I believe herein our proposal differs largely from that of Alberta.

Of course, in Saskatchewan, here again all the people do pay premiums. I have to criticize this because in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, with a compulsory plan and everybody paying a premium, albeit a small one, what is the use of giving the man a loaf of bread for 10 cents if he does not have 10 cents? There, they put him in jail, and indeed I was shocked to read in the *Regina Leader Post* of an old man of 75—

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister was not shocked enough.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I was shocked to read of an old man of 75 years of age, dying on the courthouse steps, going in to answer a summons because he had not paid his premiums.

Now, I have to be critical, sir, because I am simply rebutting criticism that has been levelled against our government on many occasions by my hon. friends of the NDP. I almost said the NDP party, but I forgot my hon. friends told me that "P" was redundant.

In Saskatchewan, sir, they demand that the municipalities must pay premiums for certain persons. I think that we would have

little difficulty in finding recorded in *Hansard* many instances where we have been criticized by the representatives of the NDP in this House, because we were inflicting these matters on municipalities. Indeed, I think one of the points of which my hon. friend from York South made a good deal when he was debating Bill 163, was the fact that in that bill we made provisions that municipalities may make provision for assistance to certain groups. He will be pleased to know, I am sure, that we have withdrawn that from the new Bill 136.

In his comparison of costs, the hon. member spoke about the cost in Saskatchewan vis-à-vis the cost suggested by the Hagey committee for Ontario, but in Ontario the only cost the government will have anything to do with will be the cost for those whom we support in whole or in part, and the maximum premium.

Then he said, and I think this was the *pièce de résistance*, that the Saskatchewan plan vindicates the Hall proposals. One of the other hon. members of his group, the hon. member for Yorkview, also said this afternoon that Saskatchewan has a Hall plan. This, sir, is just not right. Saskatchewan has not got a Hall plan, because, I repeat, the Hall proposal is for a complete health services plan; not only physicians' services; not physicians' services in hospitals; not physicians' services, hospitals and drugs; but everything bound up in one. That is the only Hall plan that I can glean from a reading of the report and I have read both of them; I have read the main one three times over.

Sir, if the Saskatchewan plan vindicates the Hall proposal, I am quite certain that Mr. Justice Hall would be very disappointed, because no other jurisdiction in the country has seen fit to follow the lead of this province.

Then my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) made some statements, he made a very impassioned address. I have to say he was a little confused on certain things. He complained, as did the hon. member for Ottawa East, a few moments ago, that we had been studying this for six years and we did not have all the answers. I make no apology for that, sir, and if I study it for 60 more years, I do not expect to have all the answers. My hon. friend gave me a very good bit on which to hang my hat here. He said that the European plans, having been in force since 1880—I think it was 1886, was it, that Bismarck introduced his plan in Germany? Germany is still today looking for answers, many of them, as is every jurisdiction that has ever undertaken this plan, and we will

continue to look for answers, because we never will find all of them. All of them are not in this tremendously comprehensive volume, commonly called the Hall report.

Then my hon. friend said, "What choice is there, if there is no government plan?" Mr. Speaker, as I see it, and as I know the health care insurance field today, there is a great number of choices, a great variety of choices available to the public today. One can almost get a health-care plan tailored to suit his wants or his needs. That is how varied and how numerous they are. And yet my hon. friend from Parkdale says, "What choice is there if there is not a government plan?" But on the other hand, he and his party obviously want one plan, a government plan. He is worried because there are no choices with a government plan, and then he wants us to do away with all of the choices that are now existent and introduce only a single government plan.

I agree with him completely there are many loopholes in the present plan, and this is one of the reasons, one of the fundamental and important reasons, for Bill 136. This is one of the very substantial benefits that will accrue to those who will provide their own, because at the present time—and all of us have had experience with these things—if they are stricken with serious or long-lasting illness, or if they are past that magical age on the calendar of 65 years, a great many contracts now in force have the right to cancel them or to refuse to renew the contract. Bill 136 makes this impossible.

My hon. friend from Parkdale had one spot where he was tremendously inconsistent. When he was saying it, I could not help but recall something that the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) said when we came in for the first session of this Parliament, following the election of 1963. He spoke of the plans for the future of his party under his guidance, and he spoke about consistency, and I wondered what had happened to that consistency when my hon. friend from Parkdale complained because the health insurance companies used health care insurance as a loss leader, and yet in the very same breath, he screamed about them gouging the public because they wanted to make high profits. You cannot have both. He spoke, and many other spoke at length—

Mr. Singer: Once get your foot in the door and you are in.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —about the indemnity companies having a retention factor, or a profit, I believe he called it on one occasion,

although I will not vouch for that. I only made notes from memory. He spoke of the indemnity companies having a retention factor or profit of 28 per cent, but he ignores the fact, sir, that these very same companies, are in competition with the non-profit or the prepaid plans, and on many occasions are underselling them today. I am quite certain my hon. friends in the NDP from Hamilton will know of cases where in that city, groups have dropped the non-profit plan and have taken on insurance under indemnity plans at a better price. I cannot just recall now the union which told me of that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The hon. Minister does not understand the insurance business.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe I understand the insurance business as well as my hon. friend understands the practice of medicine. The fact does remain, sir, that almost from the beginning of time, when the insurance carriers got into this field, they have been in direct competition with the prepaid plan, and I believe they sell just a little more than 50 per cent of the insurance. But this is good for the public. I really cannot become worried about whether the insurance companies make a profit or not. I remember one of the hon. member's previous colleagues, who left us at the last election, complained that the insurance companies would not stay in the business because they could not make money. At that time I said I could not care less, they were big boys, now; they can look after themselves; and if to gain business they enter into competitive price cutting, the only person I can see gain, sir, is the consumer. They can cut their costs as low as they like, as long as the consumer gains. That is my only concern.

Now, the hon. member for Parkdale made a great deal, sir, about the Liberal Party speaking for the little people. You know, that is a word I do not like. I cannot think of any of our people being little people, sir. However, a rose by any other name—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): No! You divide them into classes.

An hon. member: They are all first-class.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Again I have to say to my hon. friend from Sudbury, sir, that the word was of legal choice and I was advised again, after I paid attention to his proposal. I went back to my legal people and they

assured me that this was proper legal language.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister ought to be ashamed of them, then.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will have them talk to the hon. member, sir. However, I do not think that any one of the three groups in this House has a corner on this "concern" for the ordinary folk, for all of the folk of Ontario. We believe as a party and as a government that this is our duty, this is our sacred responsibility, sir, while we stand in this House, to speak for, and to represent all of the people of Ontario. These little people have been our concern. It has been our concern to see to it that through the legislation we bring to this House we keep ever foremost in our minds the interests of the people of all the province of Ontario.

How my hon. friend decided by the terms of Bill 136 that we were giving millions to the insurance companies, sir, completely eludes me because it has been made eminently clear that not one dollar of public money will go to any insurance company, be it indemnity or non-profit plan.

My hon. friend from Huron-Bruce put forward a very good plea for para-health services, but there is no discrimination in this. This was a very difficult problem with which the committee wrestled and I have met all of these people, and in spite of all the woeful and dreadful things that my hon. friends fear—because my profession happens to be that of a physician, and the unfair, or the biased, or prejudiced approach I may take in dealing with those things, sir, I do not really believe that, with the exception of one group who did me the honour of speaking to the Hon. Mr. Justice McRuer, submitting I should be cited for discrimination or something of the kind. I think that was the greatest compliment that was ever paid me.

However, apart from that one group, sir, no group in the para-health field has ever accused me, to my knowledge, of being prejudiced against them. So long as I occupy the chair of the Minister of Health, sir, my only concern is to see that these services which the people of Ontario want and look for are the best possible under the circumstances. To that end all my actions have been directed and will continue to be directed so long as I am in this chair. I forget my professional loyalty, sir; I have one loyalty and that is to this government and to the people of Ontario.

The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr.

Davison) compared the proposed individual family premium suggested by the Hagey commission report with the group family premium charged by PSI, and I am quite sure he would not want to leave any wrong information in the minds of the House, sir. You cannot compare a group premium with an individual premium. Individual premiums to which the hon. member should have referred were \$207, not \$159 or \$160.

Mr. Singer: What premium is the hon. Minister going to charge?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Universal—again in keeping with most of the hon. members of the Opposition, sir, the hon. member for Hamilton East said a great deal about universality and we are all in favour of universality. Indeed this is one of the basic principles of our bill, that medical services insurance shall be universally available.

Then, of course, we come to my hon. friend from Sudbury. In the first five or ten minutes he speaks—I love to listen to him, sir. He was concerned, and I give him great credit for this, about the numbers who are living on the edge of poverty. And again I say that no political party in this province has any corner in that concern, sir. Everyone of us is concerned about it. One has only to look at the great volume of legislation that passes through this House every year to realize the concern of this government for those who live on the edge of poverty, to see all of the things that are being undertaken and done in an attempt to lift our people out of this group altogether, and to lift them off the edge of poverty and give them an opportunity to rise above their present state. But I did wonder, while my hon. friend was speaking, why he did not try to pour out some of his oratory upon his colleagues at Ottawa in the hope that they would perhaps alter the income tax exemption levels. Now, he spoke at great length and so did some others about compulsion in education and compulsion in health. Of course there is compulsion in education, Mr. Speaker; we do not want an illiterate population. But he forgot to state further that the compulsion in education stops when the child reaches the age of accountability. As soon as the child reaches the age of sixteen and can make a determination for himself he does not have to go to school any more. He makes that election for himself or in concert with his parents if he is well trained and well raised.

And then the statement of the philosophy that my hon. friend tried to weave around this business of freedom, that there cannot

be true freedom without economic security. I would agree with that, sir. But how in the name of reason is one any more secure economically because the government takes his money from him and spends it rather than leaving him to spend it himself? This will not enhance his economic security nor will it enhance his freedom. I say to you, sir, the more government takes away from the people the more likely they are to become enslaved. In the history of society, all the great nations, all the great empires of the past, as I read history, fell for two reasons: They depended too much upon government; they became enslaved, they became soft and faded into oblivion.

If this, Mr. Speaker, is to give true freedom to the individual; if the government is to look after him as far as health care is concerned; providing he is capable of looking after himself, then why not look after him so far as his food and clothing and shelter and all of the necessities, the basic necessities of everyday living are concerned?

Mr. Singer: Or his pension, or his hospitalization.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend spoke about priorities and I am going to leave that for the moment and come back to it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I would remind members that the Minister is making the speech. I think he was quite reticent when other members were speaking and I would ask the members to give him the privilege which he should have when he is presenting his remarks.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I touched a raw nerve apparently. Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the matter in hand. All in all, throughout all of the speeches of the Opposition there are some common threads running through the whole fabric. I do not need to say, because it is perfectly apparent to all of us, not only to us who sit in this House, but to all of the people of Ontario, that we know exactly where the New Democratic Party stands on this matter.

Mr. Bryden: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And they do deserve to be commended for this, sir, because consistently and without deviation they have stuck to their programme and stuck to their policy. I recall when I first heard it—I was a freshman, I believe in university, beginning to cut my political teeth. I had just recently qualified to become a Canadian and I

wondered how I should vote. I thought the best way to learn was to hear the representatives of all of the political parties who were periodically invited to speak to the student body. The first one I heard was a man whose figure and manner and everything else made a serious impact upon my memory, but what he said did not.

He was nonetheless a great man, the late J. S. Woodsworth. His missionary zeal and his passion for his cause could not help but impress me. Mr. Speaker, those were the depression days, as you will recall. But the thing that impressed me was that the full burden of his theme was that government should do everything for everybody.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister did not listen to him very well.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And here we were, sir, a group of young men and women about to embark on a life's career, hoping to make some contribution to the society which was then helping us, and Mr. Woodsworth did not challenge us to face up to and grasp the opportunities which this great province and this great nation offered us. He expounded his party's policy on Medicare—even then.

The next man I heard was W. L. MacKenzie King—

An hon. member: With his crystal ball!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, he neither had with him his crystal ball nor his dog.

Mr. Trotter: What has this got to do with the principle of the bill? Wandering all over the place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we know exactly where the NDP stand. They have been consistent in their stand and they have never deviated from it; they have enunciated frequently in this House and I do not believe that the enunciation has deviated one iota. The last was the same as the first, so that there is not any doubt in their minds, nor in our minds on this stand. But I had to say to you, sir, a great gulf is fixed between them—and even the engineers of The Department of Highways would never be able to build a bridge long enough to get across that gulf.

We cannot, however, say the same of the Liberal Party, sir.

Mr. MacDonald: Medicare if necessary but not necessarily Medicare.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The third man was the late Mr. R. B. Bennett and he, of course, sold me.

Mr. MacDonald: Proves what a Tory the hon. Minister is. Bennett retired to the House of Lords.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that we know where the New Democratic Party stands I have to say we cannot say the same about the Liberal Party. We do know that the late Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King paid lip service to health care insurance. First in 1919—and then at every election thereafter until he left the Canadian scene.

An hon. member: A great Canadian.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A great Canadian, it is true; I am not questioning that in the least.

Mr. MacDonald: He was one step at a time, don't you know?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He paid lip service, sir, but took no action. And now my hon. friends in the Liberal Party, I know, are very touchy about history so we will come a little more up to date to August 2, 1962, when the whole Liberal attitude is well summed up in the *Toronto Daily Star* of that date, and I quote:

Neither Mr. Wintermeyer nor any other responsible Liberal spokesman has yet spoken up clearly on the issue. A party which endorsed a national health insurance programme as long ago as 1919, should have no hesitation in 1962 in declaring where it stands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the difference in philosophy between the two but it does appear from what the hon. leader of the Opposition has said, and what all of his colleagues have said, as if they would like to embrace the policy so long enunciated by the NDP. The only difference, sir, is again that the NDP is full steam ahead and damn the torpedoes.

Mr. MacDonald: For once the hon. Minister is right.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there is a very great deal of talk about government responsibility in a matter of this kind. It is a question I have often asked myself, and it seems to me that many of us have been asking ourselves questions recently. Government

has a responsibility in this field but I believe that its basic and most important responsibility is to see to it that health care insurance is available to all, regardless—as we state it in our bill—of age, state of health past or present, or financial status. And to see to it, sir, that this insurance will not be cancelled at the whim of a insurance carrier, usually at a time when the person needs it the most. There is not any use—

Mr. MacDonald: Infringing on the rights of free enterprise!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is not any use in selling something to a person, and then, at the time when the need arises that they must have it and must benefit from it, to tell him that its benefits are not available. This has happened, and this can happen quite legally under existing contracts at the present time. I think that government has a responsibility to exercise reasonable controls on costs and for that reason we have placed within the terms of the bill the right that government shall approve the maximum premium that can be charged—the high or bad insurance risk cases. And to see to it—and this is another very important matter—because the conscience of Ontario society would have its government see to the provision of essentials for all of those people who, for a variety of reasons cannot look after themselves—under the terms of this bill that this medical services insurance is provided at public expense for those who cannot afford it. Further, we will assist those who are in a stated low-income bracket, and all this we have done, sir, under Bill 136.

Let me submit a quote to you, sir:

The state in organizing security should not stifle incentives, opportunity or responsibility, it should leave room and encouragement for voluntary action by each individual.

In case my hon. friends are trying to remember who wrote that, before they put their foot in their mouth, it was Lord Beveridge. And Lord Beveridge certainly was never a Conservative.

Mr. Bryden: No, but he certainly would not have supported this bill.

An hon. member: Who can say? He advocated complete medical care.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, now I think, sir, there has been great and meticulous care on the part of the Liberal Party particularly, to avoid the word “compulsion” except to point out that I was afraid of it. I am not afraid

of it, I detest the word, I hate the word. Anybody who has been taught "Scots wha hae wi' Wallace bled," could not do anything but hate the idea of compulsion.

Now, in these days we are very prone to point to certain things and say that they are trends of our time. Many of these are good but many, many of them are questionable and, in my opinion, sir, one of these questionable trends is the very marked tendency to compulsion by governments. Does the government know, after all, what is best for the people in all things? When the good of the public at large is at stake, of course, the government must take a stand and do this, but is the good of the people at large suffering because we do not compel everybody to buy medical services insurance? Is it better to compel everybody to buy it, sir, and then because they do not pay the premium, be it big or little, to put them in jail? Is that a good thing, is that a good feature?

An hon. member: Who did that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is a very dangerous tendency growing on the North American continent, Mr. Speaker, to believe that election to a Parliament vests one automatically with the ability to spend the earnings of the citizens better than they who do the earning. And then, in our times too, there is a great deal of talk about democracy. A democratic form of government is defined as that form of government which interferes least with local and individual liberty. And lest, again, my friends say that is from a 19th century dictionary, let me assure you it is from the latest one I could get.

Now, again, we know exactly where the New Democratic Party stands on this matter of compulsion. They have been completely frank and open about it and they have never changed in this instance, but we do not know where the Liberals stand and we do not even know from their discussion today, where they stand on it. Nor can I glean this from the amendment which they have proposed to Bill 136.

We will not go very deeply into history at this time but let us listen to the former leader, Mr. Wintermeyer, quoted from the *Toronto Telegram*, Wednesday, June 3, 1959. He said: "I think it is a shortcoming of our system to require everything to be done in compulsory fashion."

And I have not the slightest doubt in my mind, I do not recall the occasion, but I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that

if he said it here everyone of us would have thumped our desks because this is sound thinking in a free nation.

The *Toronto Daily Star*, during an interview of May 29, 1959—he was interviewed and questioned by Mr. Beland Honderich of the *Toronto Star*—and here is what Mr. Wintermeyer said:

At the present time I do not think it is feasible in Ontario, I think we can eventually pursue a programme of medical protection on a voluntary prepaid arrangement.

Only two years later Mr. Wintermeyer proposed a compulsory medical services plan for Ontario. If, again, I read aright the true meaning of what the hon. leader of the official Opposition and his colleagues have said, they too are advocating a compulsory plan but they have not yet said it, Mr. Speaker. If they want to be honest and frank with the public of Ontario they ought to say it and they ought to put the proper word upon it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Minister can state his views. There are other members left to speak in the Liberal Party who may disagree with what he has said and so they have an opportunity to reply later.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would ask the Minister to continue and also ask the other members to give him their attention. Members are supposed to speak only once on second reading, and I would remind the member for Sudbury that he has spoken on second reading.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have just checked again on my notes and I apologize humbly to the hon. member for Sudbury. I see I have a note here that he is the first to use "compulsory" in connection with their scheme. I take it back.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, I would like to assure the hon. Minister that I used "compulsory" and tried to interpret to him the great fear of compulsion that he had in connection with hospital insurance. I hope he is not suffering at night from an uneasy conscience because every piece of legislation that is passed is compulsory.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did say at the outset of my remarks that the hon. leader of the Opposition had used "compulsory" in respect of me, but I have not heard him use it in

respect of their own proposals. I still must maintain that I have no record of having written that down but I might have missed something. I will check *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bill, labour too has had something to say about compulsion which was very revealing to me. Hear this:

Compulsory social insurance is in essence undemocratic and it cannot prevent or remove poverty. Compulsory sickness insurance for workers is based on the theory that they are unable to look after their own interests and the state must use its authority and wisdom and assume the relation of parent and guardian. Workers adhere to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory system which are held to be not only impractical but a menace to their rights, welfare and liberty.

That, Mr. Speaker, came from the tongue of no less a man than the late Samuel Gompers, the founder of the AFL, and one of the greatest—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It sounds to me, Mr. Speaker, as if the representatives of labour in our day have repudiated one who laid the foundation upon which their strengths and successes have been raised.

Mr. Bryden: Why does the hon. Minister not read something from the 20th century?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. members asks me to read something from the 20th century. Hear this then, Mr. Speaker. First, I would like to remind the hon member that Sam Gompers' words were spoken in the 20th century, I believe the date was 1903. But this is 1965. Mr. Speaker, this is a statement from 1965 and it is from the voice of labour:

The time has arrived for the labour movement to mount a massive drive to throw off the yoke of compulsion.

That is from the tongue of Mr. Sefton as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of May 4, 1965.

Mr. Bryden: Has the hon. Minister heard what Mr. Sefton said about his bill?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, it does not matter about what was said, sir, he is speaking of compulsion. One cannot adopt a policy of one kind in respect of one question and another in respect of another question.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to thresh over the old straw that has been threshed so many

times about this means test. We have stated unequivocally that this is an income test because it is based on the mechanism of the personal income tax, which most of us have come to accept. Indeed, this is one place where compulsion does obtain in this land and we must accept it whether we will or not. But if this is an iniquitous means test—and the words are not mine—then great numbers of us—not those who are seeking to extract moneys from the public Treasury but who are being forced to put money into the public Treasury—have been subjected to it for a long time and I have never heard any of us complain of any damage to our dignity resulting.

This is a reliable way, in our opinion, of determining need without prying into the most private and personal affairs of the individual. In spite of all the discussion about this, only one of those who have spoken in the debate made any note of the statement written by Joan Hollobon, who made a very objective study of this whole matter across Canada. She said that more than 80 per cent in the group which she questioned in British Columbia did not have any strong feeling about it.

A very great deal has been made about the cost of public and private programmes and there is much in the Hall commission's report about this. Mr. Speaker, in spite of all that is written in the Hall commission's report about this, I submit to you, sir, we have no record of any controlled studies having been made in this area. Of course, statistics of existing companies have been checked, both private and public, but there has been no controlled study done to ascertain whether a public programme can be operated at less cost than a private one.

For instance, the Hall studies all but ignored the group insurance mechanism which has been so successful in the medical care field, particularly in our province. There is no intention under this bill and there is no authority under this bill, to interfere with existing group plans or the existing individual plans, provided the people are satisfied with them. I submit to you, sir, the Hall report overstates the comparison of expenses of a voluntary insurance programme with a government-operated one, and again I submit this on the basis that there is no real factual knowledge on which to base this.

For example, there are group plans in operation in Ontario which provide insurance for \$3.90 for an individual per month, or \$13.25 for a family, and these are actual prices quoted from a service or non-profit

plan just last week. A similar plan can be had from an indemnity carrier—Mr. Speaker, this is a plan offering the same benefits for \$3.03 for an individual, or \$10.04 for a family. An individual contract from a service plan is available in Ontario today at \$6 a month for an individual and \$17 a month for a family. From an indemnity carrier such a contract can be had for \$5.50 and \$15. So there is now ample evidence that competition does operate and should continue to operate to the benefit of the consumer.

From such experience, sir, who is to say that government can operate a plan any more economically than private enterprise? In our proposed programme we believe that there can be comparisons made. The experiences will be useful to us although not exact, since it is suggested that the group covered by government will include a large percentage of high-risk cost and high-risk cases.

The Hall commission report speaks of conditions in the nation. It does not point out that the figure already covered by medical services insurance in Ontario is 80.8 per cent and this has increased steadily and progressively during the last five years. There have been far too many statements about costs, or overstatements, which are just not true. For example, in the *Globe and Mail* on May 14, 1965, we read:

Dr. John Hastings contended that public schemes are almost more responsive to the needs of subscribers and less expensive to the public than private plans. He offered as evidence the fact that the premium for Ontario's proposed plan, which is to be provided by private carriers, as outlined in the Hagey report, is expected to be \$175 a year, compared to Saskatchewan's \$24 per person charge in its tax-supported plan.

Mr. Speaker, if Dr. Hastings had wanted to portray an accurate picture, he would have given the total cost of the Saskatchewan plan, just as he did in quoting the figures which he extracted from the Hagey committee report. Who knows exactly what the total cost of the Saskatchewan plan really is? I have asked many people, and I know that my hon. friend put on the record figures which were purported to be exact, and to the best of his knowledge they are exact; but many people to whom I have spoken in Saskatchewan very seriously question many of those figures.

There are many questions which will arise out of this programme. We are quite aware of them, we know that they will come up and will have to be answered.

First of all, it has been suggested time and time again that we are going to upset what is being done in the province now. I say to you, sir, again, that there is no authority nor is there any provision in Bill 136 to interfere in any way with any existing group or any individual contract, either with the provisions or with the costs. Only the maximum premium for standard contracts will be controlled and this is only to protect those who ordinarily could not get medical services insurance because of age, state of health or their financial status. I submit to you, sir, that this will provide much-needed protection for many, and it may well be at a lower price than they are now paying, if they are able to secure it at the present time; but the great majority now insured will go on as at present.

If those who purchase their own insurance do not want to buy from private companies, there is wide choice and they may freely go to the non-profit or the service plan. There are some 44 such plans operating all across Ontario today. There is no obstruction to those who are going to provide coverage for themselves going to these plans to get it, Mr. Speaker.

This programme need not cause any obstruction. There is nothing about the programme that will cause any obstruction to any other programme that may be developed, indeed, the opposite is the case.

I think that the way this is being administered, it will be a very simple matter to greatly broaden the scheme as time and experience would dictate. Much has been said, particularly by my hon. colleagues on the government side of the House, about priorities. I am very much disappointed, sir, that the Opposition has glossed over priorities, because they are of very great importance indeed.

Have proper priorities been observed? We believe they have, and that by this proposal we have planned wisely. We have tried to put first things first and at the same time meet needs which are very real for many people in the lower income bracket—those who need protection most; those, according to the statements made by many critics of this bill, sir, who are prone to a higher morbidity rate than are others. These are in need of coverage, and for them we have made adequate provision.

Every possible effort will be made to acquaint all concerned with the programme on its introduction. We will use every useful information medium, municipal authorities, doctors, public health nurses and welfare

authorities to make known to our people what will be available to them.

These are but a few of the questions that will have to be answered, but I assure hon. members that every aspect will be given careful and thorough study and consideration. We are not going to jeopardize the programme by any precipitate, ill-considered or careless action.

There has been much talk about what the maximum premium will be. I have to say to the House, sir: According to the terms of this Act I cannot tell the House what the maximum premium will be, because it is specifically stated in the bill that the function of the medical services insurance council which will be established under the Act is to recommend the initial and future maximum premium levels. Until the medical services insurance council is set up, I cannot presume to set a maximum. We have had actuarial studies because we have to reach a cost on which to base the coverage for those whom the government will support in part; and for those who will be assisted by government, the premium rates will be \$72 for an individual, \$144 for a couple and \$180 for a family.

Now immediately we will be told that these rates are higher than group rates now in operation. Of course they are, because we have been told that at least 45 per cent of those whom the government will insure are over 65 years of age.

This, of course, bears out what my hon. friends across the way have said, that the government is carrying the high risk cases, taking them off the hands of the insurance companies. But how shallow is that argument, Mr. Speaker, when you look at it. Suppose we put them on the insurance market—they have to be covered and the costs will be no higher and no lower—they have to be covered and so the insurance market will have to add enough to every premium now existing to cover the additional costs created by these; so the people would be paying no matter what happens. In this way the people are paying through taxation, in the other way they will be paying through this insurance premium.

For all of the broad sweeping statements that have been made and the recommendations that have been quoted here anent the Hall report, very few recognized or said anything about the emphasis that Mr. Justice Hall and his colleagues put upon all health care needs and also upon setting up realistic priorities. Some of these, for the education of professional personnel and the recruitment of staff and all of these things—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I merely wish—having missed it on this side of the House—to ask the hon. Minister what precisely were the figures that he quoted in his lead up to this, the figures that ended with \$180, I think it was, for a family. Which figures were those?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This will be the premium structure, if you will—for those who will be partially subsidized by government.

Mr. S. Lewis: What were they?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They were \$72, \$144 and \$180; to meet the very pressing needs to which I had reference previously, to look after those in the non-taxable income group. Those who, as several hon. members across the way recently stated, are now being looked after. I think that this should be made eminently clear. While some care has for some time been provided for those on social assistance, it has been rather minimal care and certainly not the type of comprehensive coverage that is envisioned in the standard contract.

To meet this pressing need and to fill this gap in our medical care services, this bill is now before the House. We believe that this bill, through its provisions, does fill the insurance gap in Ontario.

The hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) already dealt with this. I am not going over all of the figures, other than to remind hon. members that the insurance gap, according to the statistics which we have—and we have reason to believe that they are very soundly based statistics—the insurance gap in 1965 is estimated to be 968,000. Yet we have made provision under this bill to provide total coverage for a non-taxable population of 977,000, or a favourable balance of 9,000. Now how this comes about, of course, is difficult to understand. It is quite possible that coverage is already being provided for or by some of these people. So we point out to you, sir, that the insurance gap—again I repeat, according to well based statistics—is 9,000 less than the non-taxable population. These we propose to cover entirely out of public funds under the terms of Bill 136.

In addition, we propose to assist a further 800,000 in low income groups, although they have income subject to income tax.

We repeat, sir, that on the basis of these findings, support of the non-taxable population, as we propose, to the extent of 100 per cent, would more than cover the insurance

gap that now exists in the province of Ontario.

In summary, this bill provides that everyone in Ontario, regardless of the age, state of health or financial position, may protect himself and his family, or be protected, against the cost of ill health and physicians' services. It will be guaranteed, non-cancellable and renewable; it will not exceed in cost a government approved maximum premium; there will be no interference with doctor-patient relationship; there will be no interference with those already covered by groups or individuals; those who have a non-taxable income will be provided with standard contract coverage, fully paid for out of public funds; and assistance will be provided for a further group with a taxable income up to approximately \$1,200.

My hon. friends on the Opposition benches, in their submission to the public, I presume to the public on the facts of Medicare, make one or two mistakes. I hope my charity will stretch enough to look upon them as mistakes, but they state that our plan goes nowhere while theirs emphasizes preventive care and well-baby care. Again I have to say they did not read the provisions of the bill, because we have made provision for well-baby care and preventive check-ups once a year. In response to the fear of my hon. friend, the member for Scarborough West, that the psychotherapy and the well-baby care provisions were not adequate, these I say to you, sir, were arrived at in discussions with those involved. We changed our well-baby care provision because the pediatricians were at odds with me on it. I bowed to their superior knowledge since this is their field. We came to the decision about our psychotherapy provisions after consultation with representatives of the Ontario psychiatric association and we were assured that they were good provisions.

The matter of pointing to the difference between the patient under the private psychiatrist and the patient under the salaried psychiatrist does not obtain. Ever since the province of Ontario got into the business of providing health services this has obtained. This is going to obtain more and more, because more and more, in certain types of health care facilities, we will find salaried personnel. The tendency now is more and more for chronic care and convalescent care institutions to provide salaried physicians; tuberculosis sanatoria provide salaried physicians; mental hospitals all over the world, I believe, provide salaried physicians and there will be no difference in this regard. Of course,

we will have to keep salaries in tune with the times and this, I am assured by the civil service commission and The Department of the Civil Service, is constantly under review and will continue to be.

And now, I have to repeat, sir, for the last time, at no time has this government ever implied that this bill is Medicare, nor have we ever said that this is our last word on health care provision for the province of Ontario, but we do state without equivocation, sir, that it is a logical progressive step forward in a plan that is steadily unfolding.

It is therefore, sir, with great sincerity that I submit it to the serious consideration of the House.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the principles of this bill, following the hon. Minister of Health, I can only say that he obviously must understand the practice of medicine and understands it very thoroughly, because he obviously does not understand anything else related to the provision of a method by which the people of the province of Ontario will have the advantage of medical services, from the medical profession, at the least possible cost.

We agree 100 per cent with the hon. Minister that his duty is, as he stated it, to represent—and he said his sacred responsibility—all of the people of Ontario. We agree that this is his duty. We think that sometimes he represents some of the people at the expense of others, and this is what he has done this evening. The remarks which the hon. Minister has made were nothing short of an insult to the Legislature of the province of Ontario. They were pedantic; they bore no resemblance whatsoever to the current trend of political thinking in the province of Ontario, or in the western world. He quoted only one person who I would say had any merit in the remarks which he addressed to the question which he has put before this Legislature and those were the remarks of Lord Beveridge. Lord Beveridge—when he produced the plan in England during the war, which was the forerunner of the medical plan that was introduced into England for the care of the health of the people of Britain—was speaking as a Liberal, and the plan which he formulated and put into effect was put into effect by a Labour government. And the issue on which we are speaking tonight in this Legislature is far too serious for the hon. members of the government to think that in any way they can, on this occasion, divide the members of the Liberal Party from the members of the New Democratic Party.

The Opposition in this House this evening is united and determined to oppose this bill. The Opposition in this House and the New Democratic Party in this House will oppose this bill because they represent something more than 50 per cent of the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that this bill as presented to this House is regressive, inequitable, economically inefficient, discriminatory so far as part of the population of the province of Ontario is concerned. It is wrong in its basic approach, and the government itself has failed to give us, until the last few minutes of the hon. Minister's address, any statistics of any kind on which we could base any assessment or pass any judgment. And we can only assume that his reluctance to give the figures was a calculated reluctance to have those figures debated in this Legislature.

The hon. Minister has sacrificed the interests of the people of the province of Ontario to the interests of his own profession.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a rather shameful accusation and nothing could be further from the truth, and I would respectfully ask that the hon. member withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker: I would remind the member that in any of his remarks he cannot impute an improper motive to any other member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention to impute a motive, I simply stated that the hon. Minister of Health had sacrificed the interests of the people of the province of Ontario to his own profession.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Well, withdraw that.

Mr. MacDonald: Why? That is what the *Globe and Mail*—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, it has been stated in this House—and I do not think anyone in the Legislature will gainsay the proposition—that the medical profession—the doctors in the province of Ontario—are, on an average, the highest earning income group in the province of Ontario at the present time.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Some lawyers do pretty good.

Mr. Renwick: The doctors in the province of Ontario have been granted by this Legislature a monopoly in the practice of their profession. How have they exercised that monopoly? In the way in which any monopoly is exercised, they have limited the right of entry into their profession and they have established fees which bear no relationship whatsoever to what those fees would be if there were a competitive medical profession in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: They could allow more into the profession, but they do not.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the medical profession in the province of Ontario has within it the ability the capacity to forecast the number of doctors who are required for the province of Ontario. Of all the manpower requirements of any given area in our society, the one which is most readily calculable is the number of doctors required in our society. The reason for that is quite simple. All the doctors are registered within the college of physicians and surgeons. It is well known as to the number of doctors who are in fact practising their profession, the ages of the doctors are known who are practising their profession, and it is quite possible from those details and from the world health organization tables to calculate the number of doctors that the province of Ontario requires to meet the needs of the people of the province over the next 25 years. This has not been done. It requires the intervention of the government to even enlarge the areas in which medical education could be obtained to bring the number of doctors that are required in the province of Ontario up to some reasonable minimum; and anyone would be able to assume that, within that framework, the fees which are now charged in the schedule of the Ontario medical association are not fees which can be left solely to the dictates of that medical association to establish.

The government has enshrined those particular fees in this bill because the particular section of the bill states unequivocally that the benefits under the plan proposed by the government as to standard contracts will be the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association. It has then stated that the government will determine a maximum for the premium which may be charged, or the rate which may be charged for that insurance coverage. It does not matter what the government says about that maximum; that maximum must of necessity—because of the legislation which is before this House—be more than the schedule of fees of the Ontario

medical association. There is nothing in this bill, once it is passed, which permits anybody—the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the medical carriers incorporated, the medical council or the Minister of Health—there is no one once this legislation is passed who can prescribe a maximum premium that will not cover whatever fees the doctors choose to set up in their schedule under the Ontario medical association.

I think that this is a grave mistake in a bill which purports to suggest that medical services are going to be provided for the people of the province of Ontario at an economic level. It is just not economic.

I would like to look just for a few minutes at the 1,800,000 people that the government so gaily announced to us are those who are deserving of care within our society. It is only a short time ago that we in this House stated that there are more than 2,000,000 poor people in Ontario. Of these, 700,000 are destitute and abjectly poor, 500,000 are living in poverty at a bare subsistence level of existence, and 800,000 are in want of the comforts and necessities. Those are 2,000,000 people. Give or take, if the government will, 200,000 people, we are not very far off in our calculation as to the number of people who are below any acceptable level in our society at the present time.

Mr. White: It depends on definition.

Mr. Renwick: We are using yours.

Mr. MacDonald: 1,800,000.

Mr. Renwick: We then went on to say that there are another 1,000,000 people in Ontario who are just able to make ends meet, and if the government has put forward the proposition that there are 1,800,000 people, we happen to say 2,000,000 people who are living below a level which is acceptable in our society. I do not think it is up to the government to say that there are not another 1,000,000 people who are just able to make ends meet, living in our society. And what does this bill do? This bill provides that those people will pay the same number of dollars for their share under this bill as the person who is earning \$10,000, \$45,000 or \$100,000. And that is inequity in the language which I speak.

Mr. Bryden: That any humane man speaks.

Mr. Renwick: Just look again at who these people are. There are 1,800,000 of them, or 2,000,000 of them. In the language which I speak tonight there are another 1,000,000 people, so we are speaking of between

40 and 50 per cent of the people of the province of Ontario, and I would ask whether they were ever represented in anything which the government did to decide what scheme would be used to provide the prepayment of medical care in this province.

Were they represented on the Hagey committee? The Hagey committee was made up of three physicians, three representatives from the medical insurance plans operating in Ontario, two nurses, a member of the Ontario hospital association, and a business man, a farmer, a lawyer-businessman and a representative of organized labour. The people who were not represented on that committee, whose views were not canvassed before that committee, and whose views if they were canvassed by any of the people who made representations to that committee, were discarded, are precisely that 1,000,000, 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 people in the province of Ontario who, as was said on another occasion, are voiceless.

They are not organized. They have no way of expressing their needs, their wishes, in our society. The only possible place that those needs can be recognized is in this Legislature, and this Legislature under this bill is not prepared to do so. The reason it is not prepared to do so is because it is going to take 1,800,000 on the calculations of the government, and the government is attempting to suggest to us that there is no means test involved because it is using the income tax method of determining eligibility for the subsidies from this government.

First of all, let me say that the income tax, as I understand it, is comprehensive, universal and compulsory. Everybody files a return. Everybody files a return, there is no distinction between one citizen and another. But it is not possible for this government to say that if a limited number of people in this province file a copy of their income tax returns with us, we will then determine whether they fall within the categories which permit them to be subsidized. It also is not possible to say that that is not a means test because it makes a very substantial difference between the group of people who choose to file their income tax returns with this government and those who do not choose to file their income tax returns with the government.

Just as a sidelight, of course, as I understand it, the government has no authority whatsoever to obtain any information whatever from the government at Ottawa about those income tax returns to verify them in any way at all. I think it will be necessary for the government to introduce some kind

of legislation to give it that right, because one of the most carefully guarded rights under The Income Tax Act of Canada is the information which is filed with the government of Canada, and it is confidential.

I have said that this is a regressive bill and it is regressive in any sense of taxation economics, because a regressive tax is a tax which when it is imposed, imposes a tax which bears a larger proportion to the income or the assets of one section of the population as against another. This particular bill does just that so far as at least 1,000,000 people in the province of Ontario are concerned, because the 1,000,000 people somewhere just above the level at which they will be subsidized are going to pay the full premium for their insurance coverage, equal to what anyone else at a higher level of income in our society will have to pay for their coverage. In that sense it is a regressive tax.

How would we propose that it be not regressive? Premiums levied on each individual in our society should be at a level which eliminates to a great extent that regressive feature, and the other aspects of the revenues which are required to run such a plan should be charged by way of income tax and by way of corporation tax. In that way they are taxes which are related to surpluses, either personal surpluses paid through the income tax, or surpluses in the companies paid through the corporation tax. In this way the regressive feature could very well be eliminated by this government. It is an inequitable bill because it distinguishes between all types of people in our society.

I have tried to illustrate in my way why it is inequitable so far as the 1,000,000 people, at least who are immediately above the subsistence level, are concerned. But I think it is inequitable in another sense. It is inequitable in terms of the children of the province of Ontario. This comes somewhat toward the question of compulsion, which the hon. Minister of Health has made a great to-do about in this Legislature and tried to draw all sorts of analogies to the educational system.

The educational system is a compulsory system but there is no one in this Legislature who would think for one moment that if the compulsory requirements under the educational system were dropped, many children would stay away from school, because the parents in this society would see that most of the children in this society would go to the schools. The area of compulsion is therefore related to a very small number of fami-

lies who would not otherwise send their children to school, and that is the sole area of compulsion involved in education in the province of Ontario. It is available to all, but it is compulsory for those who do not choose to avail themselves of it.

Under the bill which is before this Legislature, if a family chooses not to take out medical insurance, whether it be subsidized insurance or whether it be from one of the medical carriers, the children in that family are not covered. They are not entitled to the care, and I happen to think that the children of the province of Ontario should be entitled to medical care under any scheme which the government is going to put into operation. It would not come as some type of new legislation from this government, if it were to require in this bill that everyone take out medical insurance, because it would make certain that the children in the province of Ontario, the limited number for whom the parents would not otherwise make provision, would have provision made for them.

I would like to turn briefly to the question of the economics of it. I am not an economist, but my understanding of it is that a considerable amount of time and study has now gone into the question of the factors which go into the national productivity of any country. Contrary to what has been understood in classical economics, at the present time there is great debate as to the factors which do in fact make up the productivity of a country. It used to be capital and labour. But the analyses which have now been made show very clearly that of the additional factors which lead to an increase in the productivity of any country are the education of the people and the health of the people.

The combination of the two are essential ingredients in the increased productivity of the national economy in Canada and of the economy of the province of Ontario. We in this party take the view that if the community of the province of Ontario, through its government, through its Legislature, choose to divert certain resources of the community of the province of Ontario toward health and toward education so that the productivity of the province will be increased, then we think that it is nothing to which the people of this province will object if it is made compulsory for the limited number of people within the province who might not otherwise avail themselves of this opportunity of taking out this kind of insurance.

I would like to comment again briefly on

one other aspect of this particular bill before us. By dividing the community up into two groups, one of which will be subsidized by the government—and by the way, these people do not quite have the same choice otherwise that the rest of the province do, because they must take it from the government, and of course the other part of the province of Ontario, sir, must take it from the private carriers, so we really do not have the same choice within the province of Ontario at all. Once one divides the province into two groups, as the government has done in this bill and proposes to do, then they automatically increase the overall cost of medical insurance to the people of Ontario.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Not necessarily!

Mr. Renwick: Yes it does. It must do so.

Mr. White: The hon. member is not speaking as an economist now.

Mr. Renwick: If the hon. member would look at it in terms of the people who are going to be subsidized in their medical insurance premiums by the province of Ontario, he will then find that the remaining people in the province of Ontario are going, through the general revenues of the government, to pay the additional moneys required to provide that subsidy.

In addition, those same people are going to pay for their own insurance, which is going to go to medical carriers of one kind or another.

Mr. White: That is what the hon. member has been advocating.

Mr. Renwick: No, it was not.

An hon. member: The hon. member listens poorly.

Mr. White: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. He was talking about regressive taxes. This is the opposite of regressivity.

Mr. Renwick: But it will mean that if the government would, in this small opening which they have left themselves, perhaps in the future, move into the kind of Medicare that we are speaking about in this House—and I am limiting myself to the question of prepayment of medical services—if the government would open that door and allow everyone in the province of Ontario, if they chose to do so, to purchase from the government a standard contract, I think the hon. Minister would be quite surprised at the

number of people who would avail themselves of that opportunity.

If one looks back at the hospital insurance scheme, which this same government put into force, by requiring that the first 60 per cent of the population had to partake in that particular hospital insurance scheme it automatically cut the insurance carriers out of that type of insurance, until at the present time in the province of Ontario it would be very difficult to walk around to an insurance company and obtain standard hospital care insurance coverage. The only place one can now obtain it is from the province of Ontario.

We would like to have, in this province, that same kind of system put into effect. If the government chooses to adopt the very method which they used in the hospital insurance, well this would be fine. We would prefer the government to come out and say, yes, it will be compulsory or obligatory on all people, because it is in the interests of everyone in the province of Ontario to have that kind of coverage, to have that kind of security and to have that kind of well-being.

I think the government quite often fails to understand the drains on the income of a person earning anywhere up to, say \$5,000 a year in our economy. There are very few people earning somewhere up in that range of income, who are not already committed substantially for credit purposes for many of the luxuries or the amenities that they are attempting to enjoy, and who have those obligations and will continue to have them.

A great deal of the time and effort of this government is directed towards persuading them to consume more and more, and one of the methods by which they consume is to extend their credit. For many people, their credit is now fully extended. To saddle those people with an additional charge of, shall we say, \$180 a year, or whatever lesser amount is going to be charged, is an undue burden on the people of the province of Ontario.

The other day we had the debate about the portability of pensions in this province. We in this party choose to believe that the individual man should, if he is labouring, working and is entitled to certain benefits from his employer—whether they are medical benefits, group insurance benefits, pension benefits, whatever they are—should be able to take them with him wherever he goes. One of the factors which I do not like about the perpetuation of this system is the fact that it is going to mean that many employers in this province are going to be able to hold employees in their employ because of the fringe benefits which are provided, just as

the lack of portability of their pensions until they will be 45 years of age and have 10 years' service is going to accomplish the same purpose. We think that it is in the interest of the people of Ontario, in the interest of the economy of the province of Ontario, that there be the greatest possible area of mobility among the people of Ontario in moving from one job to another job. One of the ways in which this can be accomplished is to have the premium an equitable one, not a regressive one, and to establish an efficient premium to provide the services which they personally may need wherever they are in the province of Ontario.

I can only say, in closing these remarks on this bill, that it is essential that this government not pretend any longer that they are providing in this legislation something which they are not providing. The only thing that this bill does provide is exactly the recommendations which were put forward before the Hagey commission by the Ontario medical association and by the Ontario health insurance association. They are not the views which were put forward by, for example, the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto, who represent the 1,800,000 people for whom, presumably, this government is now going to provide a subsidy.

If my economics happen to be somewhat less than sophisticated, I would simply refer to a recent article in the *Globe and Mail* which stated that:

Canadians should be wary of claims that high and expanding government expenditures for health and welfare services act as a drag on the nation's economy, Arthur J. R. Smith, director of the economic council of Canada, said in Toronto yesterday. Mr. Smith, speaking to the Canadian health insurance association, said it is virtually impossible to find any clear correlation between rising government welfare expenditures and rates of economic growth.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Read the first paragraph of that report. Read Watson's words.

Mr. Renwick: I will come back to that, be glad to. I just thought I would deal with what the one man said before I dealt with what the other man said.

Mr. Smith, speaking to the Canadian health insurance association, said it is virtually impossible to find any clear correlation between rising government welfare expenditures and rates of economic growth. Nevertheless, he said, two facts suggest the need for caution against exaggerated claims that the tax levels created

by welfare service expansion erode incentives to work and promote national bankruptcy.

First, Canada ranks far down the list of industrial countries when it comes to the proportion of national income devoted to social security expenditures. Moreover, many countries having relatively higher social expenditures have at the same time experienced much more rapid rates of growth than Canada.

He also said that although some people are worried about expanding Canadian social security, this country still devotes a relatively small proportion of its national income to taxation. He said that according to the latest figures, Canada is well behind the United States and most western European countries when reckoning the proportion of income contributed to direct and indirect taxes.

An hon. member: What are his politics?

Mr. Renwick: He is a Tory. The first part of the article which the hon. Minister of Health wished me to read, which I had not intended to read, but I think is worth quoting, says:

The Ontario government's medical services plan will allow health insurance companies to prove that they can voluntarily bring coverage with efficiency and complicity to the province's population, G. N. Watson, president of the Canadian health insurance association said yesterday.

Mr. Bryden: They got the support of the insurance companies, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Renwick: Quoting further:

Mr. Watson, a vice-president of the Crown Life Insurance Company, Toronto, said the government's recently established plan embodies principles first advocated by his association in a submission to the Hall Royal commission in 1962.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad the hon. Minister had him read that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I simply ask that the government would this evening reconsider, and withdraw this bill for further consideration before presenting it for the approval of this Legislature.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in my time in this House I do not think I have experienced a

debate such as this one before. This debate has gone on now for some three days and I would estimate that perhaps 30 different hon. members have taken part in it. It has been very interesting to sit and listen and watch the various speakers who took part in the debate. I do not think it is too surprising that from both Opposition parties, first the hon. leaders took part, and then—in the case of my hon. friends to my left here—I think all of the hon. members of that party have partaken, and a very substantial proportion of our members have taken part in this debate.

The fascinating thing to me, Mr. Speaker, has been to watch the various speakers that the government put forward, and as I watched them stand up one after the other, I must admit I had to ask where the bright young boys are who were supposed to have joined this House as members of the Progressive-Conservative Party? As I listened to them, Mr. Speaker, I recognized that the people who were put up were the old Tory moss-backs, both in age and in philosophy. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that we did not have the bright young men who took exception to Bill 99; they did not stand up and say, "This is our view on Medicare." We did not hear a Cabinet Minister in this debate, Mr. Speaker, until the eleventh hour.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): The hon. member will see how they vote.

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, we know how they are going to vote. I am sorry that my friend, the hon. Minister of Mines, did not get in and add some of his eloquent philosophy to this debate. It would have just been the thing that we needed to put the icing on the cake.

Mr. Sopha: He just wandered in.

Mr. Singer: But as we listened, Mr. Speaker, I think it was most significant that at long last we are able to draw from the words of the various government members—judging from the type of speaker that the government ran in this debate, and the government controls the speakers who go on—the type of philosophy that it wants to present to the people of Ontario.

Granted, Mr. Speaker, a few of them talked about this being a first step, but I wonder how serious a part of established Tory thinking the words of the hon. member for Oshawa really were, or was he speaking to the union members in a union town? I wonder if the true words of Tory philosophy did not come from my friend, the hon. mem-

ber for Dufferin-Simcoe and from the hon. Minister of Health.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe likened Medicare at least to socialism, then he mentioned communism sort of in passing. I would not want to put words in the hon. member's mouth, but certainly the message that he was carrying back into the rural highways and byways was that if we are going to have Medicare in the province of Ontario, we are verging on the edge of communism.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Singer: They can "oh" as long as they want. The philosophy that comes forth from the hon. Minister of Health comes from the same man, Mr. Speaker, who stood before a Tory convention in 1961 and said, "I don't believe in Medicare." He is the same man who went to Ottawa in 1962 and told the Hall commission, "Medical care is not the responsibility of government." And he is the same man who now has been reluctantly pushed by his party into taking this halting and slow, careful step, and he stands up now in an attempt to justify it.

But as you listen to his words, Mr. Speaker, and I made some notes about what he said, you can see that really his thinking has not changed. Really he does not believe in this. Really he does not want the government in the medical business at all. He says—and he chooses his words carefully; he is a clever man, my friend, the hon. Minister of Health—"I never said anything about Medicare." But he was a part of that team which advertised in the papers in the election of 1963. They had these charts with the scoreboards and the tick marks, and one of the phrases that ran through that ad, day after day after day—it was a cleverly conceived campaign and the people of Ontario went along with—said "Medicare for all the people of Ontario," and that was tick-marked.

What did the government have on that day, Mr. Speaker? It had a bill it had introduced into the House, given first reading and then taken back. At that time, that was "Medicare for the people of Ontario, done." And at the same time it was being done, my friend, the hon. Minister of Health, was going to the Hall commission and saying, "This is not a problem for government. Let the people look after themselves."

Mr. Speaker, this is a party that has grown old and tired. The years have begun to catch up with it. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to wave off the ravages of time, in an effort to assuage some of the younger thinking—the

so-called progressive thinking that we hear about from time to time—this bill has come forward with all its fanfare, with all the careful precautions that have been written into it and with all of the things that have not been said, in order that the real philosophy of the Tory party will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the people of Ontario want Medicare. They want a universal plan. They want a compulsory plan and they want a government-run plan. And I may say, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. Minister was talking and said that nobody over here had said anything about compulsory, I say he was quite wrong. Several of my colleagues did, and to remove any doubt from the hon. Minister's mind, I say that the only way this plan can work and will work is if it is compulsory. We want it to be compulsory; and that is the only way that it should be.

Mr. Thompson: Hear, hear! He speaks for us.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister's concern about this word compulsory is very hard to understand. Surely to goodness we can expect some consistency in government; in the various plans it puts forward. We had a committee that sat and investigated automobile insurance for some two years, and one of the things that we studied very carefully was the advisability of compulsory automobile insurance. You could see at that time, Mr. Speaker, that amongst the government members of the committee the word "compulsory" was a bit of an anathema. But what did we do? What did the committee do, and what did the government do, as a result of the committee's recommendations? Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, you were a member of that committee at that time. We made it so difficult and so impossible for anyone who drives an automobile in the province of Ontario to drive without insurance that the figures rose from some 89 per cent insured up to some 98 per cent insured. What can you call that, if you do not call it compulsory?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): It is not compulsory.

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense. Utter nonsense. Mr. Speaker, when you get 98 per cent of the people participating in any plan that government initiates, and you make it so difficult for them to stay out by providing penalties if they do not carry cards saying that they

wasted \$25 which gives them no protection, a rose by any other name can smell just as sweet. We have a compulsory automobile insurance plan in the province of Ontario. There is no question about it.

We have compulsory hospitalization in the province of Ontario. Why did we get that, Mr. Speaker? We got that because the people of Ontario wanted it and because the people of Ontario eventually got it with the co-operation and assistance of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, we heard in the last election the dangers of a compulsory pension plan. This was a great issue that my hon. friends took out into the hustings.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, no. You took it out.

Mr. Singer: All the woes and all the trials and tribulations; Ontario is going to go to pot. The whole province is going to collapse if we had a compulsory pension plan. Mr. Speaker, we have a pension plan. All of the objections that my hon. friends brought into the last election, all of the warnings of danger, all of the infringements with private initiative and all of the infringements on local autonomy were all swept aside. This is a government that pays lip service by and large to these phoney phrases. That is all they are. Local autonomy, private initiative, individual efforts and so on. Now there are some of them that really believe it. And they bring it forward on occasions like this. The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe and the hon. Minister of Health really believe this, but they only get their way at the beginning of a step.

Mr. Speaker, this first faltering step that the government is introducing today, and calling Medicare, is nothing more than a pale, paltry excuse. The attempts to blame the federal government really fall on deaf ears. This province is rich enough to do it. This province can afford to do it. This province will do it. Mark my words, Mr. Speaker, we will have a compulsory Medicare plan in the province of Ontario before the hon. Prime Minister calls the next election. This is all that the government is waiting for. They are not ready for it now, and they are paying lip service to the idea as put forward by my friend, the hon. Minister of Health, and my friend, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe.

Mr. Speaker, let us listen to some of the views. The hon. member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis) referred this afternoon at great length to a selected group of news

clippings, and very few of them came out and said—hardly any of them said—this was any more than a beginning. I do not recall one that said this was the answer to the health problem in the province of Ontario. He deliberately avoided, Mr. Speaker, referring perhaps to an editorial that says the hon. Prime Minister is trying to foist an immoral mockery of a Medicare plan on the people of the province of Ontario. He deliberately avoided, Mr. Speaker, the views—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I did not see that one.

Mr. Singer: You did not see that one? That one was in the *Toronto Daily Star* on May 27, 1965. I will send it over to my hon. friend if he wants to read it.

He deliberately avoided, Mr. Speaker, the views expressed by the Ontario federation of labour in its papers issued in May and June, 1965. He deliberately avoided the views of the farmers union and the people they speak for. He deliberately avoided the various briefs submitted to the Hall commission. He deliberately avoided the opinions of the Ontario association of social workers. He deliberately avoided the opinions of the Royal college of dental surgeons of Ontario and the Ontario dental association.

He made no mention at all, Mr. Speaker, of the views of the Ontario federation of agriculture. My hon. friend from Oshawa made no mention at all of the views of the Canadian region of the international union of the united automobile workers.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): I will make my speech, you make yours.

Mr. Singer: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Oshawa, having made his speech, should be prepared to say—

Mr. Walker: You make yours—you usually twist the facts.

Mr. Singer: Well, we will make it known for him, Mr. Speaker, if he is not prepared to do it. We will make it known for him, that the hon. member for Oshawa, speaking in this House this afternoon on this debate, completely neglected to mention the views of the united automobile workers in his plant, and I think they should know about it. Mr. Speaker, we heard no mention today about the views of the united electrical, radio and machine workers of America; we heard not even the views of the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada. And I would have thought that the

least that could have come forward from the government benches was the views of the board of evangelism of the United Church of Canada.

An hon. member: We will get you Anglicans.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to quote all these views at length, but just let me quote what the Reverend Stuart Crysdale, assistant secretary of the board of evangelism, said:

We have recent evidence that the members in adherence to the United Church in Ontario solidly support the contention of the general council that a medical insurance plan should be universal, comprehensive and contributory. A systematic random sampling indicates that our people, furthermore, believe that such a plan should be government operated and tax supported. We are now conducting a national survey of the United Church and returns to date show that 67 per cent of the members of the church and adherents in Ontario favour a plan having these characteristics. By direct inference, the United Church rejects the limited coverage proposed in Bill 136.

Mr. Speaker, it was very fascinating, as I say, to watch the selected group of hide-bound mossbacks that the government chose to put forward this afternoon to express the views in support of this faltering one step forward—the one-step polka, I think, could well describe it. It really means nothing at all insofar as advancing the real interest in health of the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to deal at any great length with the plan that was put forward. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my hon. friends in the House know me well enough to know that applause for that sort of remark only encourages me, and perhaps with that kind of reaction I will feel called upon to speak for another hour or so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think we should pay some attention to just a few of the remarks that I wrote down as the hon. Minister of Health spoke. He says and these are his exact words: "We have a plan to suit your wants or your needs." If there could be anything more typical of the real approach of the hon. Minister of Health, I think it

could not be better contained than in that phrase, "to suit the wants or the needs." Does the hon. Minister of Health have a crystal ball into which he can gaze and tell a person what his health needs are going to be a month from now, six weeks from now, a year from now, two years from now? Mr. Speaker, if he did, there would be no problem, there would be no problem about running government at all. This would be a simple matter. So he is going to have a plan that is going to cater to our needs.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would let me correct him?

Mr. Singer: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not like him to correct. My hon. friend had an opportunity and his words—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He wants to stick to the wrong statement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, his words are there, his words speak for themselves; I was very meticulous in writing down the quotations and this is what the hon. Minister said. He said he has a plan "to suit your wants or your needs."

Dealing with the part about needs, I say the hon. Minister, or any official, or any board that he is going to set up to deal with needs, is going to have to have a crystal ball to determine it. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the wants relate to the ability of some people to want better care than others. Those wants really must relate to the economic ability, the financial ability, of people to pay for them. It is unreasonable, I would imagine, to expect that people who are on the lower income levels will want, even though they might need it in the future, the sort of medical care that people who have several times their income are entitled to.

So when my friend, the hon. Minister of Health, says, "We have a plan to suit your wants and to suit your needs," he is really in effect talking about a plan that is tailored according to the economic scale that applies in the province, and that is gauged on the workings of some sort of crystal ball arrangement that is going to allow somebody to determine what a person's need is going to be a week or a month or a year from now. This certainly typifies the whole approach and in fact implies, Mr. Speaker, a real means test in perpetuity. It categorizes the people of Ontario; it places people on different levels and it establishes far better than anything

we on this side can say, out of the hon. Minister's mouth, the real philosophy that he at this moment is trying to put forward.

He says, "I can't become worried whether insurance companies make a profit or not." I think, Mr. Speaker, when this plan is established, if it goes forward in its present form, the hon. Minister has to become worried whether the insurance companies make a profit or not, because while on the one hand he takes 1.8 million out of the group, he forces the rest into the hands of the insurance companies. He provides for the insurance companies by the removal of the bad risks, and when he says he cannot care whether the companies make a profit or not, I am suggesting to you, sir, that he really cannot care whether this plan is a success or not, because the two things go hand in hand. As he drives people into the plan and as he drives people into the plans handled by the insurance companies, if his approach is in the manner that he expressed it this evening, if he does not care about the profits, then he does not care about the health needs of the people of the province of Ontario.

He says, "Our duty, our responsibility, is to speak for and to represent all of the people of Ontario." Mr. Speaker, how can you reconcile that phrase with his idea that this is a plan to suit everyone's wants or needs? How can you reconcile that sort of thinking—the idea that he and his hon. colleagues are speaking for all the people of Ontario—with the idea that he is going to categorize people according to their wants—which must be governed by their economic ability to satisfy their wants?

He proudly pats his back and says: "Not one dollar of public money is going to any insurance company." In a manner of speaking this is true: not one dollar of public money. This means money collected by the government is going to an insurance company. He drives into the insurance companies hundreds of thousands of dollars of private money by the mere fact that this bill is probably going to move a step further in this House this evening. So he is quibbling, he splits hairs, he pulls these phrases out of the air which are full of sound and fury and signify absolutely nothing. He does not mean what he is saying; he is trying to create the impression that the province is giving something that really it is not giving at all.

In effect, the hon. Minister of Health has not changed his views one iota from those views that he put forward to the Tory leadership convention in 1961, that he repeated to the Hall commission in 1962, that now he

has surrounded in a bill that his hon. colleagues, I would suspect, have forced upon him, that he really does not believe in, and that is going to be changed before too long. But he is hoping that with these hollow-sounding phrases he is going to be able to keep pulling the wool over the eyes of the people of Ontario.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Ontario are going to inquire very closely into this, and that the voices of these various authorities to whom I have referred are important voices in our community. These are voices that should and must be heeded. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government had better look to its laurels, because as it gets old and tired in office, if it is not prepared to move with the times, if it is not prepared to allow its bright young men to take part in this debate and to let their feelings be felt, if it is going to depend on the paternal views of my hon. friend from Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) —“Good old Len will provide it for you if nobody else does”—this government of Ontario is out of step with the times.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Did the hon. member happen to hear old man Wells?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the other obvious whipping boys that my hon. friends bring forward on every possible occasion—I am surprised they could not get a quotation or two from Hepburn—are those terrible fellows up in Ottawa. Let me make this abundantly clear as well, Mr. Speaker. The plan that has been enunciated by my hon. leader and my hon. colleagues is the plan that we in the Liberal Party in Ontario believe in.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Today, but not tomorrow and not yesterday.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the views of the government in Ottawa are the views of the government in Ottawa. On many occasions we do not agree with them, and we do not share their views in the fact that they have not put forward a comprehensive universal health plan for the whole Dominion of Canada. We make that abundantly clear. Mr. Speaker, we are no more responsible for what they do, than our hon. friends over here are responsible for the actions of the former Prime Minister of Canada. The day that any one of them is prepared to get up and say that what the former Prime Minister of Canada did we accept and adopt—and he was always right—on that day, then the same sort of responsibility can be attached to us.

Mr. Speaker, I say as clearly and succinctly as I can, that what the Liberals in Ottawa do is the business of the Liberals in Ottawa. Our views are expressed here. They are expressed by our leader, by my colleagues and by myself, and these are the views that we shall continue to express. We are bringing before the people of the province of Ontario the sort of health scheme that we think the people of the province of Ontario need and want.

We are bringing before the people of the province of Ontario a health scheme as expressed in our amendment to this resolution, that will be good for the people of the province of Ontario right now. Not next week; not next year; not 10 years from now. Right now. And this is the scheme and plan, Mr. Speaker, that—with all the authority and all the conviction that we have in our command—we want now for the people of the province of Ontario.

I do not think there is any point in prolonging this debate. The sides are chosen; the views are made abundantly clear. Let me just say this in conclusion, Mr. Speaker. I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister, because I think the hon. Prime Minister has considerably more common sense than my noisy friend from Lakeshore, before he rises to vote against this amendment, to seriously consider the possible course for the future that he is charting for the people of the province of Ontario.

It is unlikely to expect, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues are going to support our amendment. But I would think this. I would think after the benefit of these three days of debate, after the benefit of the very carefully researched speeches from the hon. members of the NDP, my colleagues here and from a few government members, I would think that the hon. Prime Minister should have pause to think. Before he takes this very serious step, he should take this bill back, Mr. Speaker, and re-examine his whole position. If he really believes that Ontario is the leading province in Canada—certainly, Mr. Speaker, Ontario can afford a proper Medicare plan; certainly Ontario needs a Medicare plan—there is nothing that would redound greater to his political credit than a re-examination of Bill No. 136 that is now before the House.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in winding up this debate, I would first like to say, despite some of the remarks of the last speaker, that I, personally, have been very impressed with the standard of the debates as we have thrashed this subject through.

I would like to offer my congratulations and to compliment the hon. members of the House who have taken part in the debate. It seems to me that we have had a very full and a very frank discussion of the principles involved in this bill, and indeed, a great deal of the particulars of the bill. Seldom do we reach the position in this House where we have an opportunity to have a rather clear distinction in the basic political thinking of the groups that make up this Legislature, of which we are all so fond. I am only disappointed, frankly, that I still do not know where the Liberal Party stands.

I was rather surprised at the hon. member for Riverdale when he invited them in. That is the first time I have heard, from his group, such an open invitation to the Liberals to join them. I have been very aware heretofore that the great effort was to push them away, but tonight he asked them to join his group and this may be the forerunner of great things. I do not know. But in any event, I am well aware of—

Mr. MacDonald: We invite you, too.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well you will never get us to join you, and of that I am certain. I know where the opposition is, and tonight I would just like to assure the last speaker that, when he asks me to think and consider, I can only assure him that the thinking and the considering was done before this bill was brought into the House.

There has been a great deal of repetition in this debate. I suppose this is to be expected because we have been told continuously, and of course I have read this in the press, and I have a sneaking suspicion it has something to do with the defeat of the last leader of the Liberal Party. But this continual harping on the fact that this bill, and what this government does, protects the insurance companies and the doctors is simply not so, and the lack of truth eventually finds you out.

We have been told that this bill represents a very high-cost, low-value insurance. We have heard a great deal of talk about the pension rates and various statistical facets of the insurance industry, all of which, in my view, has served primarily to befog the issue and to make it really difficult for anyone to understand what is being debated here. I will return to some of these points as I continue in my remarks, but I must make a point that we have had a good many red herrings, as my hon. friend from Woodbine is wont to remark about almost anything said on this side of the House.

Another feature of the debate that I have noticed, is the reliance of the Opposition on the Hall commission report. Indeed, the Hall commission report has been referred to by certain speakers on this side of the House and it reminds me of the theological argument, when one uses the Bible, because really, if one sets one's mind to it, it can be used to prove almost any point one wishes to make. You decide what your point is first and then find the points of view therein to buttress the same, rather than looking at what it says and drawing your conclusions from that.

The hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) in his very thoughtful and able address made the point well when he spoke of the obsession of the hon. members opposite with their views of a compulsory medical services insurance plan and their complete failure, really, to understand or to comprehend the fact that this volume and the one that follows it really deal with a total health care plan. It does not deal with a compulsory medical services plan; it deals with a total health care plan, and this is what is outlined in the Hall report and what this government proposes to implement.

There has been some recognition in the debate of the need for staging, but very little in any real deep or honest sense of the term. I think everyone recognizes that this cannot all be done at once. It would only be recognized that way if you had to do it. When we are having to do it you say we have not gone far enough, we should do it all at once. The whole secret of this report is the question of staging and planning, and working it out step by step. And while there is some recognition, to be honest, in the debate that this principle does exist in the report, I would suggest to you that it has been well played down and the major objection to the plan we advance here tonight in this bill is that we should go much farther and much faster, and in a more complete way.

When the hon. Minister made his introductory remarks, I think—in fact, I know full well—one of the key statements in his remarks, and I will quote it, is simply this:

So it is, Mr. Speaker, that the programme proposed in this bill cannot be taken as an isolated one. Rather, I submit, it must be read as an important and logical step forward in the context of all that has been done is now being done and is envisioned for the future for the well-being of our people.

And that is the key point, in my view, of his remarks and that is the key point in what we are doing with this bill.

I am going to suggest, quite frankly, that this has been completely ignored, this very basic point, in the remarks that have come from the other side of the House, and I intend to speak to the principle of this bill. I do not intend to speak in detail on it, but I think that really the fundamental basic principle of this bill has been completely overlooked in the remarks of the Opposition.

The major point upon which those opposing the bill have placed their arguments, is on the point of compulsion. I would suggest that their objection to this proposition and what is involved in this bill is based on this foundation and this foundation only. I think that they have failed to appreciate really what this bill means in terms of plans already conceived and carried out, plans in the process of being developed and plans that lie in the future. I think they have misrepresented Bill 136—whether intentionally or not, I do not comment.

If I can refer to this report, I would say first that in reading it, nobody can point out to me one instance where this report specifically and categorically recommends a compulsory programme of medical insurance for the people of Canada. Such a recommendation is simply not in this report. And, therefore, I say that it is impossible for hon. members to use this report—

Mr. Singer: Page 740.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If the hon. member sends me a note I will read 740 in due course. I have read the report several times.

I want to turn to the report's definition of the word "universal." I think of this in terms of the bill that we are presenting tonight. "Universal" means that adequate health services shall be available to all Canadians wherever they reside and whatever their financial resources may be, within the limitations imposed by geographic factors.

I will concede that the members of the Hall commission had very grave doubts in their own minds as to whether a voluntary plan, even if supplemented with assistance from the government, would be effective.

Mr. Bryden: They said it would not, specifically.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I say they had grave doubts. But I would make this point very clearly, that when the Hall commission members wrote this report and when they carried out their examinations and they looked at what was going on in Canada, there was no such plan in effect, so they

were not in fact dealing with any plan that existed. I would suggest this, too, and this has been said by many hon. speakers, of course, supporting the bill, that this is not by any wild stretch of the imagination, the be-all and end-all, as I have said before, and not the final answer to this problem. But nonetheless there are certain very basic principles in this bill; I think they are simple, and I think they are very sound. That is a good admission—

Mr. Sopha: It is an admission the bill is inadequate. The hon. Prime Minister has said it four times now.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course, if simple repetition would satisfy the hon. member, I have heard many things from him 150 times. All I say is that there are two principles in this bill: The first is that adequate medical services insurance be made available to people of limited financial means through the whole or partial subsidization of their premiums by government, and the second is that insurance carriers make available a standard contract to all the people of Ontario without regard to their state of health, age or any other consideration.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to make available adequate health services to all the people of Ontario, and I quote from the Hall report, "Wherever they reside and whatever their financial resources may be." And that is the basic principle of the bill.

I am convinced that taken in conjunction with other progressive steps that we have taken in the government—in the provision of hospital beds, training of medical practitioners, nurses and other paramedical personnel—this bill and these steps taken as a whole, not separated out and looked at one at a time, together really conform very closely with the objectives as set out in the report of the Royal commission on health services.

I would make one other comment on this report, and in this I would agree with the hon. member for Sudbury—I do occasionally. I think it is one of the most important reports that any Royal commission has produced in this country for a long time and I can assure him that I join with him in his hope—I believe he phrased it by saying he hoped it would not be put to gather dust in the archives—I can assure him, and I will go on to illustrate my point, that it is not the intention of this government that this report will be put in the archives to gather dust, and indeed, I would like to point out to hon. members that here we have done more

than any jurisdiction in Canada to implement the recommendations that are contained in this report.

Mr. MacDonald: Saskatchewan had this implemented years before the Hall report.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am so tired of hearing about Saskatchewan from the other side of this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we are very tired of hearing that kind of statement from the government side.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would just like to say that I consider that my responsibility lies to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: They do not even see through that.

Mr. Letherby: We would not put people in jail here.

Mr. Bryden: We do not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, section 2 of the recommendations deals with health personnel, facilities and research. I should like to read some of the recommendations contained in that section of the report, and then I am going to comment as far as this government is concerned upon the recommendations.

Recommendation 124 on page 67 says:

That there be established in each province a nursing education planning committee, advisory to the Minister of Health, to plan and direct the gradual and orderly development of nursing education.

In a statement that I made on October 29, 1964, which was about six or seven months after this report was published, I announced that a planning council on nurse education would be established in this province and it has been done.

To meet some other specific recommendations of the report in connection with nursing education, two other programmes have been introduced since then. The first is special programmes to prepare suitable personnel for the responsibility of teaching nurses, because if we are going to have nursing schools we must have those who can teach in them. Second, we have increased our grants for the construction of nurses' residences from \$2,000 per bed to \$3,200 per bed and this is to encourage the construction of nursing schools around hospitals.

In addition, we have put forward a programme to build in the province, three regional nursing schools, and we are encour-

aging the hospitals to push forward their programmes of training registered nursing assistants.

This might not be nearly as dramatic or interesting as to dream up hypothetical cases of what might happen to Charlie and Matthew, but these are things that are done, that are on their way.

Recommendation 140 on page 71 says:

That funds be allocated from the health facilities development fund—

which, I might say, is not yet established:

—to provide for one-half the cost of the required expansion and for renovation of medical schools now operating.

I am quoting recommendations from the Hall commission report, recommendation 141, page 71:

That funds be allocated from the health facilities development fund to provide for one-half the cost of construction of new medical schools.

Recommendation 142, page 71:

That the provisions of the hospital construction grant be amended to provide one-half the cost of hospital facilities for new university hospitals or for expansion or renovation of existing university affiliated hospitals, or teaching units in non-university hospitals.

Those are three recommendations contained in the report. Last October I made a statement concerning this as well, and I am going to repeat it, so that hon. members will understand that we are not a government that has disregarded the Hall report; and I said then:

For the past two years the government, through The Department of Health and the advisory committee on university affairs, has examined the question of the medical and dental teaching facilities that would be necessary if Ontario was to meet both its own needs and make its contribution to the Canadian nation in the future. A very thorough study of the problem has now been completed, certain recommendations have been made to the government and those recommendations have been accepted. The result will be that four major projects, recommended by the advisory committee on university affairs, will be undertaken on the campuses of our provincially assisted universities.

1. A new medical school, with basic teaching facilities will be established at McMaster University.

2. A new school of dentistry will be built at the University of Western Ontario

to operate in conjunction with the present school of medicine as a health sciences centre.

3. The medical school at the University of Toronto will be expanded and renovated so as to provide for the admission of an additional 75 first year medical students. At the same time a general upgrading of facilities and equipment will be undertaken.

4. A new health sciences building will be provided at Queen's University at Kingston and an extensive renovation of the present medical school facilities will be carried out. As a result the first year medical class will be increased in number to 75 at that institution.

The total cost of this programme will be approximately \$50 million and the programme will be administered by The Department of University Affairs. We feel that it will prove to be a sound investment in the future of our people and our province.

The expansion of accommodation and facilities in the medical and dental schools requires a complementary expansion of space and facilities in those hospitals associated with them. As part of the overall study of these resources in the province conducted by The Department of Health, every teaching hospital was visited and its facilities and needs inspected and discussed with the boards of these hospitals.

The great advances in medical and dental science have made necessary some marked changes in the physical setup of these hospitals—there is far more to the preparation of a modern doctor or dentist than was required even twenty-five years ago. A few of the hospitals whose facilities are available to the universities are reasonably well-equipped to meet the needs of the schools, but many of them have been unable to keep pace with the needs arising out of the advances in medical and dental sciences.

Accordingly, the government is setting up a programme of special grants to assist hospitals associated with our medical and dental schools. This programme, estimated at \$64 million, is planned to go forward in stages and the first of these will call for special grants of \$3,602,250 in the next fiscal year. From then on, the construction and renovation projects will move at a greatly accelerated rate to completion, probably in 1968-69.

The hospitals connected with the following medical schools will receive special

grants under this programme: University of Ottawa, Queen's University, University of Western Ontario, University of Toronto.

In addition, two new teaching hospitals will be constructed on university campuses as part of this programme. These hospitals will be associated with McMaster University in Hamilton and the University of Western Ontario in London. This step was also recommended by the advisory committee on university affairs.

Now I repeat this only to point out that what we are doing with Bill 136 is simply placing another brick in the foundation of what we plan to be a total health care programme.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There is a great deal more to be done, of course. New programmes are needed and new programmes are now in the planning stage. I have no doubt, that as time goes on improvements will be required and will be possible in the bill that we have introduced here and to which I am speaking this evening. As the hon. Minister of Health pointed out, we have said several times that this is not, and I will say it again, not the end of the road; and it is not the end of the road of this government either.

I presume that when we do bring this programme to a further stage of completion, five or six years from now, we will be standing in the same place explaining it to the same people.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Maybe that little line over there will have disappeared, I do not know, it may be gone by then. I do not know whether they are going to move over or how it is going to happen, but they are going to rob other hon. members blind if they are not careful.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, may we return to the subject of health services? There is a reference in the Hall commission report to financial participation of the federal government, and our legislation is in line with the position taken by the commissioners. Hon. members can find it on page 14, and it says:

The responsibility for leadership must be accepted by the federal government and plans made so as to ensure that every phase of the development of the programme

is consistent with its overall objective. The unity of the programme and its application to all Canadians must be safeguarded.

This is the real key; this is what this report means. It does not mean compulsory medical services and insurance to be imposed in the province of Ontario today or tomorrow, it means the totality of a health care programme. I can only suggest that as yet we have not seen the leadership from Ottawa.

This is the essential feature of the Hall commission report, which I think is illustrated by the quote I made. It envisages the development of a comprehensive medical services programme which could be worked jointly—and I believe this can be illustrated and I will not bother to do it—by the opinions of the commissioners. They looked towards a programme to be worked out jointly by the federal government and the provinces with planned staging of various programmes which would in 1967 culminate in a programme that could then, if properly implemented, according to their opinion, in the ideas expressed by these men, culminate in a total health care programme for our country.

A year has gone by and there is little evidence to date of any commitment by the federal government. I can only say, as I have said before, that we felt we could not wait. We have taken the steps which I announced last October and outlined to the House again tonight. In this bill we have taken a further step along this road.

In the debate here tonight, Ontario has been called perhaps the fulcrum, or perhaps the key point, in the development of a national health programme. It has been suggested that we will set the pattern for all of Canada, and of course this has been used to buttress the argument that we are going the wrong way. I would agree that Ontario plays a very important part in the national scene as far as an overall national health programme is concerned. I would suggest to hon. members that we have already taken the lead by developing within this province an overall health programme with staging as set out, at least to some degree, in the Hall commission report.

We have increased our grants to all types of hospitals and we have increased our grants to research. We have, as I have said, taken these steps to develop not only medical doctors, but paramedical personnel.

I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition has commented in reference to Bill 136. I believe one of his remarks referred to it as a dead-end bill. He said that it would

effectively block any future attempt to introduce a broader type of medical insurance, if it may be deemed necessary in the circumstances that may arise in the future. Well, with all the charity that I can muster, I can only suggest that either he has not read the bill or if he has read it, he really does not understand it, because as far as we are concerned in the government, we think that this bill provides a great degree of flexibility. This seems to be the point that is bothering my hon. friend, the member for Sudbury. He really wants me to say, I suppose, that with this we have brought all our endeavours in this field to an end, because every time I say that this might be a beginning and we might go on from here, he says that is the fifth or sixth time he has heard it, but I repeat it because it is true and it refutes completely the argument advanced that this is a dead-end bill and that it will in any way prove to be a block to whatever may be developed in the future. We agree that there are two groups in the province at the moment who cannot avail themselves of medical insurance. There are those who cannot afford to purchase it because of financial limitations and those, although they have the financial means, are denied insurance because of the state of health, or age, or other factors. This bill rectifies the situation as far as both these groups are concerned.

But it does not, in any way, restrict or limit any further action on the part of this government to introduce any further changes we might want in this system. It does not block us in any way from conferring with the federal government and co-operating with them, if we think that the plan is proper and right. There is nothing in this bill that will in any way limit the freedom of action of this government in proceeding along the road where we have already taken several major steps.

There has been an attempt, I think, by the Opposition to paint a glowing picture that there is a rising tide of enthusiasm in our country and our province for a compulsory, government-operated medical insurance plan. Let us take a look at the facts. I am going to mention here this word "Saskatchewan," and I assure you I only use it for purposes of illustration and will not mention it again. Such a plan was tried there and it resulted in two things, and I do not think anybody can deny this: The first was a revolution among the doctors; and the second was the defeat of the government. Believe me, that is the greatest expression of public opinion in existence. When the people rise up and

turn out the government, they obviously do not like what it has done.

Mr. MacDonald: All parties are in support of it, including the Tory party in Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not know there was one.

Mr. MacDonald: To the extent that there is a Tory party in Saskatchewan.

An hon. member: There is no ND Party.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, just to complete the illustration of my point, there have been two other provinces which have introduced forms of coverage such as this—British Columbia and Alberta. And I would just point out to you that neither of these provinces have followed the example of Saskatchewan. I just put this forward because the hon. member for Sudbury, who is a very astute trial lawyer, will know that it is the evidence from which conclusions are drawn.

And I would say this to you, that in this country at the present time we are experimenting in the whole field of social services. I think the great pension debate is a good example. I deplore always, and will forever, that it was thrown gratuitously into a provincial election campaign. I think in the final analysis this did the plan no good, however, we fought our way through that. But I think that this, too, was an experiment. The federal government produced three separate plans, all of which differed. I have no real objection to this; I am just happy that they did not pass the first one, because we had some refinements in the second plan and further refinements in the third plan. Even it, in my view, was not a very good one, but it was certainly a lot better than the first plan.

But I think in this area, too, there are experiments being carried out in our country and I think it behooves us to move relatively slowly in order to build a social foundation. We are of the opinion that the people of Canada are trying to work out what will be an acceptable approach to the people of the country from coast to coast in dealing with this great social problem we have.

We on this side of the House advance a proposition and an idea. I am pleased that it has been received as it has, and as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I think the debate here cannot be anything other than fruitful in the final development of what will come.

But I do say that if we are to play this part, as the province of Ontario, I would consider it a very great mistake to introduce into the Legislature at this stage—in the history of this particular situation and in the history of our country at the present moment—a bill and a plan which would commit us irrevocably to one direction.

Once again, my hon. friend from Sudbury can add another chalk because I am going to repeat that we have here a flexible plan that will permit alteration. It is doing two fundamental things. Starting in 1966 it will look after people in this province who need to be looked after. I will suggest to you that so far very little has been accomplished other than by this province. If all of the Hall commission recommendations were done, you still could not have a plan before 1971; whereas we will be looking after our people in this province, who need looking after, by 1966.

And I would say this, too, Mr. Speaker, we will gain in knowledge and we will gain in experience. There is not a doubt in my mind that we will consult with the federal government and we will consult with the other provinces of Canada in dealing with this particular problem that is on the agenda—although not in any very specific way—for the next federal-provincial conference. I think that with the experience we will gain, with what we propose here, we will be in a better position to judge and weigh propositions that may be made to us. We will be in a better position, and I say this unabashedly, to negotiate with the federal government, and we will be in a better position to look after the interests of the people of this province, and we will be in a better position to look after the interests of the people of Canada, as far as we have that responsibility as a provincial government.

Finally, as I have said, in the meantime while these discussions are continuing, and while these matters are being examined on a national basis, we will have provided care for our people, five years earlier than it could have come any other way.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of comments I want to make concerning some of the somewhat confused thinking that in my view has come from the other side of the House. I listened with interest to the remarks of my friend, the hon. member for Parkdale, whom I consider to be a magnificent Gladstonian Liberal. He went on at great length, charging that this government was going to squander public money for the benefit of the insurance companies. If I have ever heard

and listened to a broken record, Mr. Speaker, this was it. I have listened to this now for about two and a half years. Just because there is an insurance company having a head office in the city I come from, the attempt has been made to paint me as the great supporter. I remember the erstwhile leader of the Opposition when he made comments about this during the last election and all I can say is that it did not get him very far. Even though this remark has been laughed at, I will say it here, and I will say it again, and I will say it as many times as they choose to say that I am a tool of the insurance companies: There is not one single penny of public money that will go to any insurance company under this plan.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Not directly.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I just cannot understand whether this is a political ploy, or whether they really believe what they say, because if they read the bill this is so obvious. It just simply cannot. It is impossible.

The other thing that has interested me in this whole discussion about insurance companies is the complete disregard, really, of who is going to provide. Who are the carriers? Who are involved in the carriers of this province?

In 1962, in this province, there were 2.6 million people—that is the last year for which I can get complete figures—there were 2.6 million people covered by medical services insurance policies, administered by non-profit plans, operated by either the doctors or the co-operatives operating these plans in this province—2.6 million people, and those hon. members sit there and say that we are handing all this to the insurance companies. Have they never heard of the co-operatives? Have they never heard of PSI? Have they never heard of AMS? They so conveniently forget this in their argument that they drive me reluctantly into only one conclusion, and that is that they want to use this for political purposes.

These 2.6 million people in this province will continue, I assume, if they are satisfied, to be covered by the non-profit carriers, and Physicians' Services Incorporated, Associated Medical Services and Windsor Medical Services Incorporated—I knew my hon. friend would get a mention of Windsor in there some place. Then there is a non-profit doctor-sponsored plan which operates in Quebec and comes into Ontario in certain areas; then there is CUMBA, Co-operative Health Services in Metropolitan Toronto, and there are 34 medical co-operatives operating in this prov-

ince that are organized on a county basis. There is one in my own county; there is one in Lambton county. I will just repeat for the third time: They cover 2.6 million, but I did not hear one word about these. All I heard was, "You are handing it all to the insurance companies." What absolute nonsense.

I will make one other point. The insurance companies must compete with these non-profit carriers.

Mr. Trotter: That is what costs money.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is that old Gladstonian Liberal. I just say to him that if the private carriers, if the insurance companies, wish to come in and compete with the non-profit carriers, I think it will be a good thing for everybody.

Mr. Trotter: Twenty-eight cents on the dollar.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course that figure is absolutely wrong. I am not going to go through the figures. We have heard them a number of times in this debate, but none so deaf as those who will not listen.

Sir, I could continue for another hour but after the very gracious way in which my hon. friend gave up his last hour of debate, I will do the same. I would just say this, in final and absolute conclusion—

Mr. Sopha: What about the Hagey report?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would just say that in my view the Opposition has failed completely and absolutely to grasp the intent of this bill, of its position in the programme of this government. As I sat here, and I have listened to every single speaker who has spoken in this debate, in my view the hon. members just simply have not got the import of what we are doing or where it fits.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no import.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: A perfect illustration, Mr. Speaker, of my point. I would say this, that I am going to ask all of them—and I am quite sure after my remarks that they now understand exactly what I am speaking about,—to forget this amendment for the following reasons:

First, the amendment fails completely to take into account the necessity for the proper staging of a total health services plan, as set out in this volume. Second, the amendment fails to appreciate the principles and purpose of Bill 136. Third, it is essential that Ontario adopt a flexible position in the field of health services to facilitate the development of a

national plan and not, at this time, commit itself to any scheme which would hinder the co-operative development of a national health services plan in the future.

Mr. Sopha: Not a word about the Hagey report. Not a single syllable.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: When the members feel they are finished with their interjections, I shall put the amendment which is before the House.

The amendment before the House at the present time was moved by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mr. Oliver. I do not think I should have to read it again. It was read at the time it was presented. Following the vote on the amendment, we shall take a vote on the main motion.

All those in favour of the amendment, as moved by Mr. Thompson will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Before we take the vote I would ask members to give their co-operation to the Clerk and the assistant Clerk of the House. It is most difficult for the assistant Clerk to call the names if there are many interjections, and it is most difficult for the Clerk to record these. I would ask members to give both the Clerk and the assistant Clerk their co-operation.

Call in the members.

YEAS	NAYS
Bryden	Allan
Davison	Bales
Farquhar	Beckett
Freeman	Boyer
Gisborn	Brown
Lewis	Brunelle
(Scarborough West)	Butler
MacDonald	Carruthers
Newman	Carton
Nixon	Cecile
Oliver	Connell
Paterson	Davis
Racine	Demers
Reaume	Downer
Renwick	Dunlop
Sargent	Dymond
Singer	Eagleson
Sopha	Edwards
Spence	Evans
Taylor	Ewen
Thompson	Gomme

YEAS
Trotter
Whicher
Worton
Young—24

NAYS
Grossman
Guindon
Hamilton
Harris
Hodgson
(Scarborough East)
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Johnston
(Parry Sound)
Johnston
(Carleton)
Kerr
Knox
Lawrence
(Russell)
Lawrence
(St. George)
Letherby
Lewis
(Humber)
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Olde
Peck
Pittock
Price
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Simonett
Spoonier
Stewart
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardrope
Welch
Wells
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yakabuski
Yaremko—66

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 24, the "nays" 66.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the amendment has been defeated and we turn now to the

main motion. I wish to make certain comments with regard to that main motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps I could permit the member to make his remarks on a point of order, as he has been good enough to give me notice of what he intended to do, but I would point out to him at the present time that as far as I understand, our procedure upon the defeat of the amendment that was before the House, that made the part of the question decided, that the words, and I quote: "the bill be now read a second time," stand part of the question. In my opinion, these words cannot be amended or changed at this time or deleted.

Now, I know that Rule 56 says this:

If on an amendment to the question that the bill be now read a second time or a third time, it is decided that the word "now" or any words proposed to be left out stand part of the question, the Speaker shall forthwith declare the bill to be read a second or third time as the case may be. Except in the case of hoist motions—

this rule has been varied by precedent, of which the hon. member is aware. It has happened several times in the House, not only in this session but also the last session, and it is now the practice of this House to permit a vote on the motion for second reading after defeat of the amendment. But that is as far as the variation extends, to my knowledge.

Therefore, as soon as the amendment has been defeated, I have always been of the opinion that the main motion should then be put forthwith, without any further amendment or motions from any member.

Now, after having said that, I am willing to let the member, on a point of order, explain his position on the matter.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your courtesy in this matter. The last point in what you said was said, I think, just a moment ago for the first time ever in this House.

It will be recalled that on a number of occasions in this House I have argued that the defeat of an amendment on second reading automatically carries the main motion. You, in your wisdom, sir, have ruled that I was incorrect; that even though that may be the rule set forth in the rule book, the practice in the House is that, except on hoist motions, there is a separate vote on the amendment and on the main motion.

This group here did not agree with your ruling, but we accepted it. We believe in

accepting the Speaker's rulings, even if they are to our disadvantage. There was one case not very long ago where it was clearly to our disadvantage to accept that ruling, but we accepted it. But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if your ruling was correct there, then it is a logical corollary that follows as night from day, that the main motion is subject to debate. If a motion is subject to a separate vote, it is subject to a separate debate.

Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt the member just for a moment, to point out that the leader of the Opposition was the first member to speak on the main motion and that was after the ancillary motion was made by the Minister, "that the bill be now read a second time." Then the leader of the Opposition spoke. At the conclusion of his speech he made an amendment to the motion which was placed before the House. At that time it was agreed that members speaking thereafter would be speaking both to the bill and to the amendment—

Mr. Bryden: There was no such agreement!

Mr. Speaker: I remember being asked this question by a member and I believe I pointed out to the member at the time and I agreed he could speak to both the amendment and the bill at the same time and that would be the procedure that we would follow—something the same as was followed in the Budget debates.

The member spoke on the bill and never on the amendment really when he was speaking, because he brought forth many different viewpoints on the various principles within the bill; so I consider that he has spoken on the main motion.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that there was no such agreement. This is the first I have heard of it and I think it is the first time any member of our group has heard of it. This is an entirely novel ruling that appears to be in the process of being made. We previously had a ruling from which it logically followed that the amendment and the main motion are separable. All of us, except the hon. leader of the Opposition, spoke to the amendment. If we were not speaking to the amendment, we should have been ruled out of order. That is what the debate was on; it was on the amendment.

Now, the main motion is still before the House and I submit, sir, that on the basis of your previous ruling, it is open to debate.

It would be quite unfair and unreasonable to rule otherwise at a time when your ruling will now be to our advantage if it is consistent with the ruling made earlier that was to our disadvantage. I submit to you, sir, that you should permit debate to continue.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate the member's viewpoint, but I differ from him on this. I have been of the opinion throughout this debate that members were speaking both on the bill and on the amendment that are before the House. In view of this I do not think I should allow the debate to continue further. I have allowed the member to raise the point regarding his wish to speak to the main motion.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to this point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Would the member wait until I am finished?

In view of our former procedure I had not intended that we continue with any further debate on the main motion but that it should be put forthwith, and to the best of my knowledge that has been the precedent that we have established over the last couple of years, except on the occasion of hoist motions.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I wish to draw to your attention, sir, in deference to what you have said, is that under the practice of the House, the government prepares the order paper and the government, in virtue of its majority, has the right to call the order of business. In that context, I draw your attention to the seventh order that we are debating today, and the government has decreed that the seventh order is as follows:

7. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading, Bill 136—

Accordingly, the House is bound by the terms of the order paper, which the government, according to the rules of Parliament, decreed shall be the regulation of business. Accordingly, sir, we in this House cannot change the order of business as on the order paper, and I submit to you that my hon. friend from Woodbine is perfectly correct that all of the debate up to this point has been on the amendment, in accordance with the order of business set out by the government.

Mr. Speaker: The member is not correct, in my view; and I would remind him that it is the Clerk, not the government, who prepares the order paper.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: I wondered for a moment where I was, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to have to rise and say that we are going to have to challenge the ruling that you have announced, and I do this regretfully. I want to underline why we are doing it, Mr. Speaker. We are now—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: We are now, Mr. Speaker, tying the rules of this House in a knot. You chose, earlier in this session, to describe what you call a "variation" in the practice of this House by saying that when an amendment on second reading was defeated it did not automatically carry the motion—

Mr. Speaker: Except on a hoist.

Mr. MacDonald: Except on a hoist. This has been the traditional rule in Parliament—May and everywhere else—all down through history, and you, Mr. Speaker, chose to change it.

We have accepted your ruling; you cannot now reverse it when it happens to be to our advantage. Otherwise, the rules are used and developed to suit the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, if I may draw to your attention, as proof of the fact that the rules are being made as we proceed—tonight for the first time we learned that as a corollary to the proposition that an amendment on the second motion did not automatically carry the bill, the two motions are put together. This was not announced in earlier debates; this is a new development. It is a new development, I submit, on a pattern which is completely at variance with history, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have no alternative but to protect the rights of the Opposition in this House. I challenge your ruling and I do it regretfully.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I draw your attention to page 133 of the precedents of Mr. Lewis, in which he refers to this very question? It was the same question on third reading, mind you, but it was exactly the same question in which, at that time, the Speaker of the day made exactly the same ruling that you are now making at this time.

Mr. Bryden: That was on a hoist motion.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: No, sir, it was not on a hoist motion, it was to refer it to the committee for further consideration and it was not a hoist motion whatsoever. That is exactly the intent of the motion here.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. I must say that in deference to the member for York South—now, we have not been doing this down through the years—the rule as it stands in May is, and I will read it:

Limitation on questions to be proposed on second or third reading: Under the provisions, if on an amendment to the question for the second or third reading of a bill, the House determines that the word “now” or any other words proposed to be left out of the question shall stand part of the question, the Speaker is directed forthwith to declare that the bill has been read a second or a third time, as the case may be.

As I said before, that is the strict ruling of the British House, but during the last number of years—and I think it was the member for Woodbine who debated a subamendment a few years ago, before my term of office, and brought about the precedent and we have been varying from this rule since—when a motion that is not a hoist motion is made by precedent we have then asked the main motion to be brought forward, and given members an opportunity to vote on the main motion as well as the amendment. But there was no debate on the occasion, and the Speaker called the main motion forthwith as we did on the indemnity bill or the bills to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, which was before the House prior to the Easter holiday.

Mr. Bryden: But nobody asked to debate it, sir. Since you referred to my previous conduct, may I say that on any occasion when I protested in the past about variation from the rule, which is the rule laid down in May and in our own rule book—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is my understanding that the Speaker's ruling is not debatable and I—

Mr. MacDonald: Has he made a ruling?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, reference was made to what I had done in the past. To the best of my knowledge and recollection, on any occasion when there was a departure from the rule that the two were one motion dealt with in one vote, I always protested, but I was overruled so many times that I

finally gave up. Now I am suggesting that we should accept the logical corollary that the main motion and amendment being two separate motions, may be debated separately.

Mr. Speaker: I am of the opinion that the debate was on the main motion and the amendment throughout and I am going to rule that I do now call the main motion to be voted upon, and if the members wish to appeal my ruling, they may do so.

Mr. MacDonald: I have no alternative, under the circumstances, but to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the Speaker's ruling will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion the “ayes” have it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

All those in favour of the Speaker's ruling will please rise.

All those opposed to the Speaker's ruling will please rise.

YEAS

Allan
Bales
Beckett
Boyer
Brown
Brunelle
Butler
Carruthers
Carton
Cecile
Connell
Davis
Demers
Downer
Dunlop
Dymond
Eagleson
Edwards
Evans
Ewen
Gomme
Grossman
Guindon
Hamilton
Harris
Hodgson

NAYS

Bryden
Davison
Farquhar
Freeman
Gaunt
Gisborn
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
MacDonald
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Paterson
Racine
Reaume
Renwick
Sargent
Singer
Sopha
Spence
Taylor
Thompson
Trotter
Whicher
Worton
Young—25.

(Scarborough East)
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Johnston
(Parry Sound)
Johnston
(Carleton)

YEAS

Kerr
 Knox
 Lawrence
 (Russell)
 Lawrence
 (St. George)
 Letherby
 Lewis
 (Humber)
 Mackenzie
 MacNaughton
 Morningstar
 McKeough
 McNeil
 Noden
 Olde
 Peck
 Pittock
 Price
 Reilly
 Reuter
 Robarts
 Roberts
 Rollins
 Root
 Rowe
 Rowntree
 Simonett
 Spooner
 Stewart
 Villeneuve
 Walker
 Wardrope
 Welch
 Wells
 White
 Whitney
 Wishart
 Yakabuski
 Yaremko—66.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 66, the "nays" 25.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the appeal lost.

All those in favour of the main motion that the bill be read a second time, please say "aye". All those opposed, please say "nay".

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise now under the rules. Notice of motion has been given to the Clerk by my colleague, the hon. member for Scarborough West, that upon the calling of the order for the committee of the whole House he will move that the following instruction be given to the committee, namely, that it has the power to consider and make recommendations to amend Bill 136 to provide: 1. That a fund

be established to which shall be paid all money necessary to provide—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I cannot conceive of what the member is trying to do at this time because we have not had a vote on the main motion as yet.

Mr. MacDonald: We just finished voting on the main motion.

Mr. Speaker: We voted on the member's appeal of the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: And then we voted on the main motion, by agreement to reversing the vote.

Mr. Speaker: No one said anything.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister said "reverse vote"; we clearly understood him to say that.

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, yes; I did say that. I was not aware that anyone agreed with me. The hon. member was on his feet talking, but if he agrees we could take the same vote as being in support of the main motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the same vote be taken as on the amendment? Only in the reverse order.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

An hon. member: Now what is the hon. member going to do?

Mr. MacDonald: I have indicated what I am going to do. In accordance with the rules laid down by May, I have given a notice of motion that upon calling of the order for the committee of the whole House, it will be moved that the following instruction be given to the committee, namely:

That it has the power to consider and make recommendations to amend Bill 136 to provide:

1. That a fund be established into which shall be paid all money necessary to provide fully comprehensive medical insurance contracts to persons designated in Sections 6 and 7 of the bill and in this motion, and that the said contracts be issued and said fund administered by the hospital services commission of Ontario.

2. That government support according to an appropriate sliding scale be made available to provide comprehensive contracts

to those whose taxable income does not exceed \$3,000 per year.

3. That all residents—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is this a money bill?

Mr. MacDonald: No, it is not.

3. That all residents of the province, whether or not referred to in paragraph 2, be entitled to receive comprehensive contracts from the commission upon voluntary payment by them into the fund of appropriate contributions as determined by the commission; and that issuance of such contracts and payments of such contributions be required in respect of those for whom coverage is mandatory under The Hospital Services Commission Act and regulations.

4. That provision be made to cover prescribed drugs, at least for pensioners, persons for whom continuing drug therapy is required after discharge from hospital and persons for whom long-term drug therapy is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time to read here tonight, but set out in the document that I have given to you are the references to the rules which clearly indicate that this is in order. I would just suggest to the House—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member? Might we have the courtesy of a copy of his document?

Mr. MacDonald: I would be very glad to give him a copy.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member has asked us for copies in the past during the entire session of this House; might we have the courtesy of a copy?

Mr. MacDonald: We will be very glad to give the hon. Minister the courtesy. Does the hon. Minister want the courtesy or does he want to argue?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member has not given it yet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member is giving a notice of motion, which he has filed with the Clerk and which he may do. It is not a motion which has to come before the House at this time. The member is filing a notice of motion with the Clerk. I would ask members to wait until he is finished.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I rise on a point of privilege: Earlier in this session some great point was made about the courtesy to be extended to the hon. members of the Opposition by the government with respect to important matters, motions or bills brought before the House. Now we on the government side have endeavoured to collaborate and to co-operate with that request. We have given copies of notices, copies of bills. Here tonight, on one of the most important debates that the House has had during the current session, at this hour, we have what cannot be described as something that arose at this very moment, but something which has been typed long beforehand; and we have not even had the courtesy of having a copy sent to us.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a one-way street with respect to the handling of the business of this House. The hon. members of the official Opposition endeavour to co-operate with government and give us copies of their bills or statements which they have to make. We have not had one copy of that notice, which is typed, but the press here tonight has had it and it has been distributed. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the conduct that is being demonstrated by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party is a flagrant abuse of the privileges of the House; indeed is an insult to the members of the government.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is so wrong!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is so right!

I put this to the hon. member: The information that we have is readily available to all hon. members of the House long before the press sitting in the gallery have had it brought to their attention.

The press gallery has been a favourite weapon for the members of the NDP. The secretarial staff wander through the press gallery and give out material long before this House has ever been notified. We are talking about the ordinary courtesies that go along with the conduct of business.

Mr. Speaker: I may say that perhaps the Minister speaking to the point of order, has brought out a very good point, in that when there is an intention to file a notice of motion with the Clerk, that before the member rises and reads the notice of motion, which I doubt is in order, but which he has filed with the Clerk, perhaps it should not be given to anyone else before it is given to the Clerk and perhaps to the leader of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. After listening to that unctuous

outburst from the other side, let us get the facts straight.

Notice of this motion was given to the Clerk quite some time ago.

Clerk of the House: At 11 o'clock!

Mr. MacDonald: At 11 o'clock. Okay, that is an hour and ten minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member has the floor, and he does not have to yield it until he completes his point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: I have the floor on a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member is already on a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: And my point of order is simply this, Mr. Speaker, that it was given to the press only after I rose in this House, and it was given to the House leader as soon as he requested it. If we get that kind of service in the future we will be very pleased.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: But not before—

Mr. MacDonald: What does the hon. Minister mean, not before? We will give it to you just as quickly as you ask for it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Why the hon. member would not even give the government the courtesy of the notice of a typed document and that is why we are not going to ever see them be the government of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here since 1951—

An hon. member: That is too long.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order. I might ask the Minister to speak to the point of order, as briefly as possible.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: My point is this. I direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to rule 39 of the rules of this House, of which the Opposition is supposed to be the expert, and it deliberately flaunted rule 39 tonight. The rule says:

Such notice to be laid on the table before 5 o'clock, p.m.

The hon. member did not do this.

Mr. Speaker: I rule all other points of order out of order and ask for the next order of business.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, and I have a feeling it is time we all went home, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Education. Between five and six o'clock in the afternoon we will debate the other public bills and orders; and I would like to do this again on Thursday afternoon, between the hours of five and six o'clock in the afternoon.

At two o'clock tomorrow afternoon, we will commence the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he will indicate what motions will be discussed in that hour?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think we better start with number one and work our way through.

Mr. Oliver: Well, that seems a very reasonable way.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.15 o'clock, a.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 2, 1965

Final report, standing committee on standing orders and printing, Mr. Ewen	3565
Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	3565
Liquor Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading	3565
Liquor Licence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, first reading	3566
Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	3572
Introducing Hon. Ronald Mack, Minister of Health for the state of Victoria, Commonwealth of Australia, Mr. Dymond	3572
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis	3572
Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, on second reading	3596
Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, bill to amend, Mr. Freeman, on second reading	3603
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3606

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the Speaker's gallery, members of the women's Progressive-Conservative association, Kingston township; under the Speaker's gallery, members of the women's Liberal association, Etobicoke, and in the west gallery, members of the Grimsby ladies society, Grimsby.

We are also pleased to welcome the students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Belfountain public school, Belfountain, and the safety patrol of Princess Margaret public school, Orangeville; and in the east gallery, Stuart Scott public school, Newmarket.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth), from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's third and final report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the customary supplies allowance for the current session of the assembly be fixed at \$100.

Your committee recommends that copies of the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*, the *Canadian Almanac* and *Canada Year Book* be purchased for distribution to hon. members of the assembly and also that each hon. member be given a year's subscription to the *Labour Gazette* and the *Municipal World*.

Your committee recommends that the following sessional papers be printed for departmental use and distribution: Accounts, public, 1,650; Agriculture, federated colleges, Guelph, report, 2,000; Agricultural research institute, report, 3,000; Agriculture, Department of, Minister's report, 2,000; Arts council, 5,000; Auditor's report, 350; Civil service department, report, 500; Education, Minister's report, 3,700; Estimates, 1,400; Highways Department, report, 775; Labour,

Department of, report, 2,000; Lands and Forests, 1,350; Legal offices, report of inspector, 575; Liquor control board, 675; Mines, 6,500; Niagara parks commission, report, 400; Ontario Northland transportation commission, report, 475; Police, provincial, report of commissioner, 300; Public Welfare, Department of, report, 1,300; Public Works, Department of, report, 450; Reform Institutions, Department of, report, part 1, 1,675; part 2, 1,675; Transport, Minister's report, 750; Tourism and Information, Department of, report, 2,000; Veterinary college, report, 1,000; Workmen's compensation board, report, 2,175.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO MENTAL HEALTH FOUNDATION ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Act is very brief. It is to shorten the name Dr. C. K. Clark institute of psychiatry to the Clark institute of psychiatry, and to revise its organization to give the institute powers as to admission, treatment, discharge of patients and related matters.

THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and the indulgence of the hon. members of the House, I propose to introduce another bill and then deal with the two at the same time.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the Acts which I have introduced are two that the hon. members of this House and the general public, I think, will have a great deal of interest in. I should like to give the purport of the various portions of the bill in a fair amount of detail, trying to keep it as brief as possible to accomplish the purpose of the explanation.

The Acts which it is proposed to amend by the bills introduced have served the people of this province well, but as always this government is anxious that legislation keep pace with the times. It is in this spirit, therefore, that we propose these amendments so that our administration will be in keeping with the needs of the people in this second half of the 20th century.

All matters relating to liquor have been given a most thorough going over, both by the specific responsible authorities and by the government generally. Consideration has been given to many briefs, formal and informal presentations, and criticisms and suggestions noted in the press and as expressed by members of the public and the hon. members of this Legislature. There has not been such a general overhaul of the Acts since they were first passed, though a considerable number of changes occurred in 1962 and during the period since.

The first bill introduced is in respect of The Liquor Control Act. It is this Act that has to do with the control of sale and consumption of liquor in other than licensed premises—matters related to the latter coming within the scope of The Liquor Licence Act which is the second bill. The liquor control bill, with 80 amending sections of varying degrees of significance, provides for a simplified Act. The Act in its revised form is an instrument which will provide for the legitimate distribution and sale of alcoholic beverages and at the same time maintain in the hands of the government, the effective control of such distribution and sale.

The new proposals respecting The Liquor Control Act fall within the following categories:

A. Changes made necessary by the earlier discontinuance of individual permits, resulting in deletion of whole sections and parts thereof, wherein references are made to such permits.

B. Changes made necessary by the renaming of "Vendors" as "Managers."

C. Changes to define, to clarify and to remove redundancy and verbiage.

D. Changes updating several provisions, eliminating others which are no longer required, nor valid, nor currently applicable and to make departmental practice developed as a result of experience, legislative requirement—for example, the audit section.

E. Changes in principle are summarized in the following items, and I think these are the portions which will be of interest presently to hon. members of the House:

Item (1) Ontario wine to include that produced from apples and other fruits in addition to the cherries and grapes now utilized, so that all our fruits may be utilized.

Item (2) Definition of liquor is confined to drinkable liquids, and a new subsection is incorporated into the Act respecting the control of possession, selling and keeping for sale of preparations, combinations or mixtures capable of human consumption that contain alcohol.

Item (3) The requirement that, in all cases, persons must have baggage or personal effects in hotel suites is removed. In a great number of cases persons engage suites at hotels for business meetings and social functions, and we are now meeting this need.

Item (4) An item is in the bill as a proposal to repeal the board's power of expropriation. The board has never exercised this power, is not likely to do so and machinery is available under The Expropriation Procedures Act to acquire property in this way, if necessary.

Item (5) A right is being inserted into the Act to allow for a stated case on a point of law and thus afford such an appeal from a board decision.

Item (6) The board's practice of giving a hearing prior to cancellation, suspension or refusal with reference to licences and permits; and that there be no cancellation of the licence of a brewer, distiller or producer of Ontario wine without a hearing, will now be a statutory requirement. There is provision made under a new section giving a right of appeal to distillers, and so on, when a licence is cancelled.

Item (7) There is a section respecting interdiction and this will provide for appeal from the following orders of the board: prohibiting any person from purchasing, having, giving or consuming liquor; prohibiting vendors, brewers, distillers, producers of Ontario wine and licencees from supplying liquor to any such person; limiting the kind and

quantities of liquor which may be purchased by a person either for home consumption or in licensed premises.

Item (8) In respect of orders of interdiction, the powers of making and revoking such orders are extended to a judge of the juvenile and family court and magistrates. That is now limited to a judge of the county or district courts.

A judge of the juvenile and family court who quite often has before him situations which may have been caused by over-indulgence of liquor and a justice who hears a charge against an individual are both in a good position to determine as to whether or not an order of interdiction should be made against the persons appearing before them.

Item (9) In respect of the fines, penalties which may have been adequate when the Act first became effective have been increased, and this covers more than a half dozen sections.

Item (10) The sections respecting the penalty sections of the Act are brought in line with the provisions of section 11 of The Summary Convictions Act which, in turn, provides: that the justice may impose up to a specified maximum fine in lieu of imprisonment, notwithstanding the fact that under the relevant Act, such as The Liquor Control Act, there is a mandatory jail sentence. Now, under the amendment, the justice will be empowered to impose a fine and/or jail sentence, and the maximum is increased with no minimum for all offences so that the judge will have full discretion.

Item (11) The present disqualification of premises for a conviction sometimes have unfair unrelated effects and the procedures are clarified.

Item (12) The sections relating to "search and seizure" are gathered together with a basic change of principle that such actions are to be based on "reasonable grounds for belief" rather than the present "suspicion or belief."

Item (13) There is a proposal to repeal sections which allowed the Crown to indicate in any information that an accused person had been previously convicted; such a procedure being contrary to the principles of accepted Canadian justice specific to section 696 (2) of the criminal code. The customary procedure can be followed that, after conviction, information concerning previous convictions could be given to the presiding judge by the Crown prior to sentence. In conjunction with this, the whole machinery respecting second offences is repealed.

The next few items are of import, not only in this Act, but in the light of the administration of justice generally.

It has become apparent that some sections designed initially to meet a particular situation have been interpreted as to suggest the possibility of an infringement upon the ordinary rights of a citizen that are his under the general principle of our laws that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty.

Now our citizens will be able to go into court with the assurance that they will not be confronted with any extraordinary procedures. To put it simply, they will be dealt with under procedures which have been accepted as those which have proven to be right and fair when a citizen runs afoul of any law.

Item (14) (i) This item deals with the fact that the very unfair provisions in the Act, relating to defences, putting the onus on the accused, are being repealed.

As soon as it appears to a justice trying a case that circumstances in evidence sufficiently establish the offence complained of, he shall put the defendant on his defence and in default of a rebuttal of such evidence to the satisfaction of the justice, convict him accordingly. Though this section does not place upon the accused the onus of proving his defence beyond a reasonable doubt, but only to establish a *prima facie* defence, and if he does so, the onus shifts back to the Crown to prove the offence beyond a reasonable doubt, it does infer that if the accused does not call a defence he must be convicted, that is, the question of reasonable doubt is not to be considered when the accused elects not to call a defence. This is not normal Canadian justice, at the very least, and the proposal is to repeal the section.

The general principles of criminal law are sufficient. Once the Crown has established that there is some evidence, the accused has the option of giving or not giving evidence or adducing a defence. If he elects not to call a defence, the court must then consider if the evidence produced by the Crown has established guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Item (14) (ii) is respecting onus on proof of possession. The complementary sections are these: the present situation is if a person is charged with selling, or keeping for sale, or giving, or keeping, or having, and the like—or receiving, and *prima facie* proof is given that such person had in his possession or charge or control any liquor in respect of or concerning which he is being prosecuted then the following extraordinary words apply: "Unless the accused person

proves he did not commit the offence, he may be convicted."

This section is directly in conflict with the basic principle that the onus to prove should rest on the Crown. The proposal is that this subsection be repealed.

Item (14) (iii) is respecting burden of proof. At the present time the burden of proving the right to have or keep or sell or give or purchase or consume liquor is on the person accused of improperly or unlawfully having or keeping or selling or giving or purchasing or consuming liquor.

The section does not create a conclusive presumption of guilt once prima facie proof of possession and the like has been established but infers that in the absence of a defence, the accused may be convicted. This onus is contrary to normal Canadian justice.

The remarks made in relation to section 133 (1) equally apply to this subsection. If the Crown is alleging that the accused is unlawfully dealing with or consuming liquor then it is desirable that the Crown should have to prove the unlawful use it alleges. There is a similar subsection respecting an onus on physicians in respect of medicinal purposes and these two subsections are repealed in total.

Item (15) There is presently also an unusual section, which provides that an order or warrant based upon a conviction, and no search warrant, shall upon any application by way of certiorari or motion to quash or habeas corpus be held insufficient or invalid for any irregularity, informality or insufficiency therein or by reason of any defective form or substance. That section is repealed.

Section 76 has no effect since a superior court will not pay any attention to it and if a conviction or search warrant is defective in substance, the conviction or warrant will be quashed. The superior court cannot be deprived of its prerogative to interfere with proceedings which are taken in lower courts without jurisdiction and the law seems clear that a court proceeding upon an information which is defective in substance does so without jurisdiction. This type of subsection should not be contained in any statute of this nature. This type of section has on many occasions been criticized by the courts and serves no purpose.

Item (16) There is a present situation in respect to appeals. The section providing for appeals requires that with the notice of appeal the convicted person must deliver an affidavit. That affidavit must be to the effect that the convicted person did not by himself or by his agent, servant or employee or any

other person with his knowledge or consent commit the offence charged in the information and must negative the charge in the terms used in the conviction.

All reference to the requirement of such an affidavit is repealed.

This was an extraordinary requirement. The provisions concerning the affidavit are contrary to normal criminal justice. They require a convicted person with his notice of appeal to swear and file an affidavit to the effect that he is innocent of the charge upon which he has been convicted in the course of appeal. It must surely lie with the judge before which the appeal is heard to determine his guilt or innocence.

There is a concluding item and that is the general intent section. The section defining the general intent of the Act provides that the purpose of the Act is to prohibit transactions in liquor that take place wholly within Ontario.

This limitation is removed. With the phrase in question deleted, the board may be in a position to control the circulation of price lists and the taking of orders of the so-called duty-free shops and other shops.

This concludes my remarks with respect to The Liquor Control Act, Mr. Speaker.

Changes in liquor licensing matters fall within three types: 1. changes in legislation; 2. changes in regulations, and 3. changes in policy.

Item (1) The first legislative changes are with respect to definition. The definition of a hotel in respect of the rooms required therefor, are now being changed and clarified. Presently the definition in one item deals with municipalities whereas another reference is to "cities" and "towns." The board is presently including, for example, townships of 15,000 which are not technically included within the latter and requiring them to have not less than 20 bedrooms as a matter of policy because these municipalities warrant this requirement of accommodation. On the other hand, the board is compelled by the statute to include "towns" of a population of 1,000 or 2,000 more or less in this same category, and that is unreasonable.

Now there will be three categories for classification as a "hotel" all related to "municipalities" within three ranges of population: (a) over 100,000, 50 rooms; (b) over 10,000, 20 rooms; and (c) under 10,000, 10 rooms. This will make practice and the statute the same.

A further amendment is being recommended to give some flexibility to this

definition by vesting a discretion in the board. This will enable the liquor licence board to exercise a discretion to classify an establishment with only, say, nine rooms as a hotel, even though the requirement is for ten rooms in the municipality concerned, if the needs of the municipality so warrant.

Item (2) The definition of a tavern is revised. An establishment presently needs two licences to be classified as a tavern, for example: "Dining lounge and dining room," or "dining lounge and lounge," or "public house and dining room."

The proposal is that an establishment holding any one licence, except public house alone will be enabled to be called a "tavern" so that what is presently a "restaurant" will be able to call itself a tavern.

Item (3) We are clarifying the interpretation of the meaning of a club being organized. The present situation is that a club has to be in operation for a year or three years, as the case might be, for it to be enabled to be licensed.

Amendments are made to clarify that the meaning given to a "club being organized" does not have to include incorporation, as long as the club has been in operation for the required period and as long as incorporation does in fact take place prior to the issue of the licence.

Item (4) Presently the sale of liquor on planes is not permitted. Licences will be issued to aircraft in the same way as trains. This is to meet a request by our air lines.

Item (5) Presently no premises have been licensed in conjunction with theatres, as there has been no provision in the Act. The proposal is that, a theatre defined as: "an establishment having the special accommodation, facilities and equipment prescribed by the regulations where, in consideration of payment, musical, dramatic or cultural performances are usually staged, but does not include a motion picture theatre" will be enabled to apply for dining lounge and lounge licences. The latter facilities will not operate as full-time cocktail bar but will only be open in the hours during which the theatre is open in respect of performances.

I point out that amongst others, this has been requested by the Canadian centre for the performing arts, the federal government's major centennial project in the capital area.

Item (6) There is a provision that further licences may be issued to premises already licensed, after a vote, without publishing notice of application.

Presently any application has to have notice given thereof and must be dealt with at a special hearing, even including an establishment already licensed in some respect.

Our thinking is that if community approval has already been given by a local vote, it would appear redundant to publish notices of application for the further licences permitted by the vote since it could be presumed that the local people would know, at the time of voting, that premises already licensed would apply for extension.

Item (7) In the Act presently, section 28 of The Liquor Licence Act refers to a person being unable to get a licence unless he is a "British subject." The proposal is to make the requirement "Canadian citizenship."

Just as The Liquor Control Act contained extraordinary legal procedures, to which I refer, so did The Liquor Licence Act. Accordingly, they will be repealed as being improper procedures. I refer to the bill, section 20, which relates to the repeal of section 62, which used to read:

In the prosecution of any offence under this Act in which possession of liquor is an element of the offence, upon prima facie proof of such possession, unless the person charged with the offence proves that he did not commit the offence, he may be convicted thereof.

We think that all cases of supplying liquor on licensed premises in contravention of the Act could be proved without the assistance of this section. Also, there is a section 63, presently:

Proof of the removal of any liquor from any licensed premises in any package is prima facie evidence against the person holding the licence for such premises of the sale of liquor contrary to this Act or The Liquor Control Act.

This section places the person holding the licence in a difficult position and prima facie makes him responsible for the acts of his employees who have illegally supplied liquor to someone who has taken that liquor from the premises. The section contravenes the basic principle that a person should not be responsible for those acts of which he has no knowledge.

Accordingly, these two sections are repealed.

In respect to the taking of evidence before the board, this is set out in section 16 and is related to investigations or hearings: The ordinary rules that are vested in the supreme court apply, except that there are four very large exceptions in which the rules

of court do not apply (a) in respect of subpoenas—and I am summarizing these:

(b) No person is entitled to claim any privilege in respect of any document, and so on, on the ground that he might be incriminated or exposed to a penalty or to civil litigation thereby.

(c) No person shall refuse to answer any question upon any ground of privilege, but a solicitor shall not be required to disclose any communications between himself and his client; and

(d) No provision of The Evidence Act exempts any bank or any officer or employee thereof from the operations of this section.

These sections are being repealed, so that the power of the board is no greater than the power of our courts.

In respect to the setting aside of liquor votes, it would appear that under the present liquor provisions, a liquor vote could be set aside because of irregularities and a new vote ordered even though the vote would not have been affected if the irregularities had not occurred. Accordingly, section 6 of The Elections Act, that is the provincial Act under which all hon. members of this House presently seated are elected, will be brought into play, which provides with respect to the effect of irregularities that:

No election shall be declared invalid,

(a) by reason of any irregularity on the part of the returning officer or in any of the proceedings preliminary to the poll;

(b) by reason of a failure to hold a poll and the like;

(c) by reason of the non-compliance with the provisions of the Act as to the taking; the counting or as to limitations of time;

(d) by reason of any mistake in the use of the forms, if it appears to the tribunal having cognizance of the matter that the election was conducted in accordance with the principles of this Act and that the irregularity, failure, non-compliance or mistake did not affect the result of the election.

Now upon the going into effect of the bills as statutes, proposed changes in regulations will take place.

First, in respect to the hours of service in public houses. The present situation is that public houses must presently close between 6.30 and 8 p.m., and the proposal is that they will be permitted to remain open during that period, on an optional basis.

In some establishments, for example,

hotels, there are both a public house and a lounge and patrons merely move to the lounge between the hours of 6.30 and 8 p.m., when the public house room is closed. Where an establishment does not have both, patrons go from the public house across the street to a lounge. This restriction dates back to wartime shortages when there were no lounges.

It is to be noted that additional staff may have to be taken on by the public houses if they are permitted to remain open for this additional hour and a half, so it is to be optional; and some may wish to choose to clean up and use it as a meal hour for employees.

In respect of the type of music, singing and the like, permitted in licensed premises, the present situation is that although the liquor licence board policy has been to allow types of music on application from a public house, there has been some misunderstanding as to the range of instruments, and so on, for which permission could be granted.

The proposal is to extend entertainment generally. The board, on application to the board, will allow different types of musical instruments and the like, including piano, accordian, guitar—I picked this list up from a reporter of the press—oboe, xylophone, lute, zither, French horn, violins, and what have you.

An hon. member: How about the bagpipes?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The bagpipes will be permitted, I assure the hon. member, and so will vocal or musical groups, audience participation, and singing and dancing, including discotheque—where facilities are available—games such as darts, cards and billiards in all licensed premises, including public houses, with the onus being placed on the proprietor to provide proper facilities and maintain order, at the discretion of the board as to granting and renewing the grant of permission and as to the hours in the light of individual situations.

If the proprietor has control over the type and treatment of music, that is if the music can only be heard in the area of one table and not throughout the whole room, then a broadcast-type system of canned music can be used, but not if the proprietor does not have control. For example, such a thing as a nickelodeon which can be operated by any guest and which can be heard everywhere in the room, and where the servicing company chooses the records, will not be permitted.

Generally, permission will be given for all

types of instruments and all types of entertainment in all establishments, but if the proprietor allows things to get out of hand, the liquor licence board will step in.

The board did not, until recently, permit women to serve liquor except in dining lounges or dining rooms. There will be no limitation on women serving in licensed premises and at banquets where women can be present.

The present situation is that no tide lines or figures are required on the measuring of the so-called shot glasses for liquor. In the future all establishments will be required to use measuring glasses having tide lines and figures in the serving of spirits.

The Liquor Licence Act and regulations require that a club, except for veterans and labour, before being licensed must be incorporated, and fraternal organizations will be placed on the same basis as veterans and labour.

At the present time the liquor licence board policy is not to permit the serving of liquor in the open-air parts of dining places or even patios in private clubs, except on a very rare occasion or at special golf tournaments when special permission is granted. The proposal is that reasonable open-air drinking will be permitted—for example, in the open-air portion of roof-top dining lounges and lounges where there is some element of privacy as in the principal dining room.

The present situation is that the board has not been licensing premises which form part of a recreational establishment. The proposal is that dining rooms attached to commercial curling establishments and bowling alleys will be able to apply for dining lounge licences, provided that the liquor licence board's regular standards, which are imposed in respect of private clubs and commercial dining facilities, are met.

I make it clear that it is not the bowling alleys per se which could be licensed, but that dining facilities within a complex that included a bowling alley would no longer be automatically excluded from the possibility of being licensed just because they were so associated, if they were of a standard that could be considered if they were completely separate.

I am sure it will be of interest to the hon. members and to the public to know of certain matters of which no change is announced in the bills introduced.

First, there is no lowering of the legal age of 21 in respect of liquor. I take this opportunity of trying to clear up what would

appear to have been some misunderstanding in the relationship to this matter in the minds of the public. At the time of the appearance of the chairman of the liquor control board before the standing committee on government commissions, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), the leader of the NDP, directed a question to him respecting the possibility of legalizing the consumption of alcoholic beverages in the home by minors. This was widely misinterpreted as relating to the consumption of alcoholic beverages in licensed establishments, that is in public, by minors.

This latter was at no time contemplated by the government, for we have noted that in jurisdictions where the legal age for what I call public consumption is less than 21, some attempts are being made to raise it to this figure.

In respect of the consumption by minors in the home, this matter has been very thoroughly considered. Assuming that there was some merit in the training of the child in the use and effect of alcohol by a parent, there are posed some difficulties in working out the details respecting the same. Should there be any age specified even in the home? Should the consumption be in the presence of the parent? What responsibility should there be on the parent to ensure that consumption within the home would not lead to difficulties upon the child leaving the home immediately after and, for example, driving a car? How could the policing authorities satisfactorily establish consumption by a minor outside of the home if circumstantial evidence such as liquor on the breath could be discounted if the same could have been acquired in such an alternate legal way?

It has not yet been clearly enough established to us that any advantages accruing from such permission being granted in the home, outweighed some of the potential risks, and therefore hon. members will note that no change is being made.

Second, I mention that at the present time there is no change which would permit of the sale of liquor on Sundays.

Third, the government is confirming its position that it will continue to maintain the local option principle throughout the province. I note that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) is on record as reiterating that if his party were to come to power it would do away with local option. I suggest that in this specific matter the government and the Liberal Opposition are completely opposed; we support its maintenance, they would wipe it out.

The position of the government in respect of local option could no more better be put than it was by Mr. Frank Turnpane in a recent column in which he stated as follows:

Local option gives the residents of any area the right to choose whether they want liquor outlets in their community, and I believe it is a right that the majority should continue to exercise.

If an overwhelming majority of the citizens of one area want to bar liquor outlets, that should be their democratic right, just as long as there is provision for amending the law when majority opinion changes.

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to force the sale of liquor by retail onto any municipality; the people will continue to decide in the accepted, long-established, traditional manner.

I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that while this government has moved to meet the needs and wants of our citizens, we are still mindful of the problems which arise from the misuse and abuse of alcoholic beverages, and in particular those associated with what is summed up as alcoholism.

During the course of his estimates in the next few days the hon. Minister of Health will unfold to the House one of the most far-reaching programmes in relation to alcoholism that any jurisdiction on the continent will have.

Thus, as we take steps to execute the will of the people in this field, we are also discharging our duty to take those steps necessary to safeguard the individual and public good.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of amendments proposed to The Assessment Act this year which deal with the matter of assessment and taxation of properties owned by school boards, harbour commissions and similar organizations. Also, there are some sections dealing with the use and adoption of the assessment manual and adjustment of pipeline assessments, as well as sections dealing with the appointment of county assessment commissioners before this system goes into operation.

Further, permission is now granted for cities and separated towns to come into the county assessment system if they so desire.

Another section deals with the matter of providing benefits, fringe benefits of various kinds, to the staffs of district assessors. We are also increasing the amount from \$200 to \$400 for collection of taxes in division courts.

Probably the most important amendment proposed is with reference to the matter of refund of taxes on account of vacancy. I am recommending that the appropriate section of The Assessment Act be withdrawn and deleted from the Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have the very great privilege to introduce to you, and through you to the hon. members of this House, the Honourable Mr. Ronald Mack, Minister of Health for the state of Victoria, the Commonwealth of Australia.

The Honourable Mr. Mack is visiting our province and our nation for the first time in his life. He has come at a very excellent time.

He tells me that the state which he serves—and he is a member of the Upper House in that state—occupies a third of the land mass of the Commonwealth of Australia, but is responsible for 30 per cent of the production of the nation, so it is not very much different than our own province of Ontario.

I know, sir, you would have me wish for Mr. Mack a very pleasant stay in our midst and express to him the hope that he will like us so well he will want to come back.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, in rising to present the estimates of The Department of Education for the current year—and this is the third occasion on which I have had that privilege—I need hardly assure the hon. members of this assembly that I am more conscious than ever of the magnitude of my task as Minister of Education, and of the vast scope and complexity of the activities and problems which engage the daily attention of my department.

The total figure of these estimates, amounting to almost \$454 million, represents 38 per cent of all government expenditures.

When we add to that the expenditures of our municipalities and our university grants, we come to a total figure in excess of one billion dollars annually, and this is some measure of the importance our people attach to the things of the mind.

Since the first modest school house was opened in this province in 1785 to the 7,000 schools now operating in 1965, the people of this province have built up a massive investment in education. Over 60,000 men and women are now giving dedicated service to our teaching profession. Additional thousands are serving on our boards of education and in the ancillary services. I may say at this point that while it is difficult to strike an accurate figure as to the dollar value of all our school buildings, I am able to tell the House that those built during the period from 1945 to 1964 cost almost \$700 million. It is also worth noting that when all of these figures are added together, it will be seen at once that their effects reach far beyond the classroom and that our expenditures on education are a most important factor in maintaining the health and vigour of our economy.

My colleague, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), has already reminded us that enrolment in our primary and secondary schools has more than doubled in the past 20 years and that we can expect at least a comparable increase in the course of the next two decades.

I am certain that there will be no disagreement in this assembly, when I say that these 1,700,000 young Canadians constitute our biggest single asset and our brightest hope for the future. From the classrooms in which they sit will come the men and women who will one day govern our towns, our cities and our province, who will share in the government of Canada, who will direct and manage our ever-growing and complex economy, who will apply their knowledge and skills in all areas of our economic, industrial and community life and who will lead Canada into a great new century of progress. Many, no doubt, will attain high distinction in their chosen professions, and some will follow in the footsteps of Osler, Banting, Best and other sons and daughters of Ontario, whose creative labours have been such a blessing to all mankind.

When viewed in that light, the estimates you are being asked to approve take on new meaning. In a very real sense they constitute not mere expenditure, but rather a gilt-edged investment from which the economic, social, cultural and spiritual returns to our society are simply beyond calculation.

Mr. Chairman, it is now generally recognized that education is our first line of defence. Indeed, it may be said that our progress as a nation can proceed no faster than our progress in education. Unhappily, we live in a world in which military weapons are still necessary to our security and require massive expenditures, but these have now reached a stage of such frightening and destructive power that civilized people the world over can only hope that the exercise and triumph of reason, restraint and common sense will make it unnecessary to employ them.

Such, however, is not the case with weapons of the mind. There is now available to us a vast new knowledge which, if fully applied to the needs of our own society and of all mankind, can bring us close to the realization of that abundant life of which the ancient prophets dreamed.

Surely we could not set before ourselves a loftier goal than to make our own educational system a powerful factor in hastening the day when the governments and peoples of this world will be able to prove through their creative endeavours that, as an instrument of human progress, the well-equipped head is indeed mightier than the sword.

And so, with these great objectives in mind, it is my earnest hope that the hon. members of this House will subject these estimates to the most thoughtful and exhaustive examination.

And now, Mr. Chairman, with a desire to keep the hon. members fully informed of what is going on in the department and of some trends in our planning, I should like to make some general comments on four aspects of our provincial programme. First, I shall refer to our schools and certain changes in the pattern of our school system's organization, then to facilities other than the university for post-secondary school education, to activities in the field of adult education, and finally to some educational trends related to technological change.

The school system of Ontario is, as you know, a decentralized one. That is, one in which local school boards carry significant responsibilities and are given commensurate authority by our school legislation. A century and a half ago, when our system was taking form in a pioneer setting, roads were poor, modes of transportation were primitive and communities were small and closely knit. As a result, our early units of school administration were small in area and our boards of school trustees were large in number. As a result of legislation passed in this House a

year ago, a long step forward has been taken to improve this situation. The organized township has now become the general unit for the administration of rural public schools, and consultative committees are being established in each county to make recommendations for uniting township units in still larger blocks at the discretion of the county council.

You will recall that over half of the organized townships of the province had constituted themselves as township school areas voluntarily before Bill 54 of a year ago made such action mandatory. I am pleased to report that the transition of the remainder to the larger unit was effected with the minimum of difficulty in January of this year. Only two townships with population larger than 10,000 took advantage of the special option in the bill whereby they might have two school areas formed within their boundaries, and fewer than a half dozen situations experienced serious problems in the process of amalgamation. Clearly, public opinion shared the conviction of hon. members of this House that the broad planning required in education today makes the establishment of larger units not only desirable but necessary. To sum up the change of last January, I may point out that the number of rural public school boards in the counties was reduced from 1,850 to 423, and in the districts of the north from 233 to 166.

The separate schools were not involved in the township area legislation, but in many localities they, too, are amalgamating and forming combined separate school zones, with the purpose of establishing rural central schools to provide an increasing number of their pupils with a graded school education.

At the secondary school level, all parts of the counties are now included in high school districts. Through voluntary co-operation, the technical facilities of certain secondary schools are being used by students from smaller neighbouring schools. It was so clearly desirable to encourage this practice, that I announced last February that The Department of Education would assume 100 per cent of the cost of building the technical and occupational shops and associated classrooms necessary to accommodate, in neighbouring composite schools, the increased enrolment of pupils in technical and occupational courses. This policy will enable secondary school boards, whose schools are too small for limited technical education or who do not operate secondary schools, to make agreements with other boards operating composite schools and arrange bus transportation for their pupils to these composite schools. Since the federal government re-

funds to the province 50 per cent of such approved expenditures, you will understand that this offer was made only for the tenure of the present agreement between the federal and provincial governments relative to technical and vocational training programmes.

I might add that, where joint action of high school districts—each too small to support technical education—occurs, The Department of Education will assume 100 per cent of the cost of building all vocational units, provided that the combined projected enrolment in one school is 1,000 or more. Through the type of encouragement I have described, I am confident that the programme of diversified courses will be extended still more widely across the province.

Mr. Chairman, I come to some recent changes in organization. These have not been limited to local authorities. The department itself has undergone a major reorganization at the beginning of this year to enable it to deal more efficiently with the important problems requiring its attention. I have already discussed these changes in some detail with the education, health and welfare committee of this Legislature, and I shall not deal with them at any great length at this time beyond reminding you of its main purposes: First, to bring the elementary and secondary school panels closer together; second, to reduce the number of special subject branches and to integrate them in the main instructional stream; third, to decentralize departmental administration by establishing over a period of time a number of administrative areas across the province; and fourth, to relieve professional educators of responsibility for school business wherever possible, and to place such business in the hands of senior clerical staff, professional accountants and school business officials.

At the same time, the general pattern of the department has been brought into line with that of the other departments of government. The former plan of having a chief director of education assisted by two deputy Ministers—one for the elementary schools and one for the secondary schools—has been changed, and we now have one deputy Minister, as the senior official, supported by three assistant deputies—one for instruction in both elementary and secondary schools, one for provincial schools and further education and one for business administration.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all the hon. members of this House share our deep regret at the sudden passing of our former chief director, Dr. F. S. Rivers. From the time he

began his teaching career in Owen Sound some 35 years ago, Dr. Rivers occupied a succession of important posts in our department and, during that period, made an outstanding contribution to the development and progress of Ontario's educational system.

Throughout his long career he served our province with singular devotion. We had all hoped that Dr. Rivers would be able to enjoy many more years, freed from onerous responsibility and devoted to the creative leisure which he had so richly earned and to which he had looked forward. He will always be remembered among those whose lives were made richer by his presence.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that I speak for all hon. members of the Legislature when I say how gratified we are that D. Z. S. Phimister has agreed to accept the appointment as deputy Minister. Dr. Phimister's distinguished and productive career in the field of education is well known at home and abroad, and is admired by all of us.

We are particularly fortunate that he comes to us after having completed seven years as director of education in the city of Toronto, during its greatest period of expansion and development. I know that I shall find in Dr. Phimister a valuable colleague and a wise counsellor, and that our department will derive great benefit from his rich and varied experience. Dr. Phimister expressed a desire to remain anonymously in the wings today, but since he is within range of our vision, I am going to ask him to stand and accept our greeting.

Two new service units have been established within the department during the past year; an information branch and a division of school planning and building research. With the department responsible for a budget approaching half a billion dollars annually, and with education having become a major concern in all jurisdictions, I am convinced that there is continuing need for a two-way interchange of information on educational activities, policies, and plans between the department on the one side and the public on the other. Accordingly, last summer an information branch, headed by Charles Williams, a former secondary school teacher with an interest in publicizing activities in educational matters, was established for this purpose.

At the same time a division was set up for the study of school building materials; the planning of schools adapted to new teaching patterns, such as those related to team teaching, tutorial groups, language laboratories, and audio-visual aids; the practices designed

to get the greatest possible value from the school building dollar. The establishment of this new division under Mr. Frank Nichol, an able young architect, was a direct result of a recommendation from the conference on school design held in September, 1963, which was largely attended by school trustees, architects and construction experts.

Our school construction programme has continued at a relatively heavy rate in 1964. Some \$71 million was spent to provide approximately 77,000 pupil places in 457 new buildings and additions for the elementary schools, while \$40 million was spent to provide some 17,500 places for our secondary school students. Two trends were responsible for the building programme being larger than was expected: The movement to provide rural central schools at the elementary level, and the continued demand for vocational school facilities in secondary schools.

Teacher supply is almost adequate to meet the demand, but problems still exist in this field. The number of teachers available for the public schools is generally satisfactory but there is some scarcity of staff for the separate schools where the annual percentage rate of increase in enrolment outpaces that of the public school system. The supply of teachers for the secondary schools continues to be maintained with the aid of special summer courses. Nearly 2,000 student-teachers enrolled at centres at Kingston, London and Toronto for these initial eight-week summer courses in 1964, and 331 elementary school teachers qualified for secondary school work through another summer course programme. The enrolment of teachers in training at the winter course at the Ontario college of education, Toronto, in September, 1964, totalled 816. Next September, the new Ontario college of education affiliated with the University of Western Ontario in London will open its doors, and I am hopeful that the total winter enrolment will increase as a result. An agreement for the establishment of a third college of education in affiliation with Queen's University, Kingston, is presently being drawn up.

At the present time a broadly representative committee is at work studying the preparation of elementary school teachers. It has been asked to recommend what immediate changes it thinks desirable in the courses as now conducted in our 12 teachers' colleges, and also to indicate what it would regard as an ideal programme for the training of elementary school teachers and the steps by which such a programme might be developed in the years ahead. Meanwhile, it

is planned to establish a thirteenth teachers' college this September on the campus of Brock University, St. Catharines. It will operate in rented quarters until such times as a permanent building can be constructed for the purpose.

One of the strengths of our secondary school staffing situation has been the contribution made by teachers with Type A certificates. Most of these staff members have spent four years on an honours course at university, and are subject specialists. This is the kind of university graduate who now finds scholarships available to help him proceed to the master's and doctoral degrees, and who is continuing with his studies to qualify himself for teaching in the universities. He is needed there and we are glad to have him preparing himself for that work. But we need honours graduates in high school teaching as well, and it seemed only prudent to offer some help or inducement to such candidates who are considering attendance at an Ontario college of education upon graduation. Accordingly, I announced in February that every student who qualifies for enrolment in a Type A course at the Ontario colleges of education this fall, will be eligible for a \$500 fellowship. This new plan recognizes the importance of encouraging young people with special scholarly backgrounds to enter secondary school teaching as a career.

The in-service training programme for teachers has been expanding principally through departmental summer courses, where some 10,000 teachers pursue studies related to their classroom duties, and through university summer courses, where elementary school teachers take classes leading to BA degrees. The teachers themselves have been active in many centres through their federation and other groups in providing lecture courses during the winter months for their own professional improvement, but these courses have varied widely in length and content and have not led to departmental certificates. Recently several of the larger school boards have indicated interest in providing winter courses equivalent in hours, content, and quality to summer courses provided by the department and have asked that the teachers taking these winter courses successfully should be issued departmental certificates. Their request has been granted, and a plan has been set up to look after this development. During the present school year Etobicoke, North York, and Toronto are conducting such courses in guidance, mathematics, and school librarianship, respectively.

The revision of courses of study for kindergarten and grades 1 to 6 is at present the major activity of the curriculum division. The committees that will carry on this work include teachers and educational officials, of course, but provision is also being made for consultation with parents, university staff members, and community leaders. In this connection a committee of 21 members has been established under the distinguished chairmanship of Mr. Justice Hall not to do detailed work on the revision of subject material, but to consider the general aims and objectives of the revision. Fifteen of the members of this committee are persons who are not classroom teachers but who have general or special interests in the educational field and who have taken a vigorous part in community life. Five representatives from the Ontario teachers' federation and the superintendent of curriculum complete the membership of this committee, from which it is hoped that useful guide-lines will come for the curriculum changes now under consideration.

As this curriculum revision proceeds, bulletins will be printed and distributed to teachers describing the progress being made. The time has passed when courses of study can be written by two or three experts and then handed to principals and teachers to carry out in the classroom. A new course of study should not come as a surprise, nor should it come to teachers who are unprepared to implement it. Effort is being made to involve the teachers themselves in the formulation of the new programme and to acquaint them with its pattern as it takes shape.

The reorganized programme in the secondary schools has now reached grade 11. It provides, as hon. members know, four- and five-year programmes in each of three branches: Arts and science; business and commerce; and technology and trades.

The four-year courses are designed for students wishing a good general education not leading to the university, but the fact that a student can enter any one of these branches and proceed to grade 13 in a five-year course and then go on to university, has done a great deal to equalize the prestige of the three branches. One very gratifying result of the operation of the reorganized programme has been a reduction in the number of drop-outs from 12.6 per cent in 1962-63 to 10 per cent in 1963-64.

The grade 13 examination has, as you are well aware, been under criticism for some years. It was said to be a cram year; it was

said to be trying to do too much in too many subjects; it was said to be sending young people into higher education ill-equipped to pursue learning under their own initiative.

Now, actually, the grade 13 examination has had its merits and its values, but frankly there has been enough truth in the criticisms I have mentioned to warrant some changes. A committee of outstanding men and women undertook a study of this examination roughly a year ago, and as a consequence of their report, which I trust all of you have read, the number of examination papers has been reduced, the courses of study have been shortened, a policy of giving some credit to the candidate's term mark has been introduced, and the study of certain portions of each course in depth is now required. These changes have been made with a view to encouraging more independent effort and a more scholarly approach on the part of the student.

One important recommendation in the report asked for the establishment of a committee to look into the possibility of advanced and general levels of instruction in grade 13. This committee was established and prepared a report which was submitted to me on March 18. Copies of this report were widely distributed so that most interested persons in Ontario received a copy. Although the committee had hoped to go ahead with some experimental work in advanced and general levels this fall, we have decided to spend a year in the preparation of curricula so that the programme can be established on a firmer footing in the fall of 1966.

I come now to the question of French instruction.

Interest in having a second language taught to children of elementary school age is not confined to our own province. In England and in the United States experimental work is being done in this field, and the climate for introducing a second language—usually French—to the elementary school curriculum in other educational jurisdictions seems very favourable at this time. Among the reasons for such general interest may be mentioned: (i) A conviction that the interdependence of all countries makes education in one language inadequate, (ii) the fact that an earlier start in learning a new language will give more time for skill in its use to develop, and (iii) the knowledge that children when they are young respond particularly well to oral language teaching.

In addition to these reasons, a special reason exists for added interest in the teaching of French in the elementary as well as in the secondary school grades in Ontario.

French is one of the two native languages within Canada. This is a fact of our history. The French language is not only the tongue of one of our founding peoples but its use is legally authorized in a number of situations related to government. Ability to use both the English and French languages is recognized as highly desirable in Canada, not only for business and cultural advantages, but as an influence for unity under Confederation.

Then, too, we have in Ontario three areas generally speaking—the Ottawa Valley, the Windsor area, and northern Ontario—where French is the mother tongue of substantial groups of our Ontario people. Their children study both English and French in our schools and it is encouraging to note the action being taken in our English-speaking elementary schools to begin the study of French.

During the present school year 184 school boards are offering French to 140,000 English-speaking pupils in the elementary schools of Ontario. This represents eleven per cent of the total enrolment of students in kindergarten and grades 1 to 8.

It has been departmental policy to approve the introduction of a programme of French instruction in a local school system only when it was established that the classes would be staffed by teachers who could meet a high standard of oral fluency in the language. For this reason the programmes offered throughout the province to date have been based upon direct classroom teaching rather than upon the predominant or exclusive use of such instructional devices as tapes and records.

Summer courses have been offered for the training of teachers in instructional methods. The courses have been open only to teachers who could meet the required standard of oral proficiency. In the summer of 1965 they will be held in Ottawa and in Toronto.

In the course of its study of the teaching of French as a second language, the Ontario curriculum institute last summer conducted an experiment designed to train English-speaking teachers whose background in the French language was acquired during their years as pupils in the Ontario secondary schools.

Last year I invited a committee of teachers, inspectors, and university professors to study and report on possible procedures for developing an articulated programme of French-language instruction through the elementary and secondary grades of our system.

As a consequence of our study of the findings of these investigations and of the experience acquired in local areas, it has now been decided that French should become a

recognized option in the elementary school programme for English-speaking students in grades 7 and 8, beginning in September, 1966. It should be noted that the school boards will decide if and when the option will be offered in the schools under their jurisdiction.

The supply of teachers will be augmented by every means consistent with the maintenance of high standards. A number of qualified teachers will take the summer course in methods of instruction. Qualified teachers from other provinces and countries who demonstrate the necessary oral competence will be eligible for an elementary school teacher's certificate for French only. Individuals who have standing in French equivalent to the Ontario grade 13, who are fluent in oral French, and who are not otherwise qualified as teachers may be admitted to a special summer course leading to a temporary certificate as a teacher of French to English-speaking pupils in elementary schools. Teachers holding permanent certificates valid in the bilingual elementary schools are also eligible for letters of permission to teach in this programme. Thus, it will be seen that all possible sources of teacher supply are being identified, to the end that our students may receive instruction of the highest quality.

It is planned that tentative outlines of departmental courses of study will be issued during the next school year and that courses at the secondary school level will be adjusted over the ensuing years to take advantage of the pupils' elementary school experience in French.

It is also expected that such radio and television facilities as may be available will be used to support the programme.

A director of French for English-speaking classes was appointed in August of 1964. Since that date he has been visiting schools in a consultant and advisory capacity and will continue to be available to boards on the same basis. The director will supervise the implementation of the departmental programme, will give local assistance in such matters as schedules for itinerant teachers of French, instructional techniques, and materials.

I am confident that the emphasis on the quality of teaching has been responsible for the laying of a sound foundation for the programme, and that the plans as I have outlined them here will result in its continuing growth. We can therefore anticipate that the programme of French instruction will take its place in the curriculum as a source of

educational and cultural enrichment in the lives of the students.

I should like at this point, Mr. Chairman, to make just a few comments about Ontario's main centennial project, the centre of science and technology, and of the part it is to play in the educational life of our province.

The department has been actively involved in the planning of the centre and we have been carefully studying the educational aspects of this exciting institution.

To that end a special committee was set up to act as an advisory body and in addition to carrying out some educational research on the subject, the committee members have visited a number of the larger and more progressive science museums in Canada and in the United States in order to obtain first-hand information relating to the educational needs, problems, and management of such centres. Some of the committee's recommendations have already been submitted to the director of the project.

The department sees the science centre as an essential and integral part of the education of the child, the adult, the pupil, the teacher, the specialist, the layman and, of course, the resident and the tourist. In a word the centre, although separated from the classroom, is envisaged, not as an extension of the school, but as a part of it. It should be as important as the science laboratory and the school library.

Class visits to the centre should not be interpreted as enrichment fringes to the science courses but rather as essential and interwoven threads within the pattern of the courses. There has been some tendency to regard the centre as a Toronto project, intended to serve only the people of our capital city and the visiting tourist. Naturally, because of its location, it is more accessible to the people of Toronto and the surrounding communities. I should like to make it very clear, however, that the centre is not to be regarded as a local institution or for local residents only. It is a provincial centre and must therefore be accessible to all who wish to make use of its services. It is obvious, of course, that no school in the province is in a position to provide the facilities of such a centre. Our task then is to devise ways and means of utilizing modern transportation to make its services available to all. The whole purpose of this great institution would be defeated, and the vast expenditure hardly would be justified if it did not serve the whole Ontario community. A great deal of thought has already been given as to the best means of making it serve the wider purpose. Among

other things we want the centre to be a place for science conferences, reference facilities, laboratories for science classes and clubs, science lectures and classes, as well as for displays and the usual services of a science centre. In short we want it to be an active, vital, teaching centre rather than a silent mausoleum of inanimate displays.

When viewed in that light the centennial science centre becomes an important contribution to the educational progress of this province. We strongly urge all school boards and community organizations and our citizens generally to keep that aim in view and to assist us in making it a reality.

I trust that this information, Mr. Chairman, will satisfy hon. members that our centennial project will be an exciting scientific centre, where this and future generations will be able to view the rich and manifold achievements of our people and receive inspiration for still greater achievements in the years ahead. We deem it a great privilege to play an active part in its development and we look forward to it becoming one of the great educational institutions of Ontario and of Canada.

Since the committee on education, health and welfare has already devoted one of its sessions to the provision now made in the province for the training of retarded children, I shall touch upon this topic only briefly. I should like to remind hon. members, however, that 1965 is a significant year in the development of the programme in the interest of these girls and boys. Begun some 10 years ago, the movement for schools for the retarded has advanced with almost unbelievable rapidity, on a financial basis of substantial provincial grants supplemented by voluntary giving from parents and the public at large. I cannot speak too highly of the dedicated effort and leadership of the local associations for retarded children and of all that they have and are accomplishing. They have brought new hope and practical help into the lives of many children and, of course, their families.

Hon. members will recall that at the last session of the Legislature it was felt that the financial burden of operating these schools should no longer be carried in part by charitable givings. Accordingly, legislation was passed placing this responsibility chiefly on the province, but for the rest, it is on the municipalities in which the parents of the pupils reside. The province now carries 80 per cent of the operating costs including transportation. The local associations still provide the buildings occupied by the schools, but school construction is assisted by a 50

per cent grant from The Department of Education. The budget and the operation of each school is administered by a local retarded children's education authority, consisting of six members—four appointed by the council of the municipality in which the school is located, and two appointed by the local association for retarded children. These authorities have now been appointed and have assumed their new responsibilities with an interest that augurs well for the future of the schools.

Since I have already made statements to this House regarding the grant regulations for 1965, including that relating to textbooks in grades 11 and 12, I shall not deal with these matters at this time, and shall pass on to some comments on facilities, other than the university, for post-secondary school education.

Large numbers of our young people who do not proceed to the universities have a strong desire for further technical and technological training. For these, the institutes of technology and the vocational centres are proving most helpful. Institutes of technology are now in operation in Haileybury, Hamilton, Kirkland Lake, Ottawa, Toronto, the Lakehead and Windsor. During the current school year, the seven institutes enrolled 5,521 students in full-time day courses and 8,165 in extension courses. Two of these institutes—Ryerson polytechnical institute in Toronto and the Lakehead college of arts and science—operate under their own boards of governors; the other five, as hon. members know, are administered by the technological and trades training branch of The Department of Education. In addition, three institutes of trades operate in Metropolitan Toronto and two new vocational centres have been established during the past years—one in London, the other in Ottawa. The total enrolment in the institutes of trade and vocational centres as of last September was 4,725 in the day-school and 2,290 in the night-school programme. Thus, more than 20,000 young people are involved in the programme of these technical and technological institutions.

The name "Ontario vocational centre" was adopted for the new institutions instead of "provincial institute of trades," because the rapid advance in automation and in the technologies has made it desirable to add a wide variety of courses in the new centres at a level higher than that of apprenticeship but below that of the technologist. A third vocational centre will open this September, located in Sault Ste. Marie, and two others are in the planning stage to be located in Hamilton and in the Niagara peninsula. The Hamilton

vocational centre is to be located on the same campus as the new buildings for the Hamilton institute of technology, and the resulting complex is to be designated as an Ontario technical education centre.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that we should really take this proposal in light of the introduction of the bill for colleges of applied arts and technology and the fact that the position of our institutes of technology will be referred to the board of regents, so that perhaps this new name may not come into being.

This combination gives promise of such excellent results that its development and operation will be watched with close interest. It is felt that having the institute and vocational centre operating on a co-ordinated basis will have many advantages over having them operating independently of each other.

An advanced technical evening programme is now available in a number of secondary schools and in the institutes of technology on a three-level basis corresponding to the three years of the day programme of the institutes. Each level is accepted academically by the association of professional engineers for certification purposes as engineering technicians and technologists. This certification programme makes it possible for secondary school graduates who enter employment, to qualify as technicians and technologists through evening classes.

The advanced technical evening programme I have mentioned serves to bring me to my third topic, namely, activities in the field of adult education. These are varied in type, but prominent among them is the service provided by the correspondence courses division of The Department of Education in upgrading the academic achievement of persons no longer attending school. It is estimated that, of the 25,000 students who will enrol for correspondence courses this year, more than 90 per cent will be over 20 years of age and employed. The courses enable such students to improve their academic standing even when they are unable to attend night school because of night or shift work. More than 4,000 students are at present working at the grade 13 level. In addition to academic courses, Ontario also provides through correspondence, 11 trade courses under a plan worked out in co-operation with the federal government; other trade courses are provided by other provinces to avoid duplication of effort. Through this service, such groups as carpenters, mechanics and radio technicians may improve their theoretical knowledge by correspondence.

The technological and trades training branch of the department is responsible for the administration of programmes 4 and 5 under the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement. Programme 4 is concerned with upgrading the educational level of employed persons, and work of this kind has been done in co-operation with three industries in Peterborough and Sault Ste. Marie. Programme 5 for the training of the unemployed is still expanding throughout the province under the supervision of local committees. Last year, this retraining was conducted in 38 centres, and the graduates of the programme obtained employment in more than 90 per cent of cases.

In this connection, a few weeks ago it was my privilege to open a counselling and training centre in Toronto. This is a new concept in aid to the unemployed. The centre accommodates classes for unemployed persons who have been referred there by the national employment service. Those admitted are interviewed, counselled and tested, and then directed to skill-training courses or basic educational schools in the city.

Although the centre is staffed by teachers and guidance personnel from the Toronto board of education, The Department of Education and the federal Department of Labour provide the necessary financing. Depending on eligibility, those persons admitted to the centre under programme 5 of the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement, receive allowances of \$5 to \$10 per day while undergoing training.

Night classes in the secondary schools have long played an effective role in the provincial adult education programme. During 1963-64, such classes were offered in 238 centres to more than 117,000 students. The four most popular courses were academic, commercial, industrial and trades, and home economics, with art, drama, crafts and physical fitness each commanding a substantial enrolment.

A number of municipal recreation committees sponsor evening classes in such fields as art, crafts, drama, music and puppetry, and the community programmes division of The Department of Education has special advisers on these activities who work out of the central office in Toronto. The branch has nine other district offices located across the province, and its representatives in these offices provide assistance, advice and resources for local programmes in adult education and recreation. The community programmes branch has also been working

closely with the Ontario council for the arts in promoting interest and activities in arts and crafts at the local level.

Actually, the whole programme of the Ontario council for the arts is related to adult education. Since November, 1963, when the members of the council were appointed, this body has been actively concerned with artistic organizations in all parts of Ontario. From Atikokan to Windsor to Ottawa, the council has not only made grants of money but has also given advice and guidance to those organizations which have sought help. Much of the council's budget must go to subsidizing the major performing arts organizations, but much of the council's attention is directed to smaller projects in communities where it is important to foster active participation in various fields in the arts. Details of the programme will be found in the first annual report of the council, which has been sent to each hon. member of the Legislature.

I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the members of the Ontario council for the arts for the time and service they have given unstintingly—and incidentally without remuneration—in the performance of their duties. They are blazing a new trail, and in doing so they are giving us a fine example of dedicated citizenship; of participation in government by the people. Recognition of the importance of artistic expression in the life of the province is shown in the estimates you have before you, in which \$500,000 is allotted to the arts council for its operations in the new fiscal year.

In these comments upon adult education, mention should be made of the youth branch which was established in The Department of Education a little over a year ago to investigate the problems of young people—in the age-group 16 to 25—who are no longer in the school system. Substantial progress has been made in its studies thus far and it is expected that the programme will be further developed as a result of its inquiries coupled with the findings of the Legislature's select committee on youth, which is making a major investigation in the same area. Provision has been made in the estimates before you for an increase in the staff of the youth branch to include three research officers with special competence in sociology, economics and education.

Finally, with respect to adult education, I would emphasize the contribution of the public libraries of the province. When we read that some forty million books go out

on loan in a single year from the libraries; and when we think how, as individuals, we turn to the library in our community not only for leisure reading but also, when new problems in unfamiliar areas of knowledge present themselves, we realize the extent of the influence of these institutions on the recreational and cultural life of Canada. In the estimates you will note that provision of \$3.25 million in legislative grants is being made for the libraries in the 1965-66 fiscal year, representing an increase of \$450,000 over the total provided for this purpose just a year ago.

My fourth topic, Mr. Chairman, concerns some educational trends related to technological change. We in The Department of Education have not been unmindful of such change and, indeed, have already anticipated the emphasis which will be placed on education and training in the future. We realize, as I said earlier, that the well-being and growth—in fact, very survival—of our nation depends on our educational efforts and on the development of our human resources. I wish to spend a few minutes now in looking ahead to the plans made to search for and implement changes to meet our new needs.

First, I would emphasize the key role that has been played by the department of educational research in the Ontario college of education. This is not only a part of the University of Toronto, but it is also the research arm of The Department of Education, and its director and staff are well qualified to guide the studies that are so necessary if we are to plan wisely for the future. In addition, in our own offices we have recently established a planning and development council—a name which I think should be remembered by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—to take advantage of the results of formal research and of the experience of other educational jurisdictions in seeking solutions to new problems. Then, as a participant in the Ontario curriculum institute, our department is associated with the teachers' federation, the trustees' council, the universities and educational officials in a broad programme of educational investigation.

Finally, we are following the practice, as you have noted earlier in my remarks, of calling together representative committees to advise us regarding specific problems, thereby not only availing ourselves of informed advice, but developing a climate of acceptance for the solutions thus jointly evolved. Through these resources we are seeking to identify needs and to devise solutions in meeting them.

I have already mentioned the research being done in the youth branch and in the division of school planning and architectural research. A significant study is underway in Sault Ste. Marie which has been sponsored by two major companies in that city, and which is of interest to our department. The Soo study, which is now in its second year, is concerned primarily with the careers and problems of school youth in that city, both of high-school drop-outs and of graduates. I am hopeful that similar studies will be launched in other communities. The full story for the province as a whole on this topic is, of course, available in the results of the Atkinson study, a follow-up of the complete grade 13 group of students begun nearly ten years ago, and the Carnegie study, a similar survey of the complete grade 9 group of students started six years ago, both conducted by the department of educational research.

The same department has almost completed another study concerning the education and employment of women—encompassing not only a review of what has been done in the past and what is being done now, but also a preliminary consideration of the demands and needs of the future for the education and training of this important section of our labour force. Many questions are being raised about what the future holds for this half of our population; there is every indication that we will, in the future, require women for service in industry, commerce and the professions as well as in the home. What education should young women then receive to enable them to return to the world of work after they have married and after their family obligations have, for the most part, been met? This is but one of the many problems which demand our concern and for which answers need to be found. As you know, the present trend is for many women to return to employment for 20 years or more following the complete formation of their families.

The Ontario curriculum institute has had a broad programme of investigation in progress covering practically all subjects and levels of the school programme from kindergarten to graduate school. Its published reports on science and a second language, and the drafts of reports on study projects now in preparation, have far-reaching implications for our schools.

The new mathematics is a field that is receiving attention in all educational jurisdictions. We have already introduced courses characterized by this new approach in all secondary schools and some elementary

school grades. The fundamental operations in mathematics are still there, of course, but the change in treatment is great. Many parents—and I was going to say, including the Minister—do not recognize the terms and concepts now used by their children. The emphasis is on the why as well as the how, and this approach pays dividends in developing an intelligent appreciation of what numbers can do. This is invaluable as the student attacks the more complex mathematical operations at an advanced level.

Turning to another educational concern, I would point out the need for a complete re-evaluation of the adequacy and effectiveness of our programmes of student aid. For the new world that lies ahead we have to consider carefully the full implications for parents and young people of an ever-increasing demand for ever-higher levels of education and training. It is obvious that not all the burden can in fairness be left to the family and the individual, and that much of the burden of the cost of the higher levels of education must be borne by society generally. Such an approach to student aid obviously requires a change in the thinking of most of us. I would remind you, however, that this government has, in some of its student aid programmes—for example, through the provision of graduate fellowships—accepted in part, at least, the principle that in order to meet critical needs it will provide sufficient funds to enable young people to secure the training and education needed without undue burdens on themselves or on their families. The student loan programmes, federal and provincial, must be subject to careful review and evaluation. Actually, I may say that the whole field of student aid is being critically reviewed now, for instance, by a commission set up by the universities, as well as through studies being made by our own officials.

In looking into the future, a number of problems of immediate importance present themselves. We may have to consider the whole matter of school attendance; more particularly the compulsory—this has been mentioned in the last few days—segment of it. At present we regard the ages of six to sixteen as the general span of compulsory attendance, but in other jurisdictions we find that compulsory attendance may start earlier and extend to older years, in some cases, as in California, to age 18. Perhaps we should be giving much more attention to the implications of what we used to think of as “pre-school” education, that is, education in nursery schools and in kindergartens. Training at this early level is of particular

importance in the case of our young children who, through unfortunate circumstances, have suffered cultural deprivation and live in disadvantaged areas. Examples may readily be found in some Eskimo and Indian communities, and even in some of the downtown parts of our large urban centres. Earlier experience with school life might do much to prepare such children to profit more effectively from regular grade work, and to compensate for unfortunate environmental conditions over which neither they, nor we, have too much control.

The roles that may be played in our schools by the now traditional radio, films, and filmstrips, as well as—more recently—by closed-circuit and live television, programmed teaching machines, language laboratories and the new marvel of computer-assisted instruction, are all worthy of increased attention. All of these examples of modern communication have a contribution to make in our classrooms; a number of them have some disadvantages, offsetting in part some of their advantages. It is important that experimental work be done with the newer devices, and that their practicability and value be assessed.

A new division has been established in the department to lay plans for the development of educational television in our school system, and a staff is being assembled to deal with this activity under the general supervision of our curriculum division.

We are deeply indebted to the present broadcasters for their past work in the field of educational television. Despite the many commitments that they have to meet in their entire broadcasting schedule, they have shown a praiseworthy concern for, and interest in, the early development of programmes of this kind. In Toronto, specifically CBLT and CFTO-TV, both on their own initiative, and in co-operation with the Metropolitan Educational Television Association, have produced many educational programmes of merit.

Since the establishment of the Metropolitan Educational Television Association, which was accomplished with some help from the broadcasters and much work and co-operation from leading educators and educational institutions, as well as The Department of Education, it has become apparent that television as a means of communication and instruction has a very important place in the future of education. We have now reached the stage where the specific curriculum needs of all levels of education in the province must be met. It is impossible for the

independent programming bodies to meet all these requirements because of the nature of their organizations.

This independent nature has, in the past, occasionally precluded the essential inter-relationships that must exist between the programme producers and the responsible educational authorities. Consequently, some of the programmes have not always met with full approval. Those responsible for textbooks and other aids intimate with curriculum requirements should also be responsible for this most important visual medium.

The Ontario Department of Education intends therefore to apply to the board of broadcast governors for a licence to establish a television broadcasting station for the purpose of producing and transmitting programmes of an educational nature.

Provided that feasibility studies and other projects now under way continue as envisioned, the formal application will be made at a meeting of the board some time within the next twelve months.

If our application is approved and construction permits are granted within two months from the date of the hearing, we expect to begin transmission in Metropolitan Toronto and the surrounding area on the ultra high frequency channel 19 within one year of the date of approval. Service to educational institutions will begin soon after.

At the time the application for the channel 19 licence is made, the board of broadcast governors will be advised of the department's intention to seek further licences for broadcasting facilities at other locations throughout Ontario. Plans will be outlined regarding the setting up of a network of stations to serve exclusively educational needs and to provide resources for those needs at all levels and branches of education within our provincial system.

Until we are able to use our own production and transmission facilities, we are proposing to launch limited programming for schools in January, 1966. We hope to achieve this in co-operation with both CBLT and CFTO-TV, who have already shown their concern for the public interest by their past activities in this field. We propose to ask these and other television stations throughout the province for their co-operation in putting educational programmes on the air at suitable times arranged with them and the local boards of education.

The provincial educational television staff members concerned with programming policies, will be selected largely from the educational profession and branches of media, and

those already involved in curriculum development in The Department of Education. Ultimate control of educational programme content will be in the hands of the assistant superintendent (television) of curriculum. This responsibility will always be held by a person who is attached to the curriculum division of the department, as will be the position of administrator of educational television.

This forward step in educational television is taken because our heritage of the past, our knowledge of the present and our needs for the future must be imparted by all means of communication that are available to our present-day society. To some of us, many of our present technological aids for living and learning are not easily accepted; but to the younger generation they are, to a large extent, part of normal, everyday living. To the younger age group television is an obvious, acceptable and respected means of communication for ideas, information and instruction.

A large, possibly the largest, advantage of educational television is that it can transfer an educational experience that cannot be, or is not now, within the capacity of the normal classroom situation.

In the development of mass media as a service to education, new trends in curriculum must be carefully considered. In fact the medium should convey these trends. It should communicate not only the new knowledge but also the new methods and the new techniques.

Programmes for teachers will help speed professional understanding; programmes for class or lecture room use will help speed academic learning; and programmes to inform parents of educational aims and subject disciplines will help speed the process of social understanding.

It will be possible for television to introduce the teaching of a course of study where, in the past, the department has possibly refrained from implementing such a course until an adequate supply of teachers could be trained. Certainly television can hasten some educational processes and help to establish right priorities.

Adult education and vocational training are areas of immediate concern because of the advances in technology of which television is, itself, a part. In co-operation with the provincial universities and the Canadian association for adult education, The Department of Education can increase its leadership in this field by providing the facilities for making courses and programmes available to

a larger number of people. Many areas of adult education are, by necessity, today receiving only a limited service. Television can provide an economical way to offer a more immediate, extensive and effective series of programmes to the majority of the population.

Extremely important is the use to which television is put in the class or the lecture room. Teachers must be assisted in the use of educational television as an aid to teaching. All must be aware of how information is represented on the medium, and must understand the differences between the presentations of that information in a textbook, film, on radio and on television. Educators must also be aware of the power that mass media possesses in shaping the social attitudes of young people. The effective use of mass media in education depends to a great deal on teacher training and the effective use of ETV as a part of the normal teaching process.

To use this system of communication obviously needs an adequate and proficient means of reception for those who require it. Consequently proposals are being considered to allow grants to make it possible for school boards to purchase television receiving apparatus. This equipment will have to conform with the specifications issued by the department with regard to standards and safety features. In addition to this, members of the department will be contacting the boards and institutions of higher learning with a view to helping them design and build any other equipment, closed-circuit systems or such devices they may need to ensure uniform, high quality, television reception. The highest quality, in the long run, is the best investment.

Educational television will be only as good as the knowledge, skills, imagination and professional talent that constitutes its foundation. Many people at all levels of education in our privately owned stations and in the print media and in film have much to contribute to ETV. It will be a medium with its own philosophical approach, and will draw resources from many other media, but it will emerge with its own discipline and individuality.

Realizing that in the not distant future the computer is going to become an important factor in the educational process, a number of studies and experiments in the field of electronic data processing are under way. These are basically of two types. The first applies modern technology to the relief of teachers, vice-principals, and principals from such clerical duties as the keeping and

posting of records and the drawing up of timetables. As I announced here earlier in the session, we have in progress at the present time a very interesting study of timetabling by computer which gives promise of being a great help to Ontario teachers and to those in other jurisdictions. Apart from relieving persons with more important duties from these routine or mechanical tasks, the assembly of accurate information speedily and in convenient form by electronic means is perhaps the chief accomplishment of data processing. Wise decisions must be based on adequate and up-to-date information. I have toured data-processing centres in Florida, California and Chicago, and have been interested in the installations used by educators in those jurisdictions, but there are interesting developments in Canada as well.

The Toronto board of education has a computer and North York has already done pioneer work in various aspects of educational data processing. The province of Quebec, at the departmental level, as well as in Montreal, has moved into this field. When the Ministers of Education across Canada met in Winnipeg last September, they set up a committee to consider the possibility of instituting a complete information system, using the most modern techniques. Officials of the education division of the Dominion bureau of statistics are represented on this committee which has already held two meetings, one of them last week in Quebec City.

The second type of educational activity related to data processing is concerned with the teaching of the skills and techniques of this new art to our young people. We have a number of programmes operating in the high schools now, on an experimental basis, and we have a provincial committee studying the appropriate curriculum and courses of study of this new field for a new age. It is expected that a range of courses will eventually be developed extending from simple introductory electronic data processing in the lower grades of high school to sophisticated post-graduate courses in our universities, designed for the most up-to-date computers.

It is imperative, Mr. Chairman, that we in Ontario keep abreast of the exciting developments of our age, and take steps to adapt our curriculum and our methods to the changes that are occurring. In touching upon this topic a year ago, I spoke of the use our department is already making of data processing in compiling our statistics, in marking objective tests, in dealing with the results of the grade 13 examination, in pretesting tentative grant plans and in the calculation of legislative grants under the Ontario founda-

tion tax plan. I have no doubt that such uses will increase in number.

Despite my keen interest in these new developments, I would emphasize that all is not new in education. The experience of centuries in guiding the development of children and youth in body, mind, and character is not being discarded because a number of fascinatingly intricate machines have been invented. No machine has yet been devised to take the place of a well-informed, understanding, and skillful teacher. And the qualities of diligence, honesty and dependability will still be in demand as long as human beings work together. These are among the qualities that are best fostered in the life of the home, the church and the school. In our inquiry into the ways of tomorrow we must be on our guard against neglecting or discarding the valuable truths that mankind has learned through its long history and experience.

Several days ago I introduced legislation providing for the establishment of the Ontario institute for studies in education, and since at that time I gave the House a fairly comprehensive explanation of its function, I do not consider it necessary to expand upon it at this time. I do hope, however, that my friends opposite and, indeed, all hon. members will avail themselves of this opportunity to express their views on this new and important development.

I am quite certain that all of them will greet with satisfaction the appointment of Dr. R. W. B. Jackson as the first director of the institute. Dr. Jackson's contribution to education in our province can not be too highly praised and I am sure that his long and rich experience will be invaluable in the development and direction of this new dimension within our educational system.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members will recall that just about a year ago I began an extensive correspondence with our school principals on the question of the teaching of history in our Ontario schools. It arose out of widespread criticism in the press following some sampling of student knowledge of Canada's history.

I have since placed on the desks of all hon. members, a summary of that exchange prepared for me by an extremely able honour student at the University of Toronto. I may say that the author, H. V. Nelles, was recommended to me by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and I am sure that we all found his report, and in particular his own commentary, at once stimulating and instructive.

As you will have seen by the letter attached

to the report, I have every intention of pursuing this matter, and in the next few months we expect to begin work on implementing some of the specific recommendations in the summary.

I may say that I was particularly impressed with the proposal that we develop the "history workshop" project on a province-wide scale as a means of assisting our teachers to better perform their task. I expect very shortly to begin discussions with Professor Careless and Professor Ricker and I am hopeful that as a result we can get this project moving before the end of the year.

There have already been some very interesting developments growing out of the correspondence with the principals. The 150th anniversary of Sir John A. Macdonald on January 11 was quite widely observed in our schools. There was no attempt by the department to have these observances conform to a single pattern, instead, it was left to each school to prepare its own programme, some were on a larger scale than others. All were at once imaginative and creative. As I intimated last year, it is our intention to encourage the observances of the anniversaries of other great Canadians such as Brown, Mowat and others which will occur during the next few years.

At the time of the 150th anniversary of Sir John A. Macdonald's birth, I announced, Mr. Chairman, that we would be sending out to the high schools across this province the two volumes of Sir John A's life to be presented to the students most deserving in the completing of their final year. These 500 volumes will be sent out to our school principals in the very near future.

I was particularly interested in a debate arranged by the principal and staff at Merriton high school—and I am sure that my hon. friends opposite will be even more interested.

The topics for the debate were as follows: 1. All Canadians should have voted for Sir Wilfrid Laurier during the 1911 elections; 2. Sir Wilfrid Laurier far overshadowed Sir John A. Macdonald as the foremost Prime Minister of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was a time in Ontario when a Minister of Education, in a Conservative administration, might have felt that such topics were a bit "too political" for a school debate. Frankly, I do not share that point of view. I see no reason whatever why, in our upper grades at least, the classroom should not be a place for argument or discussion as well as for instruction. I must, however, express some reservations on the

phrasing of the resolution, which strikes me as being rather subjective in its approach to history.

I may say that while I have not yet heard who won the debate in question, I do congratulate those who arranged it and I hope that both the affirmative and the negative gave good account of themselves. I hope too that the participants gained a better appreciation of the roles of Macdonald and Laurier. For after all, these two great statesmen can no longer be regarded as the sole possession of their respective parties. They belong to Canada as a whole—the Canada they helped to develop during many years of distinguished and unselfish public service.

I am sure that all hon. members will agree with me that the problem of teaching history in a living way is a many-sided one. It involves our textbooks, curriculum and teacher training. Indeed, I think it is pretty well summed up in the concluding paragraph of the Nelles report:

When it comes to the presentation of our heritage, the mass media can help, the textbooks can help, the curriculum can be improved to meet current inadequacies. But the crucial factor is still the human being—the teacher.

Hon. members will be interested to learn that Mr. Nelles' report has been read by the Ministers of Education of all other provinces and that several have proposed that this matter be dealt with at our interprovincial conference.

Mr. Chairman, it has often been said that our neighbours to the south are much more knowledgeable and appreciative of their history than are Canadians.

I was, therefore, rather surprised to find not long ago that this is "not necessarily so." I have reference to an article which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* of February 18, 1965 which deals with a report on "The Teaching of American History in High Schools" by three professors at Indiana University. The report evaluated material gathered over several years of questioning, interviewing and observing 1,300 of the Indiana public high school teachers.

Year after year, the authors explain, freshmen were arriving at the university knowing all too little of American history. It sounds very much like home. They wanted to know why, and after three years of research they concluded that part of the problem is ill-prepared teachers, part is ill-prepared students and other parts include course content, teaching methods and library facilities.

The three professors point out that most of the problems of high school history teaching are not peculiar to the state of Indiana but are nationwide.

From questionnaire returns it was learned that 45 per cent of Indiana's history teachers held BA degrees in education rather than in history; that 55 per cent majored primarily in social studies which means that those teachers had only 21 hours of American history.

The authors of the report were also appalled to discover that 80 per cent of American history teachers had read no books in their field within the past school year and equally appalling was the fact that 10 per cent of those who had read a history book, only read one or two on the Civil War, ignoring other periods in American history.

To excuse this lack of reading the teachers in most cases claimed, "no time." To combat this problem, the authors of this report suggest a minimum reading period of 15 minutes a day each night and more the other 185 days of the year on which they are actually teaching.

To inject vitality and intellectual integrity into teachers and classrooms, the authors of the report suggested an 11 months school contract which stipulates that a teacher spend two months in residence each year on a university campus—studying history, not education.

The authors also found that too many teachers study for their MA degrees in a field other than history. Either they have not taken the prerequisite undergraduate courses, or their undergraduate grades were not high enough to get them into a history programme.

Available reading material also required to be improved, the authors contend, and they suggested supplementing the text by purchasing good paperbacks for students and obtaining multiple copies of outside reading texts.

These findings have some relevance for our own situation and will be taken into account as we develop corrective measures to meet the problem.

There is one project which developed out of last year's correspondence with our principals, about which I should like to say just a few words. I refer to the Canada Day programme inaugurated this year by the schools of the city of St. Catharines. It is a most imaginative project and strikes me as being an excellent way to present the Canadian heritage in our schools. I have recommended to our principals that it be closely studied for adoption on a province-wide scale. I have already sent a copy of the

brochure describing the project to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) and to the hon. member for York South and I hope that they may want to say something about it in the course of their remarks.

The hopeful thing about all of these developments is that they are encouraging manifestations of a growing interest in Canada's history—or perhaps I should say, a re-examination of our history—which must be viewed as part of the creative drive of Canadians to build a community of our own.

I believe it was Socrates, Mr. Chairman, who said "the unexamined life is not worth living," and so in this context we might add "the unexamined history is not worth having." In my view, it has become more important than ever for our schools to stimulate an interest in Canadian history—in the great decisions of a century ago that placed our country on the road to nationhood, charted the course of our national development and laid down as the basis of our unity, a true understanding and mutual respect between the founding peoples.

In recent years that relationship has become the subject of a great debate in our country. Very frequently voices are raised expressing grave doubt as to whether such a basis of unity can long be maintained. Mr. Chairman, at such times as this we would do well to remind ourselves that these doubts have arisen many times during the first century of our nationhood.

Some months ago one of our principals sent me a copy of a volume of essays by Professor Frank Underhill and underlined a passage which I am sure will be of interest to every hon. member of this House. It is from a letter written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Edward Blake, a former Prime Minister of this province, in December, 1891. Sir Wilfrid wrote:

We have come to a period in the history of this country when premature dissolution seems to be at hand. What will be the outcome? How long can the fabric last? Can it last at all? All these are questions which surge in my mind and to which dismal answers suggest themselves.

Mr. Chairman, those words perhaps have a familiar sound. They were written 74 years ago, and it is worth noting that only a few years later this country of ours, instead of falling apart as Sir Wilfrid had feared, entered upon a great new stage of national development. While I do not for a moment minimize the differences of opinion in our country, I certainly do not think we have come to the end of the road. Instead I think we are moving toward a new beginning.

For myself, I do not view the present dialogue between English and French Canada as cause for despair but rather for hope. Great changes are taking place in our country and perhaps they have not yet run their course. But out of them I am confident will emerge a stronger Confederation. I am greatly strengthened in that conviction by these closing paragraphs from the recent interim report of the Royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism which I am sure will find acceptance by all parties in this House. The commissioners say:

Each age is fascinated by the difficulties it must face; hence most generations go through periods of doubt—present-day Canada is no exception—but is it more difficult to maintain the entity of Canada today, to make necessary changes, than it was to create it yesterday?

Canada will continue to exist, to grow and progress, will surmount the present crisis, if Canadians have the will—a will like that of the men that built the country.

The will we speak of cannot be stiff and arbitrary, it must take account of new conditions. Like everything that is living it must constantly adapt to changing conditions, above all it must be based on awareness and understanding.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that our educational system, our schools and in particular our teachers, have a great responsibility and a great opportunity to play an ever more creative role in the development among young Canadians of those attitudes of mutual understanding and appreciation of each other which will give new strength and purpose to our country. Our concern here is not with teaching history with a view to developing a narrow, exclusive nationalism in our schools. Indeed, I think it can be said that an adequate examination of Canada's history will make our students more fully aware of Canada's debt, not only to the founding partners but also to the people of many lands who have helped Canada's development with their toil and enriched her life and culture with their traditions and their creative skills and talents.

When Premier Lesage addressed his Legislature a year or so ago, he spoke of what he called a new relationship between the provinces—a horizontal relationship in which we recognize the need to come together to discuss our common problem and mutual interests.

In line with that thought, I am sure the hon. members of this House will be pleased to learn that I have extended an invitation

to the Quebec Minister of Education, Paul Gerin-Lajoie, and his senior officials to spend several days with us at an early date so that we can have a full exchange of views on the important new developments in education in our two provinces. Frankly, I would like to see this kind of relationship extended into other areas. Here I am thinking of such things as a teacher and student exchange which I feel should be developed on a much more extensive scale.

I would hope, too, that we could work out an arrangement whereby several thousand young people from Ontario and Quebec would cross over the borders of our respective provinces, spending a week or two in each others' homes and communities and thus come to know each other better, strengthen our fraternity, and help to meet that desire of all Canadians to feel at home in any part of Canada. It seems to me that the more we can come together to discuss our common problems and the more we do to enrich our fraternity, the more progress we shall make in strengthening our national purpose.

Mr. Chairman, during the past year several hon. members of the Legislature, among them the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis), have drawn my attention to certain passages in school textbooks which were clearly out of line with the spirit of the Ontario human rights code. I will not take the time now to go into the matter in any detail. I do want, however, to inform the hon. member for Scarborough West and others who have raised this question with me, that in co-operation with the Ontario human rights commission and its director, Dr. Daniel Hill, we are about to make a thorough examination of all our school textbooks, not just for the purpose of removing material which may be offensive to any of the groups which make up our multi-national family, but more important, to make sure that our textbooks do contain the type of material which does full justice to the contribution of many peoples to the development of our province and nation. I know from recent correspondence with our textbook publishers institute that they too are willing and, indeed, anxious to co-operate with us in this matter.

As hon. members are no doubt aware, I have, during the past year or so, received representations from a number of organizations, among them the Ontario federation of home and school associations, on the subject of religious instruction in our public schools. In addition, I have received a rather large volume of letters from individuals on the same subject.

It is quite clear to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is a sharp difference of opinion as to the wisdom of continuing the existing system. This, of course, is not a recent development. A rereading of *Hansard* of 1945 will show that these differences existed at the time the present system was adopted. The vote in this House at that time showed the then CCF Party to be seriously divided, while the Liberal Party was, I believe, unanimous in its opposition to the measure. I am sure that since the question has been reopened, the hon. member for Brant has read with more than ordinary interest the thoughtful speech delivered by his distinguished father on that occasion.

As my hon. friend said here the other day, religion is a very personal thing—to use his words “a deeply personal experience.” In the formative years of our community there were very strong views that it should not form any part of our public school system. George Brown and others, all of them deeply religious men, shared the view of Thomas Jefferson that it was not in the interest of religion for public schools “to direct its exercises, its discipline or its doctrines.” I am sure that we here are all agreed that nothing could be more divisive, nor more destructive of our community life, than the eruption of religious controversy in the public schools of our province.

There is, of course, little to be gained by applying hindsight to the decisions taken here on this matter by our predecessors 20 years ago. They were taken in good faith at a time when the values we hold dear still hung in the balance, and I, for one, certainly do not question the motives of those who took them. No one will deny that the action won wide public acceptance. To my recollection, at least, the present system has not been seriously challenged during my membership in the assembly, nor during the period that I have been Minister of Education.

We, however, must deal with the problem as it stands before us today, and as I said earlier, the matter has been raised with me by a number of important organizations and by many individual citizens. Furthermore, a certain amount of public debate is taking place on the question outside the House in which church and community leaders, the press and other mass media are participating. Serious doubts are being raised in the minds of our people as to whether the present system of religious instruction should be continued.

Without attempting now to assess the present ratio of opinion, pro and con, I will

say that there is a very strong sentiment in favour of making a careful study of this question on the basis of the past 20 years' experience, in order to determine what changes may be desirable. It is my own impression, however, that the majority of our people would consider it a retrograde step to eliminate entirely from the classroom all subject matter which has to do with character building, ethics, social attitudes, and moral values—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Nobody suggested that!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I would think that that would be the consensus of this House, Mr. Chairman. I am, therefore, going to appoint a special committee of distinguished citizens to go very carefully into the matter in an effort to reconcile existing differences and to provide us, if possible, with a more satisfactory method of conserving in our classrooms those well-tested moral principles which, although not always practised, have, nevertheless, remained—and will, I believe, continue to be—the heart and centre of our society.

I am pleased now to be able to announce that our highly esteemed former Lieutenant-Governor, the Hon. J. Keiller Mackay, has agreed to act as chairman of the committee. I expect to be able to announce the names of the other members very shortly. I sincerely hope that hon. members will agree that such an objective study, in which differing views may be put forward, is a more desirable method of dealing with a very delicate question than hasty administrative action which might be more divisive than helpful.

Mr. Singer: Good for you, and good for the hon. member for Brant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the history of education is really the history of the advance of civilization itself, from the very earliest struggle for survival to the many-sided cultural and social advances of the human mind and spirit. I am confident there will be no disagreement in this House with my earlier statement that our progress as a nation is wholly dependent upon the rate of our progress in education. The question then arises: How are we to proceed faster, and must we not be on guard against the danger that what is deemed to be progress may turn out to be retrogression in disguise? To repeat the phrase of Professor Careless, “everything is happening at once.”

In this connection I was interested to find

the same concern expressed in a book that was brought to my attention a short time ago, entitled *The Story of Education*, from which I quote a few sentences which I consider to be pertinent to this discussion:

A primary principle in education, or any other field, is that goals should determine actions. But this is not as simple as it sounds because of the many conflicting forces crying for attention and priority.

For example, a decision must be reached as to whether the schools should relegate social objectives into the background and concentrate on academic achievements. In other words, is the acquisition of facts and skills more important than the development of attitudes and values? If both goals are important, how can the school accomplish one without cutting down on the time and effort devoted to the other? Similarly, how can the sciences be stressed without neglecting the arts?

However, even when goals are agreed upon, there seldom is unanimity as to the methods to achieve them. Two schools may agree that children must be taught how to read as early and as efficiently as possible. But one school may stress phonetics and begin the training in kindergarten, while the other uses a contextual approach and delays the instructions until the child has reached the mental age of six or above. Although it often happens that several avenues to the same objective are equally good, still the problem points out the need for research and further experimentation.

From kindergarten up through graduate school a concerted effort is required to build in our children a social and civic awareness that transcends nationalistic boundaries. Leaders of the future will have to be well-informed and well-balanced individuals who are trained to see the world as a place where destinies are interlocked.

How can this be done? Immediately, one thinks of geography, history and civics as the key subjects along with a foundation in reading. But the need extends into every area of the curriculum including the guidance programme. It involves a deep plunge into the human relations, ethics and morality—all of which have been neglected to some extent in a "things-centred" and "science-minded" society. Concepts of service, sacrifice and sensitivity to others must be given utmost importance. The adult of the next generation must be inculcated with the idea that he is indeed his

brother's keeper and that rugged individualism, whether on a personal or national basis, cannot lead to anything but the destruction of democracy—just as it did in ancient Athens.

Nor can the schools afford to waste time in this effort; lost moments today may be paid for bitterly tomorrow. Although it may seem melodramatic to state the case so urgently, the facts cannot be controverted. An anxious world looks for leadership and the discovery of peaceful solutions to problems that are literally and figuratively explosive. The future of this leadership lies largely in the classroom and the success or failure of the schools will forever affect the destiny of mankind.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. Chairman.

These are but a few of the questions and the problems which crowd in upon those who are charged with the responsibility of our educational system. Some of them will be considered by Mr. Justice Hall's committee and I am sure they will not be overlooked by those who will follow me in this debate. We are all very deeply involved in these matters, as legislators, as parents and as citizens who are concerned about the future of our own country and the world of which we are a part.

Mr. Chairman, I should like once more to pay tribute to all those individuals and organizations that have exerted themselves in the interests of our educational system during the past year. In particular, I would mention the boards of school trustees; the Ontario school trustees' council; the classroom teachers and their Ontario teachers' federation; the Ontario educational association; L'association canadienne-française d'éducation d'Ontario; the Ontario federation of home and school associations; the parent-teachers' association; the Ontario association for retarded children; the municipal councils that have assisted in the collection of taxes required by local school authorities; the press, radio and television and the many individuals and groups that have submitted briefs, resolutions, and suggestions in the interests of education in this province, and in this group I certainly include the many hon. members of this House who have so thoughtfully drawn my attention to situations requiring departmental action and who have interpreted rulings and have cleared up misunderstandings concerning educational problems with their constituents.

May I also take this opportunity to express again my appreciation for the loyal support

I have received from my colleagues who share with me the heavy responsibilities of this department. No Minister could ask for more in the way of co-operation, of dedicated effort and wise counsel. To all of them I can only say, I am profoundly grateful.

In conclusion may I repeat again what I said in this House a year ago when I expressed the hope that our discussion would not be limited to a dialogue between the Minister of Education and the chief critics in the Opposition parties. There are many other hon. members on the government and Opposition sides who are knowledgeable and experienced in these matters and who should, and will, I am sure, make their full contribution to this debate.

Since I have been Minister of Education I have, of course, come to look forward to the contributions of the hon. member for Brant and the hon. member for York South. I fully recognize that it is their responsibility and their duty to criticize. I recognize, too, that the critic—even the destructive critic—is often the agent of progress. I want to assure my hon. friends now, as I have done on other occasions, that I respect their opinions, even when I may disagree with them, and that I do not for a moment doubt that we share a common desire to make Ontario's educational system one of which we can all be justly proud. In that sense, at least, Mr. Chairman, we are not adversaries but collaborators.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friends opposite who have listened so patiently to what I have had to say this afternoon have also found me, and will always find me, to be a good listener. As I said to the student body at the Sir John A. Macdonald institute some weeks ago, whenever you find a Minister of Education who has stopped learning, you may be certain that he has also stopped living and should be put out to pasture—and I need hardly add that for the present moment, at least, that kind of life has no allure for me.

And so for the next few days, or for whatever period this debate may require, I am ready to receive your thoughtful instruction and wise counsel. And here may I commend to you the words of the late Mr. James Thurber, who once observed that: "The wise man is not necessarily the one who knows all the right answers, but rather the one who asks the right questions."

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that my hon. friends opposite have come well armed with questions and criticisms. I fully anticipate that they will be sometimes blunt,

sometimes sharp, and will always aim to be constructive. I trust that out of our exchange of views will come a better understanding of the work of my department and fuller answers to our common problems.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): May I begin by extending my hearty congratulations to the hon. Minister on the excellent survey of the work of his department that he has presented to the House this afternoon. I hope it is not unfair for me to point out to him, however, that the beginning of his remarks were a signal for the exodus of many of his hon. colleagues on the Treasury benches and a large majority of his supporters in this House. Now I would say to you, sir, that there were more in the Opposition here than in the government benches—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. White: That is not so.

Mr. Nixon: That is not the main point, the point is this, that the hon. Minister's excellent report introduced his estimates which asked us in this House to vote him \$500 million for the continuance of the work of his department, the department that I would put to you, sir, is by far, the most important department of government. There is no doubt that the information that he has given to us, debatable as some of it may be, should be a part of the knowledge of every hon. member of the House, and I would hope that he would join with me in asking all hon. members to take this information as well as some of the comments that will come from other hon. members of the House back to the constituencies where the people are so interested in this responsibility of government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin my remarks this afternoon by saying something about free universal education. This is something that we are fortunate to have in this province to an extent that we will provide 13 grades of study to the people who live in Ontario. This is not reserved in any way to a free country. We know that many totalitarian states now, and in the past, have been able to evolve systems which were at least as efficient as ours in getting across facts and information to young people. The difference, however, I would submit, is that their aim was to produce obedient and efficient servants of the state and ours is considerably beyond this.

In recent reading about Egerton Ryerson, whose name is mentioned frequently in this

House, I was interested to learn that he copied the basic education system for this province from a Prussian model. In Prussia, for the last 140 years, free—and I suppose, universal—education has been the system. We, in the years since Ryerson's day have developed a democratic ideal of education that we are still seeking to achieve. We look forward to unlimited access to the best for our young people. All students must be provided with equal opportunity to know and appreciate the best that has gone before and to establish a respect for knowledge.

Beyond this, we hope to establish an inquiring mind in every one of the young people who benefits from the system that we provide. Our system must educate for adaptability, rather than for specific skill.

As time goes on, the problem becomes more difficult. Many years ago—and I suppose in the time of many of us as members of this House—there were responsibilities around the home and around the school that required real effort to meet an authentic challenge. It gave a sense of genuine achievement and self-respect for young people of school age to have a part to play, let us say, in the work of a farm or the work of a business.

Now I would submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that this has changed in the last few years quite dramatically. Even in the good old rural environment there are now many homes where the young people do not have the opportunity to accept these responsibilities that have often been classed as so valuable in the building of character. It is up to the schools, more and more, to adequately challenge our young people; to provide them with the ideals that are going to enable them to take a part in modern society.

It has been said that "ignorance of what is good is as large a drawback to success as incapacity to achieve it," and so idealism is still something that must be at the top of our requirements as we design our educational system and adapt its curriculum to changing times.

Our present system has the earmarks that all of us are very proud of. We are spending more and more money on it. The "plant" itself—if I may use that word—is becoming more and more modern; in fact, beautiful. The buildings in which our children receive their education are architectural additions to the community and we are proud of the fact that our young people stay longer and longer in school. There is a nagging doubt, however, in the minds of many people that we are suffering from what has been called

"educational inflation." We are spending more and more money on education; we are having our young people spend more and more time exposed to the system—nevertheless, there is the realization that our graduates, even from our top matriculation level, are really not ready for the experience of universities. It has been said by many at the university level that the first year is spent in adapting these young people for a different type of educational experience. Much of the course material is a repeat of what is offered at the grade 13 level. There is a sociological adaptation here—a very expensive one, both in terms of the money spent and of the number of our young people who do not accomplish this adaptation.

While I am talking about accomplishment at this level—I was going to say at the public and secondary level—I would say that not only are many of these young people not prepared for university education but, if they have taken one of the other streams in our system, they may not be adequately prepared for any employment. I have some statistics that I will give to the House in a few moments that would indicate that the largest group of the unemployed are among the young, and those who have had the most recent experience with the system of public education that we in this House have as our responsibility to provide. If we are failing anywhere, it might also be said that we are not providing the young people who leave our school system with an adequate basis of idealism and enthusiasm that will permit them to take their rightful place in the community, at least the place that we expect them to take. We have read recently of the unfortunate event at Centre Island, wherein a group of young people—for no apparent reason—set upon and attacked another group of young people who had gone there on an outing. This cannot be explained, really, if the advantages of an education were of any value to them at all. We read with something akin to horror the events that took place in a Toronto park just a few days ago, when a group of citizens—seized with a feeling that might be justified against another group that were going to be found in that park—surged back and forth in this public property, looking for someone to beat and stone and vilify.

There is certainly much to be said on the line of criticism of the inculcation of idealism among our young people and our citizenry at large. For years, people in Legislatures and people on every street corner have been saying our young people are not as good as they used to be, and so on. I know the hon. Minister would not agree with this and

neither would I. We have all had an opportunity to talk to these people and we know what they think about and the way they react to situations.

Nevertheless, it may be said that we have failed the young people if they leave school without once meeting a gifted and inspiring teacher, without learning the value of books and without once glimpsing the possibilities of man's development and their own possibilities through self-education.

It is in this connection that I would like to spend a few moments in discussing with the House and with you, Mr. Chairman, my own views as to what might be done to upgrade this general level of education.

It is apparent from the statistics that are available from the hon. Minister's report, and further from the Dominion bureau of statistics, that there are still large numbers of our young people who leave school before they are adequately prepared for the future. Sixty thousand young people left our system in 1964, 10 per cent of them without any job to go to at all, and they are listed in the statistics as unemployed. Another 10 per cent accepted jobs that must surely have only a short duration. They are generally listed as clerical, and among those that would be most readily replaced in the progress of automation.

Of these 60,000, 11,000 were 16 years of age or under, and I was interested to read in the report of the select committee on youth that 9,000 were 15 or under. In other words, 9,000 people left school at the age of 15 or under, even though our laws require that they stay on in the educational system. Here then is the obvious group that we are failing. They are sometimes called unreached youth, or unreachable youth. I do not feel that any individuals in our society should be classified as unreachable, and it is these people, and those who have reacted to situations in the community in a way that would indicate their lack of preparation for community life, about whom we must be concerned.

The hon. Minister was kind enough in his remarks to mention a young man who did some work for his department, Mr. Nelles, who has just completed a programme of graduate studies at the University of Toronto. In the section of Mr. Nelles' report that the hon. Minister quoted, he drew the attention of those reading the report, to the importance of the teacher in the classroom as the answer to most of these difficulties, and it is along these lines that I would like to proceed.

We can have the finest schools; the very

best facilities but the good teacher is our most valuable educational asset. A few weeks ago, our educational committee journeyed to London, and on a very heavy schedule we had the opportunity to visit the vocational centre there. I should say in passing that I was quite interested in the plaque in the main hall there, bearing the names of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the hon. Minister, several local members, I believe, and down at the bottom in small type, the name of the Minister of Labour for Canada. I suppose it should be brought to the attention of all of us, once again, the large part that has been played by the federal jurisdiction in the support of these new facilities that have been built in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Who paid for the plaque?

Mr. Nixon: It may be that The Department of Education provided the plaque.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it was Public Works, actually.

Mr. Nixon: I see. I was interested in touring the institution there. In connection with my remarks about the importance of the teacher, we went into one large, well-equipped electronics laboratory where a group of students—I suppose there were 18 or 20, all having achieved grade 12 standing in the regular course of their education—were being instructed by a young man with an engineering degree. Seeing him in action, and seeing the way the young people responded to his teaching, was an example of excellence that is difficult to achieve through instructional methods, or by any method that I know of, except through the dedication of the individual as a teacher.

This man was obviously well prepared for his responsibilities, but more than that, he was accepting the responsibility in the best possible way, had an excellent rapport with his students, and was leading them at a rapid pace in the responsibilities of gaining knowledge, in this case, in the electronics area. So I want to say something about teachers in general and what the hon. Minister of Education, with his staff and his budget, might do to improve their competence.

To begin with, to point out the ideal in this area, every student of the province should be taught by a devoted and knowledgeable teacher, giving careful personal attention to a manageable group. Let us look at the background of the teachers who are at present working in the province of Ontario. In searching the tables of the hon.

Minister's report, and there are 96 of them, I felt that the academic qualifications of the teaching staff of the province was not adequately put before us. There is some material there, particularly on the development of university degrees among the teachers at the elementary level. But there is nothing to indicate what the distribution of adequately prepared teachers would be, whether they are all found in the cities or in the country, and whether an adequate proportion is found in separate schools and in public schools.

I was also interested in reading the statistics having to do with secondary school teachers and it appears that the number of specialists available in the secondary system is dwindling for reasons that I suppose are quite obvious—that there are so many opportunities for these people with honour degrees to go into other fields of endeavour, and that the teaching profession is losing out in this competition. The statistics would show that of all the teachers in training a year ago, and I understand there were about 4,000 of them, only 191 of them were going for a type A certificate, that is, entering the profession at the type A level, leading to a specialist's certificate. This is a tragedy of great proportions.

The hon. Minister has announced a programme that would attempt to attract more people of high academic qualifications into the teaching profession, but I would say to him, Mr. Chairman, that unless he is successful in this, we are heading for mediocrity in our school system at the secondary level and much more must be done to ensure that people of this high academic background are going to enter the profession.

Certainly, as our curriculum becomes more advanced, more involved, and I would submit, more difficult for a teacher to handle, we are going to need more and more of them with this higher academic qualification. I am afraid that the present trend is for young people interested in teaching to take the minimum pass BA course, with the easiest possible combination of subjects, and to be hired by a board of education to teach in the fall following their graduation. They enter the classroom, then, with minimum academic qualifications—a summer short-course which will put them in the classroom, I will submit, unqualified to take part in modern teaching as we would hope it would take place.

About teacher training specifically: We have had an opportunity at least to glimpse the new facilities being built in London at

the college of education under construction there. I might just say in passing that it is a beautiful building and an outstanding addition to the University of Western Ontario campus. In looking at the campus in general, I was struck with the traditional architecture that had been followed in all the buildings there. No doubt this has been definite policy but it seemed to be 1928 university architecture—very expensive and beautiful, but rather confining when one sees what modern architects can achieve when they are given some more professional liberty. Nevertheless, the new college of education there is an outstanding building.

But the standard course, the winter course that is used to train our teachers, is falling more and more into disuse. If I am reading the statistics correctly, 566 people availed themselves of the opportunity to ready themselves for the teaching profession through the regular standard course. We must realize that this cannot be called an outdated course any longer, because the results of a large and I suppose reasonably adequate committee report have been available to the hon. Minister now for two years and we must assume that what goes on at the colleges of education is by his view as modern as it can be.

Nevertheless, more students realize or come to the conclusion that they do not want to avail themselves of this type of teacher training and actually many hundreds go through the short courses—I believe in the first-year short course, 1,952 people; in the second summer course, 1,566. It appears then only one out of six takes the standard full-year preparation for teaching. And of this, as I said, less than 200 are in the specialist category.

Once the teachers have had their training they enter classrooms which, according to the Dominion bureau of statistics education survey, are still very crowded. As a matter of fact, it appears that Ontario has the highest average number of students in the classrooms of any of the provinces of Canada. This report is the most recent available and it was a survey of 1961 and 1962 conditions. It found that, of 38,000 elementary classrooms in Ontario, 11,000 had 35 students or more in them and 2,700 had 40 or more. In the secondary schools, there were 12,800 classrooms and 5,000 classrooms had over 35 students and 3,000 had over 40 students.

When I was talking about the ideal teaching situation, it was made clear that the teacher had to deal with manageable groups of students. I suppose a very competent teacher could manage 40 or more students at

one time, but only with the merest makeshift of the real learning experience. Some individual contact is required and I submit that our aim, an attainable aim, should be not more than 20 students in the classrooms that our teachers would work with. This, of course, is something that has to be dealt with with some flexibility. There are many experiments going on across the province. In the secondary system at Brantford, there is one of the most useful programmes—involving team-teaching procedures whereby, in the introduction to a broad topic, perhaps 100 students are brought into one area. One teacher, with two or three assistants, would speak with this large group. Then they leave the circumstance that I have described and go into much smaller groups, less than 20 in the group I would presume, so that some individual attention would be possible.

But I would say that, if the hon. Minister feels that our teachers are adequately prepared for the responsibility, they are too often put into a classroom where the number of students is unmanageable. This is carried to the extent that I suppose the number of teachers who leave the profession because they find they cannot manage the group is very high indeed, and something that must be causing the hon. Minister some concern.

Now I suppose the ideal situation would be one teacher for one student. We get closest to this at the most expensive level, at the university level, where the professors with a great deal of expensive background and expense training do have an opportunity to deal with small groups of students, particularly at the senior levels. We know that some of the new universities are making a particular point of this. York University tried to do it for a while, and is gradually falling away from this ideal. The president of Trent University says that they are not going to fall away from it, and this is what is going to make their university at Peterborough different from the others.

Well, I submit that one of the reasons why students have such great difficulty when they go to university from our high school system is they do not know how to react in these small group teaching situations. I was interested to read a few days ago that one of the reasons why they had to abandon some of the tutorial work at York was that the students did not know how to respond in these small group situations. As a matter of fact, the opportunity seemed to be wasted on them. And I think one of the most useful things the hon. Minister could do would be to provide the finances to cut down the size

of the classes at the secondary level. This is something that would make the teaching much more meaningful in the classroom.

We are talking about the provision of good teachers; their academic qualifications; their training, under our present system; and what they must face in the classroom. Surely it would not be proper to leave this situation without referring to teachers' salaries. During my experience in this House I have heard some members—I do not believe they are members of the House now, since 1963—make some very definite pronouncements about their own views as to what teachers' salaries should be. Even in those days, they thought that teachers were grossly overpaid.

I would like to point out to the hon. members that the statistics would indicate that Ontario by no means leads the field in paying adequately trained teachers. In these statistics that are available from 1963 and 1964, we find that the median salary in Ontario for all the teachers was \$4,922. In Alberta, it was \$5,135; and in British Columbia, \$5,640.

When we examine the comparison of teachers' salaries in rural schools, we find that the median salary in Saskatchewan—and I can use this word since the hon. Prime Minister is not in the House; I know how it infuriates him—is \$4,133 and in Ontario, \$3,882. It may be that, if we are going to attract to the teaching profession those with the academic background that we simply must have, it is going to take more than a \$500 bursary at the post-graduate level. It is going to take the realization that the teachers are most important public servants and that they are going to have to be paid commensurate with their qualifications and their responsibility.

The hon. Minister now has a committee dealing with the training of teachers at the primary level. The report of his committee dealing with the training at the secondary level has already been before the House for some time and the hon. Minister has acted upon it.

But I feel, that from these recommendations, we should realize that teacher training must be a challenging post-graduate experience. Whether it is post-university graduation or post-secondary school graduation, it must not be an indoctrination to a world of over-control and narrowness. We must attract to the profession those who are interested in a position where their initiative is valued and where their contribution to the community is valued as well.

I submit that our teacher training courses

must be more challenging. I suppose by that I mean they must be harder, more difficult; because hard work is going to attract the people we want and repel the ones that we do not want.

Just in closing my remarks about the training of teachers, I would like to say that in a good many of the teaching situations in this province, particularly at the secondary level, the teacher who has to deal with too many students in the classroom—with rates of pay that do not compare with other jurisdictions and are below other jurisdictions, and in a situation where there is over-control and over-regimentation and a lack of opportunity for the initiative of the individual—normally has to prepare 36 lessons in a week. There are other jurisdictions where it has become apparent that some time available for reading, for adequate preparation, for adequate dealing with the tests, laboratory work and so on has been made available. I would hope that our ideal situation would reduce the teaching load of the teachers in this province to something considerably less than it is.

We must remember that the plans put before The Department of Education now call for an upgrading of the grade 13 year into what has been called the matriculation year, a transition to the university experience. If this is so, the teachers at that level must have the opportunity to teach as university teachers do. I would suggest that one class at that level would be equated with two at a lower level and their teaching load would be based on that view.

So we must realize that freedom with responsibility is going to produce the first-rate teacher that we all look for.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that you wish to go to another order of business.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 14th order, second reading, Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Ontario human rights code, 1961-1962, Mr. Davison.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might seek approval

of the House for another hon. member to introduce this bill. The hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Davison) is ill today. Also, while I am on my feet, I would point out that the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn) had another prior commitment for this hour. We have other hon. members who are in a position to introduce them into the House if there is no objection.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have the unanimous consent of the House?

Agreed to.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine), in the absence of the hon. member for Hamilton East, moves second reading of Bill No. 9, An Act to amend the Ontario human rights code.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to express my regret that my hon. colleague from Hamilton East is unable to be here today to move the bill himself. He has been waiting a long time for the opportunity to speak on second reading of this bill and I know that he is very much disappointed that he is not able to do so.

I should also like to express the appreciation of this group to the House as a whole for its courtesy permitting another member move the second reading of this bill and also the other bill referred to.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes what in terms of mechanics is quite a simple amendment to the Ontario human rights code. Essentially it proposes that the word "age" should be inserted in appropriate places in that code. In spite of the simplicity of the mechanics of the bill, I think it is one of the most important bills that has come before this House this session, notwithstanding the fact that it is being sponsored by a private member. As hon. members know, the Ontario human rights code at the present time, among other things, makes illegal discrimination in employment or discrimination in relation to trade union membership on account of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry and place of origin. The code also provides administrative machinery which, I think, all of us will agree, has proved eminently satisfactory in the field to which it applies, to make those prohibitions as effective as is humanly possible.

Our proposal is simply this, that "age" should be added to the list of conditions in regard to which discrimination will be out-

lawed in the public policy of this province. If our amendment is adopted, it will be illegal to discriminate in employment on account of age just as it now is on account of race, creed, and so on, and will be illegal for a trade union to discriminate against any person with respect to membership on account of age.

I should also call to the attention of hon. members that there is in the bill a saving clause which would make the provision of the bill inapplicable in certain specified cases where it clearly should not be applied: specifically, in a case where the nature of employment requires a young person with physical stamina and substantial physical strength and where an older person clearly could not do the job. It also would exempt a situation where a person was retired under a recognized retirement scheme upon reaching retirement age. It would not apply in those situations but it would apply otherwise.

The effect would be quite straightforward, Mr. Speaker, if we adopted the amendment. If a person applied for a job and was told that he was too old—as all too many are now because they have reached the age of 45, or even 40, and in some cases, even 35—he could go to the Ontario human rights commission, file a complaint and then the commission would initiate the procedure that it initiates in cases relating to race, creed, colour, and so on, a procedure that has been found to be eminently satisfactory. It is by no means 100 per cent effective, but it has had a significant effect in reducing discrimination for those causes in this province. I think that applying the same sensible procedure in the case of age would have a significant effect in reducing discrimination on account of age.

Basically, the procedure is a dual one: It is an enforcement procedure to a degree, but even more, it is an educational procedure. The human rights commission, when it gets the complaint, does not haul somebody into court right off the bat. It has that as a last resort if necessary. Essentially what it does is to interview the person who is discriminating, point out to him that his conduct is contrary to public policy and explain to him why it is so. In most cases the person concerned co-operates; the problem is solved, and another important piece of education has been done.

In terms of enforcement, age, in our opinion, is in exactly the same category as race, creed or colour. Age is a matter over which a person has no control—he was born on a certain day and he can never, no matter what he does, change that fact any more

than he can change his colour or his place of origin. I think all people or most people recognize that it is unfair, unreasonable, unjust—intolerable, I would say—in this day and age that a person should be discriminated against because of a factor over which he has no control.

If he fails to get a good job because he has not got adequate qualifications, that is a different matter, and this bill, of course, would not interfere with that in any way. If he is unqualified for a job, then that is his own responsibility; he could presumably attempt to get the qualifications to get the job he wants. This problem arises frequently with older people—not so terribly old at that; 40 or 45, the age of a great many of us in this House. There are some in this House, I think, who would not face discrimination on account of age if they were trying to find employment in private industry, but there are a great many of us, including myself, who have passed the advanced age of 45 and therefore would find themselves in a position where they could very well be discriminated against.

I have had many constituents come to me and, to take one type of example, among them were men who had lost jobs they may have held for 20 or 25 years, because of a change in the productive process in their plants. They became supernumerary in their plants; they were doing good work and were considered to be excellent workers, but they became surplus. They were cut off and when they went out looking for a job they could not get one. They would go to an employment office at a firm and all they had to say was that they were 45 years of age and that was the end of it. They did not even get a chance to state their qualifications or to indicate their willingness to work. I know of men personally—and I am sure every hon. member of this House knows of people similarly located—who have been reduced to public welfare because nobody will give them a chance to show whether or not they can work.

We all know that this is sheer prejudice based on nothing. In fact, most studies indicate that the older, more mature worker is often better than the younger one. He is more steady and reliable and, shall we say, he has "sown his wild oats" and is ready to settle down. But now a tragically large number of employers will not even give them a chance.

The federal Department of Labour has tried to do something about this through a publicity campaign. I do not know if it is

currently running billboards, but I remember billboards on which there was some such slogan as: "Don't judge a man's worth by his date of birth."

This type of propaganda is useful, I think, but it should be backed up by something more solid than mere billboards and newspaper advertisements. It should, in my opinion, be backed up with a clear declaration of public policy such as the bill that is before hon. members proposes.

One only has to look at the advertisements in the newspapers to see the tragic effects of the type of prejudice that we are now up against. I started to go through one of today's papers just to see how many of the "help wanted" advertisements indicated discrimination on account of age, and I got tired marking them, there were so many of them. I will read one, as an example:

Experienced sales clerks. Camera salesmen, shoe salesmen. Age to 40. Experienced in retailing.

They want experienced people, but they do not want them to be past 40. There is nothing in the advertisement that would indicate any reason why a person that was 45 or 50 could not do the job just as well as one of 35 or 40. But no, the man of 45 or 50 will not be given a chance under the policy that particular company has laid down.

We all know that there are a great many cases where discrimination on account of age exists. We find it advertised in the papers, and even though a great many of these advertisements do not mention age, nevertheless, it is often found that age is a factor as soon as a person applies.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been debated in the past in this House and I would like to say that in my opinion, the best speech that I, for one, have ever heard on the subject was made in this House in 1960. In fact, I was reading it over earlier this afternoon to refresh my memory. It was so good that I was almost tempted just to read it into the record and let it go at that without bothering to make any comments of my own. However, I decided that perhaps I should make statements on my own responsibility.

Now this speech was attributed by *Hansard*—it appears, incidentally, on pages 2521 to 2524 for 1960—it was attributed to one Mr. A. Grossman who, I think, is well-known to all hon. members of this House. At that time he was the member for St. Andrew; he continues to be the member for St. Andrew and he is now also the Minister

of Reform Institutions in the government opposite.

I regret that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is not in his seat at this moment. He is usually present in this House and I have no doubt that there is a good reason for his absence. I would like to see him get up and make a speech similar to the one he made in 1960. I am sure that he could persuade the government better than I could. I hope it is not the fact that he has grown weary in well-doing, and now that he has become a Cabinet Minister, has lost interest in the people who have reached the age of 40 or 45 or 50. I would have hoped that he would have continued to urge this matter in the strategic position he occupies as a member of the Cabinet and would have persuaded the government to bring in a bill along the lines of the one for which I have just moved second reading.

I would also like to quote another distinguished member of this House from *Hansard* of March, 1962, on page 702. These, as indicated in *Hansard*, were remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), who is quoted as saying:

I think that everyone in the House is in complete agreement with the idea that discrimination in employment on the grounds of age is a problem which affects our society today and a problem with which we will undoubtedly have to deal. I do not think that there is any doubt about that in anyone's mind. We also can recognize in our society today a certain emphasis upon youth which, in certain aspects at least, might be referred to as a fad, and if carried too far it can become something which is unjust and perhaps unreasonable. The other emphasis, of course, is on the very large problem of age and the denial of employment to any person purely because of age.

There is one other sentence which I perhaps should read:

There is the other very important effect which the practice of denying a man employment because of age has on the individual in terms of personal frustration and mental distress, a feeling of insecurity and hardship, and all these matters are related to the question of age.

I think that this is an excellent statement of the problem. Unfortunately, the hon. Prime Minister in the same speech went on to quibble that the bill which was then being discussed, which was of the same nature as the one now before us, was not going about

it in the right way and that it would take a long time to really get this matter all sorted out.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the bill before us and the bill that was before the House in 1962 tackled the problem in exactly the right way by proposing to put it into the hands of the human rights commission which is thoroughly experienced in dealing with this type of matter.

It is not as though we are breaking new ground here. This is a type of policy that has been in effect in other jurisdictions for several years. The notable example, of course, is the state of New York, where the problem is handled in precisely the way we propose in this bill that is now before the House.

I will not ask the House to accept what I have to say about the state of New York, Mr. Speaker. I would rather read two or three sentences on that point from the speech made by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, as he now is, in 1960. These quotes are all from page 2523 and he said:

The fact remains that bills of this nature are in effect in 7 of the states of the United States.

Then he quoted from the *New York Times*, as follows:

The main gain seems to have been this: Many job seekers who formerly never got as far as an interview now get that opportunity.

And then a further quote from the *New York Times*:

Compliance procedures are the same as in the cases involving discrimination on the basis of race, colour, religion or national origin.

In other words, precisely what we propose here, Mr. Speaker.

Now I realize that this House already has a committee studying the problems of aging. That committee is quite commendably engaged in a detailed, lengthy and comprehensive study of all aspects of the problem of aging and it will obviously take some time to bring in recommendations. I hope the government will not use the existence of that committee as an excuse for failing to proceed on a specific matter on which it is obviously quite possible to proceed immediately, without waiting for the committee.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that the committee on aging really is not basically concerned with the problem referred to in this bill. It is dealing with, shall we

say, the more elderly group in the community by and large, the 65, 70, 75 group. What this bill is mainly directed to is the 35, 40, 45 and 50 year old group, the people who do not as yet really think they have got into the condition of aging, as it is commonly understood, people who think they are in their prime, but are frequently denied an opportunity to prove it. So I think the existence of that committee is no reason at all for failing to proceed with the bill that is now before the House.

One final point I would mention, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill does not and is not intended to apply exclusively, to people who are, shall we say, in middle age or beyond that. The problem of discrimination in employment on account of age also applies often in the case of young people. In fact it is getting case of young people. In fact it is getting to be an increasingly serious problem with regard to young people. Not only do we have employers refusing to accept employees or even to give them a chance because they are alleged to be too old, but they are also in many cases refusing to give a fellow a chance because they say he is too young.

As a matter of fact, there seems to be a sort of magic age group that is somewhere between 25 and 35. That is the only time a man is any good, it would seem. I cannot put my finger on them right at the moment, but a couple of ads here state specifically that the applicant must be between 25 and 35 or they will not even look at him. They will not even give him a chance to show if he has the qualifications.

So the bill is not designed merely to deal with the well-recognized problem of the person in middle age who finds it necessary to seek employment, it is designed to discourage, and we hope ultimately to eliminate, discrimination on account of age, for that is the factor, regardless of what the age is.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can sum up any better than by quoting three more sentences from the speech of 1960 by the now Minister of Reform Institutions. He said, referring to the bill that he had before the House at that time:

It is not the complete answer. It will not solve this problem completely but it is a good beginning. It is a step in the right direction.

I do not know where we may have heard that phrase before, Mr. Speaker.

And if nothing else, it will have great moral influence on our society. Therefore, I would urge the hon. members and the government to give their most earnest consideration to the support of this bill.

In the absence of the hon. Minister from the House today, I am very happy to echo his words and once again commend them to the government, of which he is now a member, and to the hon. members of this House.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party support this bill. We have spoken on a number of occasions on the same principle, on the various times that a similar bill has been before this House, and I, as well as the hon. member for Woodbine, have read the speech the hon. member for St. Andrew made in 1960.

It is a disappointing thing that once a man becomes a big wheel in the Tory party, he forgets those people who voted for him and put him there. It is a shame the hon. Minister is not here today—because he knew the bill was going to be before the House—to let us know why he has weaseled out of what he once believed in. I think it is a typical Tory manoeuvre.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main excuses that used to be given in the past for not supporting such a principle as is before the House, and that is to stop discrimination in employing people because of their age, was the difficulty of pension plans. Those companies that put forth these pension plans have a certain cut-off age after which they would not take on new employees, or have new employees within their plan. With the present pension plan now in the offing and the portability of pensions, this excuse is gone and I can now see no reasonable excuse, no sensible excuse, why we have not adopted similar legislation, as they have in the state of New York and as they have in other states. It makes economic sense to do so, and of course it is the humane thing to do.

First I will take what is probably the reason of secondary importance, and it is the matter of economics. We have people discriminated against often at the height of their powers, let us say from 40 on. The hon. member for Woodbine has said that this discrimination often starts at 35. Let us say 35 or 40. Often these people—in fact almost always, unless it is in some sort of a job that requires a lot of physical effort—in middle age, are at the height of their powers, of their energy, and still have enough drive to bring in new ideas and have lived long enough that they have mature judgment.

Yet these are the people whom some businessmen seem foolish enough to overlook. I know of numerous occasions where people have been refused even a chance to try for a job, once it is known they are in some age group, such as 40 or 45. It is our contention

that if, on these applications for employment, the mention of age, like the mention of colour or religion, is done away with, we are going to assist a lot of people in finding employment. If they do not find employment, what happens? They end up on welfare, or if they become so depressed and run down, they end up in the mental hospitals or they become disabled and so the taxpayer, in the end, foots the bill.

Is it not far more reasonable to introduce legislation that keeps people looking after themselves, that gives them the opportunity to help themselves? Such is the legislation that we have before us. I say again, Mr. Speaker, it is economic sense that we do anything we can, such as we would be doing here if we passed Bill No. 9, to make it possible for people to find the necessary employment.

So often those who are in the middle-age group have fairly young families, more than likely teenagers. Some of them are going to schools for higher education. All this costs money, and in the end, we are not only helping the middle-age generation, but we are helping the younger generation. So it makes economic sense.

Second—I leave it second to emphasize the importance of it, and this is that it is the humane thing to do—I am on the committee for looking into the problems of aging, and I have had a tremendous opportunity, as the others members on the committee have had, to see the importance of keeping people busy, to keep them at work. Those people, particularly, who are in the middle-age area, do not want to be kept busy with some therapeutic work or by doing hobby craft. They want something productive, where they are in the swim of the general workaday world.

True, they advise that older people should also have hobbies to keep them doing something of interest, to keep them doing something worthwhile. If we make it possible, or help to make it possible, that the citizens of this province are kept busy doing something worthwhile, they are going to keep their powers of physique, their powers of mind, far longer, if they are kept in the swim of society. Such a bill as Bill No. 9, with its principle of doing away with discrimination of age, will help in this cause, Mr. Speaker.

I do not pretend to say to this House that this is a cure-all. No single bill is a cure-all for anything today in our complex society, but this does go a long way to help and even goes a long way in educating business men and business firms. We know that the federal

government offered a bonus to firms about a year or a year and a half ago, if they would employ people over a certain age. This is an effort by the federal government to do something in this vein. We at least should expect some kind of effort from the government of the province of Ontario.

We have had fine speeches from one man who is now a Minister in this government. We have had a fine speech on this subject, at least the first part of it was, from the hon. Prime Minister of this province, back in 1962, and yet he, as is so often the case, found some excuse to wiggle out of taking any definite action. The time has come for us to do something concrete, to let the business community know that we are interested, to let the people of the province as a whole know that we are interested, and more particularly, Mr. Speaker, to let those people who are in that most difficult time from the 40s, the 50s and early 60s, know that we are interested in helping to see that they get worthwhile employment.

I urge the government to support this private bill. It is an unusual thing for a government to do so, but it is not impossible. Bearing in mind the speeches that have been made by Tory members, bearing in mind the economic sense of the bill, and bearing in mind the common sense of the bill, I am asking the government to make this bill law.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in speaking for this bill, I would like to relate most of my comments to the way this bill affects residents in my own community. I brought this up yesterday in the debate on Medicare, the fact that we happen to have a disproportionately large number of elderly people in the community. There is a reason for that. The reason goes back to the days of the boom period, the 1920s, in the community where large numbers of young people settled and found employment in the automobile industry. Those people today are not yet the senior citizens but are in their 45s, 50s and even 60s.

When it comes to applying for employment, we find that many industries hesitate to hire these elderly people, especially when there are large numbers of younger ones available. We found this especially true in the last four and five years when the economic conditions in the city were not the best. Now the conditions happened to have turned around and are more favourable, as a result, some of these elderly people are able to obtain employment. But the recent

automobile trade agreement has meant certain dislocations in the community, and it may mean more dislocations. Generally, when it comes to rehiring some of the people, a lot of the elderly find that in some instances—because they were the last taken on—they are the first to be let go and they will not be able to obtain employment. So with them it is a real problem.

At the same time, the individual might be 45 to 50 years of age, but has a physical appearance of an individual much older than that. I know in my own riding a case of a Mr. John DeLuca, who had applied for employment in several of the industries. Through the national employment service he was referred to an industry. He went to the place of employment but, after taking one look at him they almost immediately disqualified him simply because he looked a little older than he actually was. So age there was an important factor when it came to his becoming gainfully employed.

Not only are the aged discriminated against, but also the young. It is only a few years ago that a student—after graduating from school, even though he may have had some type of skill acquired in the school—was told he had no experience; so he was also discriminated against. He was too young. Yet how would he come along and get any experience if he were never hired?

Now there is still one other point that I would like to bring in here, and that is the elderly quite often have to resort to the Canadian vocational training programme 5. They are taken on and retrained. After having been retrained, and after the federal and provincial governments having spent good money to retrain the individual, he applies for employment and is likewise discriminated against because of his age. So unless we eliminate age as a factor of discrimination, we are going to find that the CVTP 5 programme is not serving the purpose that it was originally intended to serve. So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot disregard our older people because we happen to have a disproportionately large number of them. And for this reason, I think age is one of the discriminatory factors that should be eliminated from legislation, and a person should be allowed to obtain employment providing he has the necessary physical and mental qualifications.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Welcome back.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have been told the hon. member for Parkdale suggested that—as he said it—I “weaseled out” on this debate, or something of that nature. It is typical of the type of language used by the hon. member. I do not think it is proper language to use, Mr. Speaker. I do not think anybody in this House can ever accuse me of weaseling out on anything in the 10 years I have been here.

I can be completely honest with the House, Mr. Speaker, completely honest. I still agree with the principle of that bill completely, but the government is not ready to move on a thing like that at this time. As a matter of fact, if you will have read the complete text of *Hansard* of that time—I do not have it before me—I distinctly remember that at that time the Prime Minister used my bill as a vehicle for the discussion on portable pensions and the leader of the Opposition of that time agreed that it would be a good purpose for which to use this bill. As a matter of fact, it was agreed that they were pretty well tied in with each other; that one of the problems in employing people at certain ages was the fact that many of the pensions were so geared that, to employ someone past the age of 45, gave many employers some concern about the effect on their pension plan. And we on this side would like to see what effect the new pension plan is going to have on this province before we move into this field.

Until that time, sir, I think—it is not long from now as everyone in this House knows—we can afford to wait perhaps that one year to see what effect it may have.

I make no bones about it, Mr. Speaker. I completely believe in the principle of the bill; it is a matter of whether this is a practical time to attempt it or whether it is not.

Mr. Bryden: What is impractical about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have just explained to the House in talking now about the pension plan and the effect the pension plan would have on this problem, because that may do more toward solving this problem than any bill of this nature.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the illogic of what the hon. Minister said forces me to enter a debate that I did not intend to get into.

In 1960, the hon. Minister argued that the portable pension was one of the problems in coping with this situation; now the government has moved on portable pensions. This legislation has been completed. Have we not

reached the time for you to take that first step? How many more years?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): He is not the government.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, he is one member of the government and he is equally responsible. In other words, instead of paying lip service to a principle and seeking excuses, let us take that famous first step that his government apparently finds so difficult to initiate.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think the subject matter which is involved in this bill is one on which all of the members of this House could find themselves in agreement. It is not only an interesting subject, it is a very important one. I agree with all that has been said by hon. members of the Opposition and, of course, by the speaker from our own government side.

This is an important problem. Indeed I had advanced, and prepared into its second draft, a bill on this subject with respect to this current session; but I cannot accept the suggestion that the committee on aging is not a valid reason for deferring the bill for a year. In my view, with matters of such importance, the bill we bring in should deal with as many of the areas as possibly can be dealt with. It has been indicated in the debate today that there are areas, there are most unusual situations, where discrimination is not necessarily at the 65, 70 or 75 category. It may be in some other categories, and maybe the actual facts of the problem are not as they appear.

In any event, let me make some reference to the federal government. It is rather intriguing for me, I believe, in their programme of encouragement and of education, and its slogans and advertising campaign, but I am at a loss to understand the debate from the Liberal side when no such legislation in support of its education campaign has been advanced by the federal government.

The point is simply this: I am prepared, as Minister of Labour, to advance this matter in the immediate future, but not at the present time. I would like to have the advantage of the research and study which the committee on aging may be able to give to this problem and, in any event, I want to complete my own research. I agree with the principle which has been advanced.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William) moves second reading of Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, the hours of work in the province of Ontario—indeed, all over Canada and all over the North American continent—have been reduced over the years from some frightful hours some few decades ago to the condition at the present time in the province of Ontario where 48 hours is described as the maximum work week. I am sure we are all thoroughly familiar with the fact that in various jurisdictions in this country, and in the United States, the fact is accepted that the maximum work week is a 40-hour week.

While I know this subject has been introduced into this House on previous occasions and has been the subject of much comment, not only among groups of organized labour people, men and women, but among others who are not organized, I think it is time—far past the time, as a matter of fact—that this government should take a really sound look at the matter of a 40-hour week. There are probably several reasons why a 40-hour week is completely justified at this time, and one could go on almost indefinitely and list them. I suggest that the time is coming in the comparatively near future when the question of automation is going to have a very real effect upon the maximum work week.

I suggest also to you, Mr. Speaker, that the question of leisure time which automation is very likely to bring about is going to be important if we attack this problem in its proper perspective at this time—the 40-hour work week. Certainly after listening closely to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in his remarks today, I believe that the government and certainly The Department of Education envisages in future continued use of the educational facilities to take care of larger groups and older groups of people in the communities, for purposes of improving their education and placing them perhaps in a new form of employment. These are all things that we may not pay too much attention to today, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the time is coming very, very soon when we are going to feel that we missed an opportunity if we, in this province of Ontario, do not initiate the 40-hour work week as the maximum work week in the province.

I mentioned that large numbers of people, both men and women, have talked about the maximum 40-hour work week, but I would also like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and I think you know it full well, that there are people at the present time in this province—and I would doubt if many hon. members in this House realize how many people there are—still working in excess of 48 hours a week—

Mr. Letherby: Well, we are attending the Legislature.

Mr. Freeman: But the hon. member is big and able to take it. There are very many people who are working in excess of a 48-hour week, and I suggest in all seriousness that in very many cases they are getting no compensation for such overtime as they put in at their work. In many cases the amount of overtime is very little, perhaps two, three, or four hours a week, and they seem to be willing to go along with it, although in their own beings they resent the situation and I think it is an unjust situation.

It is one that should be corrected, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is only going to be corrected by legislation.

Lip service has been paid, as I said, to this question of a maximum 40-hour work week for a long period of time and that lip service is just not enough. This province has been described as “the province of opportunity,” and I like to feel that it is and I hope that it will continue to be in a greater degree.

But I would suggest that this is a marvelous opportunity for this government, our government, to add more lustre to the slogan, “the province of opportunity,” and also a greater degree of truth to the slogan, “the province of opportunity.” One way to add lustre and to bring more truth into the slogan is for the government to realistically face this problem of the 40-hour maximum work week. I have been used to the 48-, 50- and 60-hour work week myself for so many years that it is almost difficult for me to realize that it would be possible for people to enjoy a 40-hour maximum work week. However, I hope the reiteration of “40-hour” and “48-hour” will bring the hon. members to realize that it is the 40-hour maximum that is so much to be desired.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with automation on the increase, the balance between labour and jobs can be seriously affected. The efforts of this government to cope with the problems at the present time would seem to me, and I believe to many

others, quite inadequate. Sharing the available work may not be in any way a real contribution to such a large problem but it is certainly of some help and could well be acted on by this government.

In the bill, the provisions covering no reduction in take-home pay and time and a half for overtime are related to this whole question. This is one of the problems that I am sure has probably caused the government some concern in its quest to approach the problem of a maximum 40-hour work week, because of the fact that it may be offending the sensibilities of many people whose sensibilities it has no wish to affect.

But I believe this government should face the inevitable, and should face the inevitable in a most realistic manner. I think that if each hon. member, whether at present in this House or not in this House, but who has had the matter called to his attention, will examine his own conscience or her own conscience as the case may be—the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard)—he will support this bill to make the maximum hours of work 40 hours a week in the province of Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, this bill commends itself to me and I should like to make a comment or two about it.

Quite apart from the question of the reduction of the work week so as to provide work for a greater number of our people, in a day and age when we are concerned about the problems of automation, it strikes me that the 40-hour week has come to be accepted by our population as the linear measure, in terms of the passage of time, of the amount of one's week that should be devoted to the earning of the daily bread.

I have been a bit impressed in my lifetime by the great change that I have seen in the use of winter by our people for recreational purposes. It is a good thing that we make such use of winter in the 1960s as we do, because we certainly, as in all the decades of the century—this one, the one before that, and the one before that—have enough of it. But I have been struck by the great numbers of our people who now engage in outdoor recreational activity and manly sports.

For example, when I was a boy, I recall that in the realm of curling it was only the most hardened kilt-wearing Scotsman who would hurl a stone in the winter. Now, at least in the north country, and I imagine it is true throughout the province, great numbers of people engage in the recreational pursuit of curling.

So it is with skiing. When I was growing up, it was thought that skiing was an activity that one left when one left the teens, that it was a recreation for only the very young and very hardy and people in the peak form of good health. Now, one goes to the ski slopes, and one incredibly sees people of the age of the hon. Minister of Labour just starting to take up the sport. That is to say, people in their 50s. Apparently anyone under the age of 60, if he is in normal good health, is not risking serious illness if he participates in skiing.

Then, of course, there is the winter carnival—skating. Large numbers of our young people play hockey. There has emerged on the winter scene, such a recreational pursuit as broom ball, which was virtually unknown a decade ago. Now large numbers of people in our communities engage in that sport.

That is one factor that commends itself to reducing the work week to 40 hours, so that our people have enough energy left to get out and take advantage of the recreational pursuits that are available to them throughout the long winter.

The other comment that I should like to make, and I think it is very germane, is that I was impressed by the vocal minority of people who came before the select committee on mining, and urged upon us, I must say without success to the present time, the opening of our provincial parks for prospecting and mining development. Our committee, so far with the aid of my hon. friend from York North (Mr. Mackenzie), who is a very bulwark against any intrusion into our provincial parks, has resisted the importunings of such people.

The point I want to make in respect of the provincial parks is this, that the provincial parks, so far as they provide a recreational pursuit for our people when the work day is done and the work week is done, are a very outgrowth of our industrial community. In other words, the high degree of our industrial development in this province has created the need for recreation. People working fewer hours and making more money transfer their interest from their work quite readily into an interest in recreational pursuits. I am happy to relate that, as all hon. members know, we have quite a number of provincial parks, I think taking up five per cent of the land mass of Ontario. They are a very logical development from the affluence of our industrial civilization.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill, and the initiative of my hon. friend from Fort William in bringing it before the House.

I know today—and I do not say it in a fit of depression—that somebody is going to move the adjournment of the debate, but I hope in the not-too-far distant future that this principle will find a hallowed position in statutory enactment. Being struck by the events of recent days, I know in respect of this government that it is committed to the proposition that is laid out in the Chinese proverb, "Every journey of 1,000 miles starts with one step." Perhaps in respect of this, that one step will be followed by a great many and more rapid steps and the principle here in sections 1 and 2—

An hon. member: Not over there.

Mr. Sopha: My hon. friend says "not over there," and perhaps he has got reason to be a bit pessimistic, as all of us have here, in anticipating great changes. May I say that I hope this bill commends itself to all hon. members of the House.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak very briefly in opposition to second reading of Bill No. 10, and obviously not on the basis of any sweeping principle. It seems to me that judgment of Bill No. 10 is entirely a matter of place and time, and I limit my opposition to this bill to the year 1965. I do not limit myself to what we might have in 1966 or 1967, nor to the gradients as to the number of work weeks or hours of work we might have, nor whether it would be better dropping it to 44 hours as a start and then to 40.

The background of any remarks on this subject seem to me, Mr. Speaker, to relate to the fact that there is a legislative and economic trend toward shorter hours of work. Some of our western provinces have dropped to 44 hours a week, and there is an economic trend fostered by the union movement or by the labour movement itself.

The second part of the background, and an important thing to consider, is the tremendous year of expansion economically that 1965 is for the province of Ontario. The third thing that comes to my thoughts is the fact that we have not yet quite digested the progressive legislation which was contained in our minimum wage amendments of last year and before.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak with any of the expertise of some of the hon. members opposite when it comes to the economics of this problem, but as a layman it seems to me that the first step might be to lower the hours of work by something less than a full eight hours, and the second thing is that it

would be much more obvious and much more reasonable to see this lowering in a year in which, instead of a tremendous development, we are, in fact, experiencing some form of recession.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I can only go so far as to say I can see that the bill could, in 1965, create damage and may not produce any particular good.

Analyzing the people it would help, we can deal first with organized labour, both skilled and unskilled. It does not seem to me that there is any urgency in helping the organized group of the labour force, because the place that it protects itself is at the bargaining table and with both groups, skilled and unskilled, one feels that the union movement itself is discharging the responsibility required.

Insofar as the skilled and unorganized are concerned, I would suggest that in the present economic climate of Ontario they are not being prejudiced in any way by a short further delay in any lowering of number of hours of the week for work.

The group that does concern one is the unorganized and the unskilled. Here, of course, is the basic purpose of the legislation, I would think, and that is to avoid exploitation, if it were found. Now, I can say, sir, certainly coming from my part of the province, I have not had demonstrated to me, and I do not think the tenor of the remarks today have purported to demonstrate, that we are dealing with a great problem of exploitation.

What one does notice, and I think many hon. members on both sides of the House have found this, is the very great burden felt by the small proprietor, who is generally, I would think, the person who employs the greatest number of the unskilled and unorganized workers. I know that particularly in the field of service stations and that type of small proprietorship this a problem in my own area, where I get complaints from people who labour, as well as proprietors, with respect to the present hours of work legislation.

Another thing that perhaps is not particularly pertinent to all hon. members but to some of us, is the fact that, certainly where I live, one must keep one's eye on what is happening in another jurisdiction.

From an economic point of view, the city of Ottawa-Hull straddles a provincial boundary. I can say to the House, from personal experience, that there is a very delicate balance in some of the industries in Ottawa as to a choice between jurisdictions which is

prised on the question of cents—small amounts of money in labour costs and hours of work.

Having said that, I close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we should perhaps take a small opportunity—a short opportunity—of digesting the minimum wage. I think that our rate of expansion makes us very vulnerable to any drastic changes in this kind of legislation. Finally, everyone must accept that the trend is in the direction and we will see—many of us, I hope—the 40-hour week in this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Education and we will have an opportunity on some other day of continuing with these bills and other bills similar to those we have had in the past hour.

Mr. MacDonald: Not tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, we will go on with estimates tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 3, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, first reading	3610
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	3610
Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. S. Lewis, on second reading	3640
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Dymond, agreed to	3647
Appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies, and to define the com- missioner's powers and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer, on second reading	3647
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Singer, agreed to	3650
Recess, 6 o'clock	3650

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today in the west gallery, students from Atherley public school.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to announce the retirement of my deputy Minister, Mr. J. A. Graham, due to ill health, and to inform the House of the appointment of Mr. L. R. Hackl, BA, to the position of Deputy Minister effective June 1, 1965.

Mr. Graham's resignation is accepted with much regret, appreciating the many important changes for which he has been responsible during his service with the department. Mr. Graham started his career with the department in 1946, when he was appointed governor of Carleton county jail. In 1947, he became superintendent of the Ontario training centre in Brampton, the first completely open institution in Canada. After firmly establishing the training programme at Brampton, he became superintendent at the Ontario reformatory at Mimico in 1951, where he played an important role in developing the Alex G. Brown memorial clinic for the treatment of alcoholics.

In 1953 he was promoted to executive assistant to the Deputy Minister and in 1959 to the position of Deputy Minister. During that period, Mr. Graham was active in many progressive developments in the corrections field in Ontario. He placed great emphasis on staff training, vocational trade training and many other innovations which put Ontario in the forefront in the field of the rehabilitation of the offender.

Much credit is due to Mr. Graham for the consistently high standard of service he has rendered to the province and the part he has

played in bringing The Department of Reform Institutions to its high standing in this field.

Mr. Graham typifies the civil servant in Ontario who gives of his best in carrying out arduous duties with zeal and dedication, a dedication which so often takes a heavy toll of health. Mr. Graham's job was particularly demanding because of the difficulties naturally inherent in the kind of work in which The Department of Reform Institutions is engaged.

In regretfully accepting Mr. Graham's resignation, I wish to express the thanks of the government and the people of Ontario for his long years of faithful service and wish him improved health so that he may enjoy many years of well-deserved retirement.

Mr. Leo R. Hackl, BA, the newly-appointed Deputy Minister, has worked in the department in a number of capacities since 1947. Formerly a school teacher with a BA degree and a specialist certificate in guidance, Mr. Hackl was appointed superintendent of the Ontario training centre, Brampton, in 1954. From 1956 he served as superintendent of the industrial farm and the Ontario training centre at Burch until 1959, when he was promoted to the position of executive assistant to the Deputy Minister. On February 1, 1964, he was appointed assistant Deputy Minister, which position he has carried with distinction.

I am very pleased that a man of Mr. Hackl's ability is available to take over the position of Deputy Minister at this time, when such an intensive and expanded programme of the department, including major staff reorganization, is under way.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the acting Minister of Transport. What steps, if any, does the department plan to take to implement the recommendations of the coroner's jury that inquired into the death of James Heath, regarding safety features in motor vehicles?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr.

Haskett), I have the answer for the hon. member.

The Department of Transport has not yet received a copy of the recommendations of the coroner's jury following the death of James Heath. When this report is filed it will be given the same careful study that all jury recommendations receive. Government officials and representatives of the motor vehicle manufacturers are in constant contact through the various associations dealing with motor vehicle operations and safety on our highways.

Mr. Bryden: That says nothing in a long space.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may we revert back to the introduction of bills?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, there are only two amendments to this Act. One is to place local hydro-electric commissions and other utility commissions on the same basis as other local boards under this Act. The second amendment is to authorize the Ontario municipal employees' retirement board to invest the moneys deposited with the board in the same manner as its own funds, where it is managing pension funds under agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The sixteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (continued)

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue my remarks having to do with teachers in the province of Ontario. Very briefly, I would like to bring to your

attention, sir, the importance of having our best teaching talent working with the children in the early grades. There are no drop-outs in grades 1 and 2, and I feel that by the age of ten years our young people have, perhaps, lost their claim to equality of opportunity in their own right. So many of their learning habits have been determined and, I suppose, their basic ability has more or less been established. It is because their basic ability has more or less been established, and it is because of these reasons, that I feel a special attempt should be made to see that our best qualified teachers are working with those of our students in these early grades.

In looking through the statistics of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Davis') report—I mentioned this yesterday—I was a bit disappointed I was not able to find some information that would have been useful—on specifically, the distribution of teachers of ability in the rural and urban setting, and the separate and public schools. I feel that the hon. Minister might very well go to the records of the inspectors of the teachers, who have all received a rating from their inspectors on a numerical scale. It would be useful for us to know where the teachers with high ratings are found in this province and if, in fact, there is some distribution that is something other than fair, or along lines that might be correctable by the hon. Minister, or by action of this House.

Since I have mentioned the feature of control exercised by the Legislature that is largely in finance, I want to bring to your attention, sir, the fact that although we are all strongly in favour of equality of opportunity, the fact remains that opportunity is by no means equal. I would like to point out to the House one interesting statistic that I was able to find. In 1962 the municipality of Scarborough spent an average of \$309 on each of its students. At that time the number was 43,600 and another municipality, not far away—Forest Hill; I suppose I am picking an extreme case—spent \$540 on each of its 1,800 students.

I do not know what can be done about this. We congratulate Forest Hill for having the wherewithal to provide the special advantages that go with almost unlimited funds for education. It is true that the provincial government does provide, on an average, 40 per cent of the cost of education. The hon. Minister may want to argue about that. It depends, I suppose, on whether the grants are related to the expenses of the previous year, or the current year; but approximately 60 per cent of the expense is met elsewhere.

Much has been said about the burden the municipalities have to bear. Many resolutions have been passed and received in this House. Many committees have studied the problem, but it would surely be in the competence of the hon. Minister and this government to come down with some concrete proposals that would do more than pay lip service to the problem of financing education or financing the municipal responsibility in general. That is all I want to say about that aspect.

Going now to another topic, Mr. Chairman, we are in support of the government programme that would provide textbooks free of direct charge to the students in Ontario. The hon. Minister's programme to provide extra grants to buy the books needed to inaugurate the programme is a sensible one; but I would like to point out to you, sir, that whenever the costs of a programme that have —up until a new departure—been borne by individuals, are taken over by the government, there is a tendency for them to rise without the public knowing the rate of increase. I have seen some of the new textbooks that are being provided in local schools. They are very fine, hard-covered books with four-coloured pictures; and they are very expensive. Some of them are in excess of \$5, and I can see a tendency in the future for the cost of textbooks to rise astronomically without any particular outcry from the public—since the cost is met indirectly.

This is something that we must be very careful of. Information that, I suppose, is available to everybody would indicate that the publishing business is becoming very profitable. American publications indicate that a large degree of these new profits are in the textbook section of the industry. The government is going to provide finances through the local school boards to buy the books and, of course, the government does have a certain degree of control over what books will be bought through its authorization list, which is becoming quite large, granting the freedom of choice to the teachers and the school boards that is a subject of much debate. I feel there should be this freedom of choice, but others think differently.

But my own views on the textbooks is that, if they are going to be good textbooks, they are going to be thin textbooks. They are not going to cover every section of the topics on the curriculum, with additional topics as well. I do not feel it is up to us to provide the luxury texts that we are heading for at the present time. Our responsibility is perhaps even a more extensive one; and that is to

provide libraries in our school system, as is now being done on a modest scale, so that a large number of books are available on any given subject. In this way, with proper leadership from the teachers, our young people are going to learn the fact that the textbook does not bear all the information they might require on a certain subject. They are going to learn that a broad view is necessary to get a background on a subject that will permit them to continue their education. The emphasis and the money should be spent on furnishing our libraries, rather than funneling them into purchasing textbooks that would tend to become overelaborate and expensive.

The hon. Minister has already dealt quite fully with the teaching of history. His own children, I suppose, are at much the same point in the education system as my own are; and it is interesting to observe the different slant you get on such a system as a parent as opposed to what I formerly had with just teaching experience. I can well imagine the special trials the teachers at Brampton must go through when they realize that the personal informants of the hon. Minister of Education are watching them in action.

But in surveying the teaching of history in our system, in grades 5 and 6, our young people are exposed to the explorers of Canada; while basic Canadian history is covered in grade 7 and 8. A little more is hung on this basic skeleton of information in grade 10, and more in grade 13, but most Canadian history is covered in the last two years of the primary system. In looking at this course, I find it to be fact-crammed. I find the teachers use the textbooks more than they should, perhaps, and I find that young people of rather tender years are writing their notes from the textbooks.

I do not want to be specifically critical of teachers in any way, but this is surely where the fault begins with the teaching of history; that the foundations of Canadian history are laid by teachers who themselves have not been exposed to even the grade 13 teaching and are, in many ways and by their own admission, incompetent to deal adequately with the subject. The interest of our students is often killed because of this and, for this reason, I think it is dealt with inadequately.

The hon. Minister is conscious of this and, I feel, is very interested in improving it. Suggestions have already been made for improvement in texts, along the line of the centennial projects and I hope this will be dealt with adequately in the near future.

Many hon. members have been interested to read the report on the proposal for general

and advanced levels of instruction in grade 13, and I would like to deal with it at this time. It was in January, 1964, that the hon. Minister announced the committee that was going to deal with the problem of grade 13 instruction. Part of his announcement indicated that the report would be available the following June. I think this was a commendable approach because the problem had taken on almost crisis proportions. Following the original report an implementation committee was set up, and part of this committee's work dealt specifically with the proposal for the teaching of subjects at the grade 13 level, general and advanced. This report is now available, and once again I would say that this has been arrived at in rather a hasty and summary fashion. Even in the report itself the committee more or less apologizes for having not had the opportunity to refer exhaustively to this difficult matter. I hope that the implementation of their recommendations will be dealt with, with that in mind.

Among their recommendations, they indicate that there is general acceptance of the suggestion that grade 13 topics be dealt with at two levels—general and advanced—and that it be restricted to four subject areas. I feel sure that the hon. Minister is aware that this is not generally accepted and I would like him to comment later in this debate on what the university people have to say about this university entrance course, because surely they must have the operative decision as to what would be the requirements for entrance into university. Now, all these decisions must be taken in collaboration with the educational authorities, but to say that the suggestion has received general acceptance is, I feel, not correct at this stage.

I do feel that the general recommendations in the report are excellent. They deal with the need for increased student responsibility, not only at the grade 13 level, but at all stages, particularly in secondary schools. Too many of our students are still subjected to spoon-feeding and are not having an opportunity to have the sense of achievement that some personal study and personal progress can bring. But I am convinced, as I hope the hon. Minister is convinced, that our system can be made efficient enough so that our present academic level at the senior matriculation level is possible in 12 years, whether or not this means the abolition of grade 13. There must be a clear academic path, and I have said this before, so that our average student can achieve university entrance standing in 12 years in our public system.

Some months ago I had the enlightening opportunity to visit some of the poorer areas in this city. I mentioned them in the debate on housing and I have mentioned them when we have been discussing housing conditions in other debates. One thing that did impress me in visiting these substandard communities in Toronto and elsewhere, was the fact that the young people are presenting the most pressing problem. I found them healthy, very cheery, very willing to talk to visitors and to talk about their schools. Often there was reference to the fact that there was little to do in the summer but play out in the streets. Some time ago I made the suggestion in this House that the hon. Minister of Education might spearhead a co-ordinated programme among the government departments, which might provide employment for students at our senior secondary level and also in universities. Now this would be, I suppose, primarily to provide employment for these people who have some difficulty in earning money to continue their education.

In my own view, an object that would be just as important would be to give them the experience of community service, almost along the lines of the American Peace Corps, so that our young people would have an opportunity to go out into the community and have the experience of service.

Now, my remarks in this connection began with reference to the underprivileged children in the metropolitan areas of Ontario. We know that there are some camps provided, and some recreational facilities, but I am sure that more could be organized so that our students at the universities and the higher secondary levels would be taken into these underprivileged areas; they would be able to organize classes in remedial reading and remedial subjects of every type; they would be able to undertake recreational programmes and provide an improving influence that would tend to break the cycle of poverty that has become almost accepted by so many of our municipal authorities. Because I have dealt with the subject previously and more extensively, I would hope that the hon. Minister would be able to comment on the suggestion and to see if something might be done along these lines.

For the last three years we have dealt in these estimates with the possibility of introducing educational television into the province of Ontario. The hon. Minister has made the announcement that we are going into this in a very big way and we can look forward to a complete government-owned network that would bring educational tele-

vision into every area of the province of Ontario. This would begin with an application for an educational television station in Toronto. I hope and I expect that the application would be granted and we would find ourselves in the educational television field in the near future.

In this connection I would like to read an excerpt from a working paper prepared by the Metropolitan Educational Television Association of Toronto. One of the chief recommendations that is underlined in this report, is as follows:

It is of the first importance that there be set up a council or board charged with the responsibility and authority for province-wide development of educational television.

Now, in this House in the last few weeks we have seen the hon. Minister of Education set up similar boards that would have the responsibility of dealing with educational research and the proposed colleges of applied arts and technology. I would recommend strongly to him that a similar board might undertake the responsibility of the development of educational television, because if this is not done, the hon. Minister will be open to the charge—and I would be among the first to make it—that the educational television programme is under his control. I would submit to the House that this is not a good thing, that we would expect the hon. Minister to get advice from a great many professionals in the field, but in general the operation of the network should be by a board that would be constituted on the recommendation of the Minister, but by the Legislature of the province.

Now, it is interesting to see how far we lag behind other jurisdictions in the provision of educational television. I am informed that 50 per cent of the students in the United States already have access to educational facilities by television and we need only look at the publications that are available from many areas across Canada and the United States, to see how far we are behind in this business.

I have on the desk before me, the booklet put out by a co-operative group in the Maritime provinces, dealing with Atlantic school broadcasts, and the booklet put out by the province of Manitoba, dealing with their programme in radio and television. Similar ones are available for other provinces. I have one here entitled: "Young Saskatchewan Looks and Listens," dealing with their programme. The hon. members will recognize the very thin, rather uninteresting booklet

that I now have, entitled, "Elementary School Radio Broadcasts Presented By The Ontario Department of Education."

It seems to me I remember back in grade 5, that our teacher used to thumb through a leaflet that looked very much like this. It may be that this is just a reprint, with the date changed, and some updating of the programmes, but in essence, nothing has been done of a concrete nature, until the hon. Minister's announcement, made rather informally some weeks ago, and formally presented to the House yesterday.

We are familiar with the work that is being done in England. This booklet having to do with the BBC educational broadcasting is of interest; I was specifically interested to see the programme that is carried out in South Carolina, where they have a system very similar to the one that it appears we are going to have in Ontario with a government-owned outlet reaching every community. The whole network is linked to a central control, so that an efficient means of presenting this new educational facility has been brought about.

But there are some definite questions that come to mind following the hon. Minister's announcement. We have educational television in Metropolitan Toronto, and the association has a high standard. We have had educational television sponsored by private television—channel 9, and by the CBC—for some years. It is not apparent from the hon. Minister's announcement that there has been any real consultation up to the present time about what these people have experienced in the field and think about the hon. Minister's plans, and whether or not he has adequately consulted with them before making his decisions. I would like to know at what levels the consultations have taken place. I would like to know at what levels of education television would apply.

It seems to me we would be providing a reasonable additional service for citizens of the province if a television installation were set up in this House, so that when debates of great importance take place, the citizens of the country have an opportunity to see their representatives and their government in action. I would like to know whether the facilities would be available to Mr. Fairbairn and his division. Mr. Fairbairn, of course, operates an information bureau, and these facilities would, indeed, be adequate to bring to the attention of the people those things that he felt should be shown to them.

As a matter of fact, this all points up the fact that if the educational television net-

work is controlled by the hon. Minister, or someone directly under him in the department, there is bound to be some criticism of the programming procedure. It would surely recommend itself to him that somebody would have independent control of it.

I was quite interested that the hon. Minister did not see fit to set up this new network under the direction of his audio-visual branch. This has been discussed before, and we know that the audio-visual people in The Department of Education have had some extensive experience in this line. I would be interested to know what the hon. Minister intends to do.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to deal with some matters of importance in education. We have realized that our system is adequate in many respects. We know that the rate of change in education is as great as it is in any aspect of our community life. But there is one thing that the hon. Minister has not dealt with that may affect the future of education more than any single change in the last few years. We have been oppressed financially and our facilities have been strained by the large numbers of students that, since the war, have flooded our schools. One of the changes that started rather insignificantly, but is taking on tremendous proportions, are the medical advances in birth control. The new hormones and devices that are available for this are being prescribed on a more and more general basis; I do not know whether the hon. Minister would agree with me in this, but I am of the opinion that a large number of the young people who are presently in our schools were not all as a result of carefully planned parenthood. It does appear, however, that in the future we are going to see a plateau and maybe even a significant dip in our birth rate. I was informed by competent doctors just a few days ago that the birth-control pills now available which taken daily may soon be replaced by a pill taken once a month. As birth control becomes simpler, more readily available, and cheaper, we are going to see the birth rate fall, and we will see that the strain on our facilities is going to lessen.

I think that the hon. Minister should whisper to his computer some of the statistics that are beginning to come in from this change in our way of life in the North American communities.

I would predict that the computer is going to have some interesting work in the next two years, as this new information will moderate its predictions that have been made in the past.

It may well be that it will not be so difficult to reduce our class sizes to 20. It will not be so difficult to be selective in our teachers, and it may be that our schools will be boarded up, just like the gas stations are, on the corners of so many of our communities. I hope and trust that this will not be so, but I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that you would agree with me that the advent of practically universal birth control is going to have far-reaching effects on our educational system. But, of course, the hon. Minister is not suggesting that his computer is going to solve all of the problems of education. He has, however, got another valuable asset, recently added in an advisory capacity to his department, in the form of a 21-man committee, chaired by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall. I have a feeling that we will not be able to call this the Hall committee; we may have to call it the committee of 21, I do not know. The committee has been made up of very able people. I cannot say that I know them all, but we can see from the group that has been included that they have useful knowledge about the problems of education.

I must say that I have the greatest respect for Mr. Justice Hall. I have had occasion in the past few days to indicate this, and if his survey of the educational needs of the society of Ontario is as extensive and useful as his survey of the medical needs of Canada, then it is going to be a very useful report indeed, and it is going to be very different from some of the reports that the hon. Minister has had access to in the past three years.

I presume that the hon. Minister was as impressed as I have been with Mr. Hall's work in the past in a capacity such as this. I am amazed that a man of this position, coming from outside of the province, has time at his disposal to work not in the capacity of a Royal commissioner, but as chairman of the hon. Minister's committee to take on this far-reaching responsibility.

I would be prepared to say that this committee would be able to give us the best answers available to the problems that presently confront us in education; we look forward to their deliberations. I get the impression, however, that it is so high-powered that they may, in fact, meet once a year and see what the statisticians employed by them have to present to them. I hope that it will weld itself into a group of people familiar with individual personal responses of the other committee members, and will come out with a blueprint that will take us into the 21st century in education. I trust that this is the hon. Minister's intention, and he has our heartiest support in his endeavour.

It is interesting, of course, to note that he has realized the importance of the early grades in giving them, as part of their special commission, the study of the kindergarten to grade 6 area. In my brief experience in the Legislature, the hon. Minister has announced each year that this is under careful investigation. We have still to see the results of this investigation, because very little change has taken place. But certainly this area of our school system is seriously outdated and inefficient, and we look for its improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about the provision of collateral training for those who have been subject to unemployment and who are in difficulties with continuing automation.

We know that the various programmes sponsored by the federal government, and taken up enthusiastically by the provincial government, has had varying success. Much has been said about the project that has been set in motion in this city and in other centres across the province. They have been more effective in some areas than in others.

I sense that there is a change in the hon. Minister's view of this. A recent editorial in the *Globe and Mail*, that I am sure he read just a few days ago, accused him of playing politics with this very important matter. I do not believe that this would be so. I do not think the hon. Minister of Education was so keen to win the Riverdale seat for his party that he would interfere with the educational process with premature announcements for that purpose. But I feel that there is a lessening of the concentration of the department in providing the facilities that are going to upgrade the educational standing of a good many of our citizens who have been passed over by the educational process in the past.

I suppose all of us, as members, have had telephone calls from students at the Jones Avenue school complaining about some aspect or other—mainly the fact that the upgrading process does not start low enough. I had one chap who had only grade 4 education, and the retraining programme did not start at a low enough level to help him. There have been other complaints along these lines and I certainly hope that the hon. Minister is prepared, this afternoon, to say something about a new enthusiasm and a new direction to the provision for these facilities to train and retrain those people who, at present, must be classified as unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, there is no hon. member of the House who is not prepared to offer his

fullest co-operation to the hon. Minister and his department, and all those associated with education in their greatest of responsibilities. We listened to the hon. Minister's report with interest. I consider it a valuable report and I would look forward to undertaking further discussions with him on many aspects of it during the course of this debate.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have noted with interest that there is a practice growing in this House, that when a speaker rises to participate in a debate, he does so on the basis of a text. At least two hon. members have done that in the last week, and I am provoked by their action to do the same thing.

My text for my introductory remarks is as follows:

"Our education is 50 years behind the times. It did not matter so much a generation ago, but now it is a tragedy." Mr. Chairman, that reference was made with regard to the Ontario educational system. It was not made by an Opposition critic; nor was it made by somebody who was unknowledgeable with regard to our educational system. Believe it or not, that comment was made by Dr. Robert W. B. Jackson, professor of education at our Ontario college of education, the man who had been head of the educational research department in this government for some years, and who is the newly appointed director of the institute on studies in education. Indeed, when he was being designated to that new position, the hon. Minister referred to him, and quite rightly in my view, as the outstanding man in educational research in Canada today.

I would agree that, to take this in perspective, there has been a tendency for all educational systems to fall behind the march of time—not just the educational system in the province of Ontario. I would also want to be perfectly fair about it and say that, if we are 50 years behind the times in Ontario, then five years ago we were closer to 100 years behind the times. We have done a fair amount of catching up in the last five years under the direction of, first, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), and now of the present hon. Minister of Education, but, Mr. Chairman, I think we have to recognize the basic validity of the contention that our educational system is 50 years behind the times. I think the most convincing evidence of it is to take a look at reality—take a look at the facts in Canada today.

In Canada today, for example, there are

1,017,869 men and women who have no more than grade four education. For a country that believes it is a literate country, and would be shocked if anybody were to challenge it as not being a literate country, it is rather a sobering and arresting fact to realize that there are more than one million people who have no more than a grade 4 education. It is also rather sobering to realize—this has been pointed out recently in public comments arising from a report, I think, by the head of Frontier college—that 50 per cent of our labour force in the province of Ontario has no more than grade 8 education.

Part of this, I would concede, is due to the fact that we have had considerable immigration to this country. In some instances, this immigration has come from portions of Europe that are overcrowded and have had fewer opportunities for education, and therefore one cannot attribute all of this condition to our educational system. But it is still rather sobering to realize that when one examines—as has been done by the International institute in Toronto—the problems of newcomers, people who have just emerged in this metropolitan area, the basic problem faced by these people is no different; whether they come as a new Canadian, from southern Italy, or whether they come from the rural parts of Canada—whether it be the Maritimes or the rural parts of Ontario. This is underlined by the fact, Mr. Chairman, that 64 per cent of our people in the rural parts of Canada have no more than grade 8 education. This is the result, the end product or the reality of the educational system we have had.

I think there are particular reasons to suggest that it has at least as much validity in Ontario as elsewhere, and perhaps more, because we have tended to drift in the province of Ontario. Indeed, we have drifted for generations. I can recall when I first came into this House, my first participation in debate on the educational estimates in 1956, I laid my chief emphasis on the position with regard to trade schools—the fact that at that stage—and the situation has improved some, but not really very drastically—six per cent of our young people went ahead to higher education. And there was a very heavy emphasis on our education throughout the whole school system, particularly in secondary schools, to meet the needs of that six per cent who were planning to get a higher education. There was less and less consideration, or inadequate consideration perhaps to put it more accurately, for the 94

per cent who had neither the abilities nor the interest to go ahead for a higher education. Those years of neglect, combined with new and urgent demands arising from the nature of modern technological society and the kind of education required to meet them, have created a first-rate crisis in the province of Ontario in recent years.

To meet this crisis, we have had in pretty rapid succession, I would concede, some developments that will be of very far-reaching consequences in our educational system. We had the Robarts plan and the broadening of the educational system—I want to come back to it in a bit more detail in a moment. We had an absolutely phenomenal expansion of the educational “plant” to be able to implement the objectives of the Robarts plan. It is rather interesting to realize that in 1960, in the whole of the province of Ontario, notwithstanding the fact that technical and vocational education had been introduced in our system back in the early 20s, after World War I, there were no more than 72 schools that provided technical or vocational education, secondary schools. Fourteen of them were purely vocational schools; 58 of them were composite schools that provided technical education along with the other range of subjects.

In the intervening five years, with availability of 75 per cent capital funds from Ottawa and their ready acceptance by this government, we have developed a plant until today—I believe my figures are at least roughly accurate—there are something like 237 of the 435 secondary schools in the province of Ontario that have facilities now to provide in whole or in part, technical or vocational education. Now, that is an absolutely phenomenal kind of development, but let us face it, Mr. Chairman, this is a development that we have squeezed into a five-year period, at least in terms of providing the bricks and mortar, a development that should have taken place over a period of two or three generations prior to that. So it underlines the basic validity of the contention of Dr. Jackson, that our education is 50 years behind the times.

We have had vocational centres, we have had institutes of technology; now we have had announced the introduction into our system of the whole range of community colleges. All of these are designed to meet the crisis in education, to try to catch up on those years of neglect. But, Mr. Chairman, we are all painfully aware of the fact that it is a far cry from making announcements to achieving the objectives of those announcements;

and it is going to take not only years, but hundreds of millions of dollars. Meanwhile, we are so ill-equipped to meet the situation today and the demands of today that Dr. Jackson describes the situation in no less harsh a term than "tragedy."

I want to take a look, Mr. Chairman, at a number of the developments that have taken place in the last few years, to examine the deficiencies that have emerged in them, so that we can be sure we are catching up in as sound a way as possible.

First, I want to take a look at the Roberts plan. As I mentioned a moment ago, the whole objective of the Roberts plan was to rescue an educational system that had been designed to meet the needs of the six per cent who were going on to university, and to recognize the needs of the 94 per cent who would go directly to the labour force or would want something other than a university as a post-secondary higher education. It was designed to cope with the inflexibility and the inadequacies of an educational system that resulted in an incredible waste familiarly known as the drop-outs in our educational system. And it has undoubtedly had some effect in coping with that problem. It established three streams, each stream having a course that would go through grade 13 to the normal higher education at the university, and each stream having a course that would go to grade 12 and then would lead to the vocational centres or the institutes of technology.

The important point, here, Mr. Chairman, is that this came a generation late—at least a generation late. There is growing evidence—and this is the rather disturbing thing as one takes a look at it today in depth—that we may, because we were so late in instituting the Roberts plan in the province of Ontario, be instituting something which, the experts consider, was to some degree out of date even before we got to the point of implementing it. I am referring to the amount of discussion that is going on now in educational circles with regard to questioning the wisdom of the early streaming of young people. We all know, for example, that in Great Britain the 11-plus examination, which has been accepted almost as the traditional approach to education, has been so seriously questioned that they are very definitely in the process of discarding it. It is interesting if one looks for example, as I did recently, at an article in the *New Statesman* and *Nation* of September 11, to some comments about the school system in Sweden. They were comparing the Swedish school system with the British school

system, and they were exploring the objectives and the setup of the so-called comprehensive schools in Sweden. Just let me quote two or three brief comments from here:

The schools are forbidden by law to divide or stream their pupils according to ability—

and this is a point I want to come back to in a moment in another context:

Each class has a range of ability and only in the final year is there any form of streaming. Even then it is on the basis of the child's own choice.

A little later:

In the final year the work is organized on a different basis, for the pupils are then divided into as many as five theoretical and four practical streams.

Again a later quote:

But the Swedes are determined to avoid the kind of segregation that operates in this country.

Namely, Britain. And finally:

There is a refreshing emphasis on the need for much more general education and the purpose is deliberately to reduce specialization at all stages for pupils up to the age of 20. It is encouraging to find that employers and trade unionists alike argue the case for broader education, basing their argument on industrial experience. They maintain that any specialized education was quickly rendered obsolete by the speed of technological change.

So here you have in Sweden as in Britain very serious second thoughts about the premature streaming of children. This isn't new. As the Minister commented when he was referring, I think, to the lack of knowledge of history in the United States, "this sounds like home," because we have heard much of this kind of thing from teachers, from parents, from educational experts. They wondered whether it was wise to start streaming in our own secondary schools at the grade 9 level, whether or not you were not cutting off the late bloomers and rushing them into a certain stream of education from which the whole forces so combined that it made it difficult, if not impossible, for them to escape later from that stream.

Then there is a related aspect to which I referred a moment ago. That is the necessity for a new look at our educational system in terms of its apparent crushing of a child's creativity. I was rather interested last fall, to read news reports of that ex-firebrand of the Cabinet, Robert Macaulay,

who, when he was speaking to some body in the city here, referred to the great harm that our educational system did to our children. The nub of Mr. Macaulay's comment was summed up in one aspect of the report that was carried in the *Toronto Telegram*, which quotes Mr. Macaulay as saying:

Our educational system turns alert, curious, attentive, confident, assured, interested children into little people who are afraid, bored, confused and under great tension.

Now, it may be argued that this is to a degree exaggerated, but there is no doubt that there is a disturbing core of truth in it. Parents and educational experts have been puzzled as they examine what happens in an educational system, which results in the tendency to ossify the thinking of a child, to put him into a straitjacket, so that he did not seem to be able to develop in the fashion that is undoubtedly the theoretical objective of our system—that we want to develop the personality and each of the abilities of the child.

When one pursues the thinking along these particular lines—the question that was raised by Mr. Macaulay—I find that my attention as a former schoolteacher, and as a person interested in education from almost every viewpoint except the janitor in the school, I think—

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): He is important, too.

Mr. MacDonald: I said, as a person having been interested and involved in approaching education from every angle except that.

Mr. Nixon: That will come later.

Mr. MacDonald: It may come later, yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They call them custodians now.

Mr. MacDonald: I recall one year between college when I wheeled cement into the basement of a prospective school at 35 cents an hour, back in the days when they were paying people about the equivalent of what the civil servants' pay is still here in the province of Ontario.

Before we got off on this tangent, I was about to refer to the writings of Mr. Frank Brown, who is the principal of Melbourne high school in Florida. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, maybe this is the appropriate day to discuss Mr. Brown and his ideas, because he happens to be the principal of the school at

Cape Kennedy. Most of the children in the school are the children of the people who work around those launching pads that have projected a couple of American astronauts into this rather historic flight today.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is why you have to be careful looking at that school.

Mr. MacDonald: I grant you that it may well be that you have a group of people who live in something of a world apart, a world that is something in the nature of a vanguard.

But I still agree with the basic contention of Frank Brown, namely that we have our school system in something of a strait-jacket of grades, instead of the phasing that gives an opportunity for a natural development in accordance with the abilities and the interests of a child. I still think this has basic validity. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it has so much validity that I have learned, by way of a little birdie, that one of the first items put on the agenda of the Hall committee to study the aims and objectives of education is the question of phasing work through schools, rather than grading.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I spent a little time in Melbourne, so I do know about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. I just want to quote, by way of underlining this observation that I am making, Mr. Chairman, two or three comments from an article that was written by Mr. Brown. Undoubtedly it is something of a condensation of a full-length book that he has done on this same topic. In an article that was carried in the *Atlantic Monthly* of November 1964, he said:

We simply removed all grade barriers and let the school's talented students pursue any course that they were capable of passing, without reference to the grade to which they had been promoted.

Let me pause there, Mr. Chairman. This really is not so revolutionary that it is unknown in our system. This is the kind of thing that obtains in many of our primary grades—the first three—in the province of Ontario. They go at their own pace, and then they tend to get into the regimentation from grades 3 and 4 up. Mr. Brown continued:

The outcome exceeded all expectations. Increasing numbers of students eloquently met the challenge and their parents were enormously pleased. Community approbation was so swift and convincing that in an unbelievably short time the whole

process of grouping children into grades had spun out of existence. Once the stumbling block of the grade had been removed we were able to concentrate in earnest on the development of a new brand of education. What we were after was to organize learning on a radically different basis from the conventional plan which classifies youngsters in grades, largely on the basis of age. The idea of grouping students by age into grades has never been more than a poor piece of technology. For this reason the most urgent problem facing education has for a long time been the issue of how to gear the curriculum to what the students actually know, rather than to grades to which they have been promoted. We named this revolutionary new organization a phased rather than a graded curriculum.

The final quotation that I want to give is:

The notion of phasing deposes and refutes both the graded organization and the concept of annual promotion. The purpose is to replace stops and starts with continuous learning and constant advance.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, without going into the detail because we get into technicalities here, that undoubtedly it will be the kind of thing that this high-powered committee—if I may borrow the adjective of the hon. member for Brant, with regard to the Hall committee—is going to be examining. But I suggest that that, combined with the second thoughts about the validity of separating our children into the very bright ones and the somewhat less bright, and down the scale until you get those that are just a stage or so above retarded, creates serious psychological effects on the children in a category that are potential late bloomers. They are liked before they really get to the stage where they can grapple with life's problems. Therefore, you have destined them for the rest of their life to that category. It results sometimes in the most incredible, perhaps irrational, actions on the part of parents, who feel hurt that their children are put in this rather than a higher category.

I was talking a week or two ago with a public school teacher in the metropolitan area. I will not even identify what municipality he comes from. He stated that they have eliminated the grading or this tendency to divide the grades into the various categories according to skills in their schools. Now, this is precisely the kind of thing that is done in Sweden. They simply do not divide their groups there and while I, as a former teacher, recognize the administrative problems this

may create within an educational system, I am not so certain that if we can get over the innate conservatism of the teaching profession, we would not be able to work out another administrative system that we could handle without undue difficulties. We would be getting at that basic problem that worries so many thinking people today, and the one that Robert Macaulay, in his inimitable way, dramatized—the tendency of a school system to destroy the creativity and the interest of a child, rather than fulfilling the theoretical objective of a school system, that is to develop his creativity and his personality.

Mr. Chairman, I want to note, in the context of my theme and my text, a few other developments that have taken place, apart from the Robarts plan, and indicate the extent to which they are behind the times in their emergence in the province of Ontario. This, therefore, will underline the extent to which we have got to work to catch up from these years of neglect.

I will not go into the details of the trade school situation. I have talked about this, I suppose, at least a dozen times in the House over the past seven or eight years, and the fact that it was envisaged by Dr. John Seath as the result of a report in the early years of this century. It was envisaged in a statutory sense in the year 1911 and in the succeeding 50 years we built one trade school in the province of Ontario, down on Nassau Street. So that this in itself, underlines that we are 50 years behind the times.

In the past two or three years we have moved to some fulfillment. You have had a breaking-off, so to speak, from the Nassau school into our school of automotive trades, and another one, the name of which escapes me for the moment; I believe that it is under the shadow of Casa Loma. We have a vocational centre in Ottawa, one in London and plans for one in Sault Ste. Marie. I understand from the hon. Minister's statement that we also have plans for one in Hamilton, as well as on the Niagara peninsula.

When you move to the institute of technology, we have had, unquestionably, the development of an institute of technology that is of a high calibre in Ryerson, now off on its own as an independent institution. We also have some seven others scattered across the province of Ontario, but grossly inadequate in terms of meeting the needs of post-secondary education for those who are not going into the liberal arts. We now have, because of the inadequacies of both the trade school development and the institute of technology development, community colleges

emerging. As I pointed out on second reading, community colleges are emerging because, once again, there emerged a weakness in the concept of the Robarts plan. The community colleges are designed to fill the gap. It was considered, with the Robarts plan, that when a child went through the stream to grade 12 that if he went to post-secondary education in the institute of technology, his grade 12 would be satisfactory. Or, if he went to the labour force, that degree of education from the high school would be satisfactory. Both of these are proving to be inaccurate—behind the times. Increasingly, our institutes of technology are requiring grade 13; increasingly, our children are finding that they cannot compete in the labour force if they go to work directly from grade 12, that they must have some post-secondary education. So we had to build some sort of a system that would pick up directly from grade 12. And the community college is the answer. The hon. Minister states, almost as if this were planned, that it is going to pick up in 1966 the first graduates under the Robarts plan in the four-year courses. I repeat, this is more by accident than by design. Topsy, in her development, just happened to develop at that right point, in terms of meeting those needs.

However, Mr. Chairman, I come back to a question that I asked the hon. Minister when we were debating this issue on second reading. Perhaps, because he was so pre-occupied with what he thought were the misconceptions of our community arts colleges on the part of the hon. member for Brant or perhaps he was so shaken by the purple passages of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) when he was conjuring up this concept of ivy ghettos as a description of our universities; perhaps he was so shaken by all that, that he did not get around to answering a point in which I am interested. I am going to insist on some comment from him and that is, a rationalization of all of this very varied development at the present time.

The news reports have indicated that it is likely that the first of our community colleges will be built around existing institutes of technology or vocational centres. The question that I asked on second reading and that I repeat here, is: Are we, in effect, forsaking the original concept of a separate system of vocational centres across the whole of the province of Ontario? Are we, in effect, forsaking the original concept of a separate system of institutes of technology across the whole of Ontario, and are we going to wrap it all up in community colleges, which will pick up from post-secondary education or

for the upgrading or training of the unemployed or the various other adult education aspects of the community college work?

It seems to me that this is plain commonsense, but the untidiness of the pattern does not end just there. I am interested, for example, in noting in his introductory remarks, that the hon. Minister referred to the new technical educational centre in Hamilton—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I might interrupt here. The hon. member for York South unfortunately had to leave the House when I was making that observation in my remarks and I interjected at that point that, in view of the hon. member's comments on the second reading debate of the bill on colleges of the fine arts and technology, there was a real possibility that this new name that was mentioned in my estimate remarks may never come into being. I think that was, roughly, the interjection that I made.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I draw, perhaps prematurely, the conclusion that my idea that they are all going to be wrapped into one, including the forthcoming technical education centre in Hamilton, is correct. But I will let the hon. Minister have his say and will not try to put words in his mouth.

Let me consider another interesting tag-end in this picture. I refer to the adult education centre, which the hon. member for Brant said he was sure was not thrown into the Riverdale by-election for political purposes—of course, this would never happen with the government on the other side of the House. I could not be persuaded of that, no matter how long you talked, but what I am interested in is why a need as desperate as this adult education centre should be frustrated as long as it has been by the various developments that were spelled out in a *Globe and Mail* editorial—in terms of finding a site. It now seems to be more or less indefinitely postponed, because they cannot break through the impasse.

However, let that go by. The point that I am interested in at the moment is: Is this an institution which, as an adult education centre, is going to deal with the upgrading of the unemployed? Is it going to be so specialized that it is apart from that aspect of the work that would normally belong to a community college? In other words, this is another tag-end, it seems, we have that to tidy up. The sooner we get it tidied up the sooner we will lay at rest a lot of unnecessary doubts and questions that are being asked as to what exactly is the direction in

which we are going with regard to these very many aspects of our post-secondary education at the present time.

But with all this, Mr. Chairman, I come back to my basic theme. We are running madly, not only to keep up with the march of time, but even worse, to catch up, because of those years of neglect—basically because we are 50 years behind the times, particularly in this field of technical education which was so neglected by The Department of Education in this province up to the years 1959 and 1960.

Mr. Chairman, I want to turn, in the next portion of my remarks to deal with the five programmes that have been mapped out to cope with technical and upgrading education of recent years—the joint programmes with the government at Ottawa. I want to analyze them—and this has been touched on in varying degrees in other debates on welfare in the House this year, and the omnibus debates of the Throne and the Budget. But, at the risk of a minor repetition, I think it would be useful in a rather orderly sequence to take a look at each of these programmes, 1 to 5. I do not know whether hon. members are anything like me, but each time I start to think about these programmes, I have to take a moment out to remind myself what exactly is in programme 1 and what exactly is in programme 2. And so for their own guidance I will just briefly remind them of such.

Programme 1 is designed to supply young people in vocational and technical high schools with marketable skills. The federal government contributes 50 per cent of the cost—this is within our secondary school system—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not of the operating cost.

Mr. MacDonald: Not of the operating cost —50 per cent of the capital cost, right?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the basic point and the basic problem which has emerged here, is an unresolved conflict — although on paper it has been resolved—between the Department of Education and The Department of Labour. I am hoping that some time soon the pleas that have been made to the hon. Prime Minister of this province will be carried beyond writing letters, to the setting out of the theoretical division of responsibilities to bring the various parties together, even if it requires bringing a few heads together and knocking them. As late as last week the situation was unresolved. Let me put it to the House by means of a few quotations in a release from M. J. Fen-

wick, who incidentally is one of the Hall committee, vice-president of the Ontario federation of labour in charge of educational activities within that body. Last January he said:

A seven-man educational committee of the federation of labour, which is meeting early in February, will be asking—

and incidentally, I might interrupt, they did ask:

—Premier Robarts to resolve the apparent jurisdictional feud between two Ontario government departments, education and labour, as to which is promoting vocational studies in industrial training. Unless the Premier acts immediately, this province's reorganized programmes of studies, of which he is the author, the Robarts plan, will fall flat on its face. Industrial training will suffer an equally sordid end.

The federation education committee has received complaints from a number of high school principals that vocational studies in their schools have been rendered useless because the apprenticeship branch of The Department of Labour refuses to recognize skilled time spent in secondary school courses.

Another area of dispute between The Departments of Labour and Education are worker-training programmes. Under joint federal-provincial agreement, The Department of Education is charged with implementing manpower training programmes. The Department of Labour recently announced that it is entering the field of industrial training on a total basis, which incorporates its previous activity of apprenticeship training. These new programmes come under the scope of the amended Apprenticeship and Trade Qualifications Act, 1964, and its regulations.

The confusion which has resulted in a number of Ontario schools in the precarious position in which all of the vocational education has been thrown by the action of the labour department has made it imperative that the Premier intervene.

Because, as they point out, and this is my final quotation from Mr. Fenwick's release:

Now Mr. Rowntree announces in his blueprint for The Department of Labour, among other items, "new and flexible on-the-job training programmes to meet industry's current and projected needs for skilled workers."

Now, Mr. Chairman, this apparently did come to the ear of the hon. Prime Minister, and

the hon. Prime Minister replied in a letter to Mr. Fenwick on March 16, 1965. The hon. Prime Minister stated in his letter:

As you were aware, the apprenticeship training system has been operated for many years jointly by the two departments. The Department of Labour has been responsible for that portion of the training programme carried out on the job in the normal work setting. The Department of Education, through the trade schools, has provided the associated or supplementary class instruction in the theoretical foundations of the trades. Essentially this same division will now be carried forward into shorter term and more specific training programmes that are operated under programme 4 and other allied provisions of the federal-provincial agreement.

In other words, The Department of Labour will be responsible for all aspects of the implementation and operation of training programmes undertaken on the job and designed to develop specific skills related to specific employment. The Department of Education will be responsible for all other forms of training.

An interdepartmental committee consisting of senior representatives of both departments will be established to act as a channel of communication between the two departments to jointly determine training needs and prescribed methods of satisfying them and to co-ordinate the promotion, developmental and operational activities of both departments, so that training and educational programmes will tie in with each other at all levels.

Now I will cease the quotation from the hon. Prime Minister's letter at that point.

I repeat, I was assured that, as a result of a meeting as late as last week, people who are involved—and I will not bother naming them, because this is obviously getting into politics and it may complicate their life—in these training programmes in the city of Toronto say that the situation is unresolved; that there is still, in effect, an effort to pursue this objective at the operational level, if you will, both on The Department of Labour side and The Department of Education. It would seem to me that, while there may be little empires that are being protected and somebody above those who guide the destinies of these little empires have to step in, public welfare dictates that they should step in and resolve these difficulties so that we will not have the unnecessary complications.

Now I go to programme 2, Mr. Chairman,

for which the federal government pays 50 per cent of the cost. Is that operation as well as capital? Is it designed to train technicians at the post-secondary level? I think it is accurate to say, Mr. Chairman, that programme 2 has perhaps developed fewer bugs than any of the others.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think programme 1 really has fewer.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the smaller?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it has fewer bugs.

Mr. MacDonald: Fewer bugs in it? Well, it is a matter of judgment, and I will not pursue the point any further. However, what I want to draw attention to, Mr. Chairman, is that we have so much further to go. I was very interested in getting a quick introduction as to exactly what the situation is; to go back to the rather recent and not too out-of-date testimony of the former superintendent of the technological and trade branch, Lorne Johnston, before the select committee on youth last September. On page 234 Mr. Johnston, in discussing the relative position of engineers, technologists, technicians and craftsmen, made this comment, and I am quoting:

On preparing our brief we were discussing what we called the pyramid, which we have talked about many, many times. If you compare our situation in Canada with that of Europe, we find in Europe that the engineers are at the point or pinnacle of the pyramid and, in numbers compared to the other classes, they are relatively few. We have the engineers forming the pinnacle and, we come down the pyramid, we have more technologists; and further down we have more technicians and we have the great broad base of craftsmen.

In Canada, this pyramid is almost inverted. We have a great number of engineers; we have fewer technologists; and, up until the last few years, we had virtually no technicians; and we are right out of skilled craftsmen.

Mr. Chairman, whether one is talking about education or whether one is talking about the requirements for development of a modern economy, to be able to sustain the kind of economic development we have in Canada at the present time—that is a most revealing and disturbing kind of statement, and I am convinced it is strictly accurate. We are—I come back to my theme again—50 years behind the times in terms of the kind

of educational system that Dr. John Seath went across and took a look at in Britain and Europe in the year 1908, when he came back and reported to the government; and successive Liberal and Tory governments have done nothing about it for a period of 50 years since.

We are so far behind that we have this sort of basic pyramid of skills, in our society today, absolutely standing on its head. We have a lot of engineers, many of whom are wasting their time and their skills at jobs that should be handled by a technologist or even a technician. We have inadequate technologists; we have inadequate technicians; we are only getting around to training them now; and we have a situation in terms of the number of craftsmen—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member means an inadequate supply.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, an inadequate supply of them. And we are now facing the situation, as far as craftsmen are concerned, where we have run out of them.

That, I think, underlines, if not the inadequacy of programme 2, at least the inadequacy of what we have been able to do within it because of the almost incredible need for development of skilled people.

However, I move to programme 3. This programme, Mr. Chairman, and hon. members of the House, has three objectives: To assist employed persons wishing to upgrade their skills; to help those about to enter employment; to provide training for those individuals wishing to retrain for a change of occupation. This is a programme, Mr. Chairman, which in terms of the numbers involved, is really pathetic. The report at the end of the first year, at the end of March, 1964—and I have not seen up-to-date figures, but I do not think they were that much of an improvement that I am going to misrepresent the figure by quoting the ones from the past year—only 21,000 persons out of a labour force of seven million received training under this section.

Once again, I would like to go back to the testimony of Lorne Johnston before the select committee on youth, to raise a number of questions of the hon. Minister. For example, on page 238, Mr. Johnston was referring to the kind of work that is being done in his department, in trying to identify areas in which they might be able to develop courses. He referred to the fact that they have approached the contractors association and that they had worked out, and were presumably initiating last September—at the

beginning of this academic year classes in Ottawa; on Nassau Street here in Toronto; and in London—some 20 in each of these, and he said:

We are striving at all times to identify new areas such as these where we can be of service in training a technician.

I will leave my comment with regard to the fact that there is only one man involved in trying to discover where these courses might be designated, so that they could develop them and introduce them in the system, until a little later. But I was curious with reference to programme 3, and its overall inadequacies in terms of numbers, to have an up-to-date report from the hon. Minister as to what has happened, for example, in that course that was worked out with the contractors association; or any others that may have emerged in the last six or eight months.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on programme 4. This is the programme that is, in its own way, perhaps most exciting, but it is like the story of public housing in Ontario. For years we took a look at the public housing in Toronto and this was symbolized as an example of public housing through the whole country. It was a monument to what had not been done, really, rather than a monument to what had been done. In programme 4 I think we have the same kind of a story, with reference to the so-called leap programme—the upgrading of skills by in-plant training within the province of Ontario. This has been one that industry has not been persuaded to tackle with any great degree of vigour. As I recall the testimony of Mr. Johnston, he stated that there were cases that were emerging in two or three other parts of the province, and that would presumably be in operation by now. Indeed, he referred to one in eastern Ontario, one in northern Ontario and one in western Ontario. I am wondering if the hon. Minister could report to us exactly what has happened in terms of being able to chart a course and to get industry to act on a greater degree of in-plant training.

Moving on now to programme 5, and the retraining of the unemployed, which is basically the objective of programme 5: This is something that has been discussed so often in the House, in terms of the incredible number of people who drop out, so that maybe only half of those who enter the course ultimately graduate. It is rather an encouraging record in terms of the percentage of those who get jobs when they do graduate. I think a figure as high as 84 per cent, has been quoted. But the limited numbers in the first

instance—indeed, in the first year, the number was something like 36,000 for the whole of Canada; only 10 per cent of the unemployed, and of that 36,000, more than half of them, dropped out. We still have a long way to go in terms of making that an effective kind of programme.

The general observation, I think, Mr. Chairman, that flows from all of this, is the vigour and the imagination with which we are pursuing the development of these programmes. Here again I want to come back to what strikes me as being the nub of the whole issue, the testimony before the committee in which some of the hon. members of the House were putting their fingers on the weak spots. I am quoting now from page 254 of the testimony before the select committee on youth, last September. The hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) was testifying:

Have you ever thought in your department that anything can be done like this? As we all know, in this field there are a great number of school boards who move in and decide what courses they are going to have. Everybody uses his own yardstick and thinks up what is needed. I think this is where we are missing the mark. Is there any central person or organization in your department who could act as the vocational research department to provide for the whole province some guide posts, where they should be going and what type of things they should be giving? Does anybody research all the various fields and find out? We are crazy to be building shops because even in this field there is no chance of half of them getting into apprenticeship. School boards would have to have this information available and show them what the trends are.

Mr. Johnston: There is very little of that being done at the present time. There may be some that may develop.

Mr. Wells: Is this not the logical thing?

Mr. Johnston: Very definitely.

The Chairman (the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Apps)): We should ask Mr. Johnston what influence your department has, what liaison your department has in influencing the vocational schools.

Mr. Johnston: We have complete influence and control over the vocational schools, institutes of trades and institutes of technology. In the secondary school level, very little, because it comes under the superintendent of secondary education.

So here you have this division right within The Department of Education, where a great deal of this training is taking place, not under the superintendent of technology and trades branch, but under the department of secondary education.

Then the hon. member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Peck) intervened:

Just to pursue what Mr. Wells has said, there is something that bothers me. Since the federal-provincial training programme came into effect, Mr. Wells said, certain school boards decide they are going to build a vocational school and the officials draw up various courses that they feel should go into this school, and it will be given to the advisory vocational committee and eventually to the board, and kicked back and forth. Somebody on the board in the particular industry would say, "I think we need a course in chemistry." I am using the example of what happened in one of the schools in Scarborough. This course is set up. It seems to me, these courses are set up in relation to what is needed in industry. This would have to be a provincial organization on which The Department of Education and vocational people and industry can sit down at various times and try to assess what the needs are. We do not like to see this classic example—I think in Cornwall, the retraining programme was started, and they picked up unemployed welders and trained 12 welders, and when the course was finished they had 13 unemployed welders in Cornwall. This is a classic example. I am sure it has happened over and over again.

To be fair, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Johnston intervened later and said that this got national coverage but it had never happened in Cornwall, but I think Mr. Peck's point is valid, that this kind of thing has been happening. Mr. Peck continued:

How many bricklayers are needed? We have a course in school for bricklaying. How many carpenters are needed? I don't think there is any attempt to assess these in terms of what industry needs. We may be getting further into technology, I do not know what the right phrase is, people are needed to service these machines which are coming in, but there does not seem to be any attempt from anybody to try and tie down these various trades in how they can work out through our school programme.

Now, a little later, Mr. Peck picks up again:

I am not picking out welding or any particular trade. I am talking about the

overall concept of training youngsters or maybe older people, to fit in where they are needed, and the training to be of value so that they can fit directly into the job, or further on-the-job training which can be done in conjunction with industry in which they could easily fit into one of these jobs. There are so many openings and so much unemployment on the one hand, and it seems to me that there must be some way that industry and educational people can pull together and decide what is needed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the nub of it.

Mr. Johnston: I agree with you. We have done a fair bit along this line. We have had an extensive survey done which became available to us within the last couple of months. This was a survey on a national basis which attempts to predict the needs in various trades in the coming years. We have developed a very close liaison with the Canadian manufacturers association. I agree with what you are saying wholeheartedly. There are problems in that it appears difficult for industry to tell us their exact needs five or 10 years from now.

Then later in the same sequence of that debate, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) intervened and said:

Have you any research people in your branch?

Now, after the whole point has been made, surely this is the nub of it. Here we are going to find out what we need, we are going to get to the answers instead of wandering around in the dark on this manpower problem.

Have you any research people in your branch?

Mr. Johnston: I have one man whose job it is to try to cover this area and who is in contact with business and industry. One man cannot do it.

For the whole of the province of Ontario. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why we need to go on any longer. At the provincial level, if we cannot get an adequate coping of this problem at the federal level—and I will concede to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) that they have been wandering around in the dark at the federal level on the issue, but here we are responsible for the educational systems. We are responsible for implementing programmes 1 to 5; we are responsible for the vocational centres and the institutes of technology, and it is surely

little short of ludicrous that there should be so much validity in the wondering as to whether or not we are not teaching obsolete trades; whether or not we are not spending tens of million of dollars on buildings that are inadequate, in terms of that rather delightfully entitled article that June Callwood did, in which the Jackson quote was: "Tomorrow is here and we are all set for yesterday"—an article in *Maclean's* magazine on January 23 of this year.

It is really worrying and absurd; we must get down to the answering of these questions, and no one man—if he were Solomon and all of Solomon's superiors rolled into one—no one man is going to be able to get all the answers.

A start was made by the committee that was headed by the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) that looked into manpower, but this is a continuing need. I cannot understand, in a department where there has been an encouraging degree of imagination in coping with the problems in trying to catch up with these years of neglect—when you face an age when catching up is not good enough, because the times are rushing ahead of you once again—why there is not a willingness to tackle this problem by getting a whole coterie of people to work on it. Get a dozen—15, 20 or 25—it will be far better to spend the money on getting the necessary force to be able to get the answers to these questions instead of wandering around in the dark as we have been up to the present time.

That brings me to a comment on the Hall committee. I am not going to repeat the observations of the hon. member for Brant; I think that most of the questions he put to the hon. Minister are particularly valid. I have some big question marks in my mind as to what was the original concept of the committee's approach—not the committee, because the objective is clear. It is to clarify the aims and objectives of education.

For example, I think, on the basis of what has happened up until now, that the hon. member for Brant is going to be disappointed if he thinks that this committee can come up with anything like a report of the proportions of the Hall committee report on medical insurance. That committee had a large staff that worked for years. Indeed, according to reports I have been able to get in bits and pieces—it is not public information—of the early meetings of the Hall committee, I almost got the impression that the chairman thought they were going to have a few discussions and they would conclude the

activities this fall. But only slowly has he realized the proportions of the task into which he was lured, if I may use the term, by the government.

Mr. Nixon: How do you know? That is very interesting. Have you got the hon. Minister's office bugged?

Mr. MacDonald: Do not ask me how I know, but I can assure you that what I am stating is authoritative.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether that is good enough or not.

Mr. MacDonald: You will just have to accept my word for it. Under the rules of this House you cannot impute motives to me, nor dispute my word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee met once for an organizational meeting, and for a dinner that the hon. Minister gave them back in April when it was set up. They met again early this month and set up an agenda. They are now going to solicit briefs, and these briefs will be in—or at least an indication of the briefs—by the first of July. They will hear the briefs this fall and next year.

I am 100 per cent in support of the kind of study in depth by a committee that is starting out in the area from the kindergarten to grade 6, but has to examine the whole scope of our educational system, ultimately. I just have these reservations, when I have reason to believe that the chairman had no idea of the proportions of the job that he was taking on, and whether he has the time, or ultimately the interest, to pursue this in the fashion that undoubtedly he could pursue it, as he did in Medicare for two, three, four or even five years. At the moment it is kindergarten to grade 6—what is it going to be when he gets into the secondary and into the aims and objectives of post-secondary education?

In other words, this is a very good thing, except that there are many aspects of it on which, until now, the hon. Minister has to give us a bit more detail, and some assurance if it is really going to be a meaningful study.

Mr. Chairman, before I turn from this theme of being 50 years behind the times in our educational system, I have one further chapter.

Last fall, as the hon. Prime Minister reminded us in the Medicare debate earlier this week, this government announced a very commendable programme in terms of expanding medical educational facilities. The details

of that are known to the House, but what I want to put to the hon. Minister in very forceful terms, is what is being done by him, as the Minister responsible for education in this province, to meet the wide range of personnel needs to implement the public policies—the public assistance policies, if I may use that term—in the province of Ontario? For years we have had the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) rise in this House and outline very important and desirable programmes within their departments. When we really put them to the test, their answer has been that they simply cannot get personnel at the top professional level, or at the various technologists' or technicians' level, to be able to back up the professionals.

Some day, it seems to me, this government has to quit making excuses and they have to tackle at the training level, and at the educational level, the turning out of adequate people to meet their own needs. Obviously, you cannot do it without meeting the needs of the whole of society because, generally speaking, your salary levels are less, therefore you are going to have a little difficulty in attracting your share of them.

We have rudimentary retraining programmes in some of the departments. There is a retraining programme, for example, in reform institutions—rather, a training programme. But it is not a very efficient kind of thing, in terms of the overall system, because there is a high degree of wastage. The people are leaving The Department of Reform Institutions in considerable proportions because of the general dissatisfaction with both the conditions of the work and, in many instances, the nature of the work.

We have some in-training in The Department of Public Welfare, and in The Department of Health there have been some minor approaches in terms of child care, but this is only toying with a desperate need. The government, through its various Ministers, has proclaimed this need. Everybody in society who is trying to implement these programmes has been emphasizing the desperate shortage of people. So my question to the hon. Minister is: What is he doing? Is he sitting down with the hon. Ministers that I have mentioned as a start, as he presumably sat down with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health after the Hall commission had done the job for him and pointed out exactly what should be done? It presented them with a recom-

mendation; you accepted the recommendation, and have implemented it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The university affairs committee is working on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine. What committee is working on the other aspects of it? This is my point, and I would like the hon. Minister to address himself to it. After he has made some comments, my colleague, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) will undoubtedly return to this topic, because it is one that he is extremely interested in; it is raised in conjunction with the departments in which he has the lead-off responsibility in our group.

Now I turn, Mr. Chairman, to two or three other aspects of the educational system, and the hon. Minister's introductory remarks, not necessarily related to my theme of being 50 years behind the times. I do not know whether the first one is related to it or not, because I want to say a word or so about the question of religious education in our schools. The hon. Minister has announced that he has appointed a committee that is going to be headed by Keiller Mackay, who is so well known to all hon. members of the House. This committee is going to look into this very controversial issue and bring him a report. The hon. Minister has said that he thought it was wise to wait for the considered views of this report rather than jumping in with action that might be premature and be divisive, along with all the other divisive forces within this question at the moment.

Generally speaking, I am willing to go along with the programme that the hon. Minister has indicated. I think we might as well face the fact that the province of Ontario got off on an experiment in 1944, the results of which have become increasingly a matter of dispute and soul-searching among a growing proportion of our population. There is no other jurisdiction in the North American continent that has religious education in the schools in the fashion we have in the province of Ontario, with the exception of the province of Quebec, in its rather unique situation of two school systems, and the province of Newfoundland, whose school systems are almost completely within the religious framework. Certainly they were in the initial stages.

I think it is also accurate, notwithstanding the comments of some of my hon. friends in the Liberal Party, that this is an issue that cuts across party lines. I would frankly acknowledge, as the hon. Minister pointed

out, that when the issue was raised in the House in 1944 and 1945 that the CCF group of the day were divided on the issue; the leader was opposed to it, and some of the members of the group were for it. But I think it cuts across party lines and if that division has not emerged at the caucus level in the Liberal Party, I am glad to find one issue on which there is not a division in their ranks. But I can assure them that it exists in the ranks of their members across the province.

In other words, I hope this is an issue that we can treat in an above-party, non-partisan sense, and, perhaps, putting it in the first instance into the hands of a committee under the chairmanship of Keiller Mackay, is a very good move. I was rather taken with the observations of the hon. Minister on page 42 of the mimeographed portion of his report to us yesterday, where he said on one hand:

Serious doubts are being raised in the minds of our people as to whether the present system of religious instruction should be continued.

And then further, he added:

It is my own impression, however, that the majority of our people would consider it a retrograde step to eliminate entirely from the classroom all subject matter which has to do with character building, ethics, social attitudes, and morals, and I think that would be the consensus of this House.

In my view, it is. I think there is a consensus; indeed, I suspect that a consensus has emerged. When you get to the point, for example, where you have the three Toronto newspapers all seeing eye-to-eye, either a consensus has arrived or the millennium, one or the other, and I think it is the consensus. Underlining it was an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* just a few days ago on May 31, where they pointed to the decision of the Anglican synod of Niagara Falls, where the *Star* contended that they had taken "a fair-minded and realistic stand on the subject of religious education in the public schools."

The synod approved a resolution calling on the provincial government to establish a course in world religions in the public schools. I do not know the nature of the debate that produced that resolution, or the nature of the thinking, but if I guess it correctly, I think it is essentially the same kind of thinking as was in that paragraph in the hon. Minister's introductory statement where he refers to the consensus in this House—of a support for the proposition that we do not

want to ignore completely the study of moral values, and perhaps within the context of studying all of the great religions in the world.

For those who are convinced that the Christian religion is the superior religion in the world, its obvious merits and qualities will become obvious. But we should not impose on any one group, views that will be regarded by the others as unacceptable and, therefore, be accused of proselytizing. In short, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. Minister that, speaking on behalf of our group, we are very clear in our own mind what we think should be done, namely, that we should review and change the decision that was made in 1944 and 1945, but we are willing to abide by the approach that the hon. Minister has accepted of first seeking recommendations from the Mackay committee.

I turn finally, Mr. Chairman, to a series of issues that the hon. Minister dealt with, and which I am going to lump together because I think they are related. The hon. Minister has taken a very commendable interest in developing among the students of the province of Ontario, and indeed the general public, a greater awareness of our history. The fact, for example, that as great a figure—and he is not now a Tory, in the hon. Minister's terms, "he belongs to all the people"—as great a figure as Sir John A. Macdonald should have been neglected so incredibly by everybody including Conservatives in this country until the last two or three years in terms of giving him the kind of annual acclaim on his birthday, as is done, for example, in the United States on Washington's birthday.

That is one of the disturbing things about Canadian history. I would agree with the hon. Minister that sometimes we underestimate our people's knowledge of it, or rather we overestimate their ignorance on this score because everything is relative. As the hon. Minister reported, despite the popular impression, Americans know no more about their own history. I think they can be pretty abysmally ignorant in the mass of their history, just as most Canadians are of theirs.

The hon. Minister referred, for example, to the St. Catharines project. I would say that one of the booklets that came to my desk had a magnificent little set of rather small pictures of the first Parliament buildings in Ontario in the various stages of the development of our Parliament. To whomsoever is responsible for making that available,

particularly because it was free, I express my deep appreciation. I am going to spend a little money, and have them framed, because I think this is a magnificent vignette of history, set forth in the development of the series of Parliament buildings that we have had in the province of Ontario.

In the course of his remarks, however, the hon. Minister referred to Premier Lesage's speech in this House in which he emphasized the horizontal relationship among the provinces, urging the consideration of common problems and mutual interests. In line with that thought the hon. Minister announced that he has invited Quebec's Minister of Education, the Honourable Paul Gerin-Lajoie and his senior officials, to spend a few days in Ontario for a full exchange of views on what the hon. Minister described as "important new developments in education in our two provinces." Once again I want to express enthusiastic support for this kind of a move.

I have dwelt at considerable length in my Throne speech, last year and this year, with certain aspects of the history of French-English relations, and the relations of Quebec and Ontario as the whole core of the development of this nation. It seems to me that the hon. Minister's move in accepting the challenge of Premier Lesage in developing these horizontal relationships, is one that we should have taken up much earlier and some rather great advantages may have developed from it. Tied in with this are developments in Ontario, and this is where I think many of these things are related.

During the past year the hon. Minister has appointed a director of French instruction. As a result of development and the added incentive that this man has been able to add to the work, there has been a significant increase in the number of children in classes that are learning French at the elementary school level in the province of Ontario. In the last year there has been a significant increase and we have now got to a figure of approximately 140,000. However, let us face it, Mr. Chairman, 140,000 is approximately 10 or 11 per cent of the children in our secondary schools, so we have a great distance to go.

I raise the question, indeed it was intimated following Mr. Bennett-Alder's French classes at the federation convention, that the hon. Minister was considering establishing the teaching of French on a compulsory basis in our elementary school systems, starting at one level or another. I am wondering if the hon. Minister feels that he can be rather

frank in the secrecy of this Chamber, telling us what his own thinking is on this matter. I raise it because I would like to touch for a moment on the Georgetown episode of a week or so ago.

I want to touch on it because I was rather puzzled, disturbed and on the odd occasion, encouraged by the thoughts on this issue, by the editor of the *Oakville Journal Record*—with which the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Kerr) is undoubtedly thoroughly familiar. Indeed I think I may be thoroughly familiar with some of the people on that paper. I believe that “import” they brought in to run against me in York South last time writes for it periodically. He has had a lot of time to write on it since the election.

An hon. member: You are still alive though.

Mr. MacDonald: I am still alive and I hope he is too, he is a good fellow, but politically very misguided.

Let me, Mr. Chairman, quote one or two observations in an editorial on May 13 from the *Oakville Journal Record*. They are speaking in the context of how regretful it is that the parents of these children at Georgetown had got their children involved in this rather nasty squabble and exposed them to all these divisive forces.

The great wrong committed by the French-Canadian parents of Georgetown is involving children. But let us give the children a chance. Let us give them a solid grounding in the history and the make-up of Canada. Let us teach them the roles the two founding races played in this country's development. Most of all, let us encourage them to accept Canada as a bilingual country, thereby encouraging them to understand the problems which will result from a dual personality.

Now the first thing that puzzled me is accepting what is written there, and I would accept it; it would seem to flow from that set of objectives that one would be an enthusiastic supporter of the proposition of bilingual schools. Therefore one would not be opposed to the extent that the editor later indicated he was, to the Georgetown parents' rather determined stand—because the fact of the matter is that the French-Canadians are making a determined stand today because there simply has not been an acceptance of bilingualism in our country. The latter part of this editorial reads:

What was displayed in Georgetown this week was not give and take, it was another

display of stubborn selfishness on the part of a minority group putting the interests of itself ahead of those of even its children, while at the same time putting itself at odds with those who have already come half way. Such displays are a shabby show of ignorance, the type of ignorance which right now has a nation with great potential in hot water, the type of ignorance we hope will not plague the upcoming generation upon which will fall the burden of keeping Canada together and keeping it happy.

Now if I may borrow the hon. Minister's phrase with reference to the “ivy ghetto” comment about our universities on the part of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I would say that editorial was rather unfortunately put. This action by the Georgetown parents surely is not ignorance of Canadian history—rather, it reflects an appreciation of it. But the confusion—and now I come back to the hon. Minister's part in this on the question of making French teaching compulsory—is resolved a bit in a subsequent editorial the following day. This is what the editor had to say:

The Department of Education has paid lip service to bilingualism in Ontario. It has permitted some schools, Holy Cross being one, to establish classes in French elementary grades, but so far has refused to make the language a compulsory subject or introduce a universal programme for teaching it in grade school.

There is little evidence that The Department of Education has shown the idea of making French a part of the standard grade school programme any more than wholesale neglect. This, although Premier John Robarts himself has called for “the promotion and expansion of the use of both French and English in every part of Canada.”

Despite the overwhelming evidence, in support of grade school French teaching, The Department of Education has consistently, over the years, stayed away from officially establishing it in elementary curriculum.

One would conclude, perhaps with a minor reservation of uncertainty, that the editorial writer is in favour of French being taught in the schools, and what he is doing is chastising the hon. Minister for adopting a contradictory stand in not making it compulsory through our grade schools while appearing to be on the side of the parents who were seeking to have bilingualism not

only throughout the public school grades, but at the kindergarten level, too.

I think the editorial writer has a point as to why the government is hesitant in establishing French as part of our school system—maybe from grade 4 or 5 up—throughout the whole of the elementary level. I think, however, the next step is that we should have bilingual schools where there is an opportunity for them. If you look at statistical table S-103 in the hon. Minister's annual report for 1964, you will find that there are some 30 secondary schools in the province of Ontario with significant numbers of French-speaking students in them. I have discovered, as I looked into the situation, that these schools not only teach French in French—if I may indulge in what may sound like an Irishism, because you can teach French in English and that is what we do throughout most of the province of Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We refer to it as "français" in French.

Mr. MacDonald: I know. For a while I was deeply puzzled. I studied the head of that table and I had to call somebody in the department to find out what "français" was and I translated it to teaching French in French—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Right!

Mr. MacDonald:—which is more meaningful to me anyway. But if we can teach French in French, maybe we can do as they have done in some schools and teach Latin or history or geography in French. I read a news story just last week that the schools in Cornwall are considering the introduction of history in French in their bilingual classes.

Surely it is just the Canadian way, that in a bilingual country—if we can get the Tories to accept the fact that Canada is a bilingual country, after Davie Fulton underlining it again last night—this is only a fulfilment of the destiny of Canada, and that in the province of Ontario there should be every encouragement. The thing that saddens me with regard to this issue is to find that so many people in the province of Ontario regard teaching of French on almost an anti-racial basis. Their attitude is not that it is good to have a second language; not that it is good culturally; not that it is fulfilment of the destiny of Canada as a bilingual country; but almost the attitude of the southern white towards the negro. It is the English-speaking Canadian, Protestant WASP attitude, if I may put it in the most extreme form, toward

the French-Canadians, and surely we can get over this. Indeed, I think we are getting over it, and I would give the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Education marks for giving the lead in terms of saying that we should learn to speak French. If the hon. Prime Minister said it will not likely be until his grandchildren's day before we will be able to do so, I feel it is because we are teaching French in English. And I want to come back to that in a moment, because that is the crippling aspect.

However, there is another question I would like to put to the hon. Minister. I am convinced that if you pick Ottawa, Toronto and Sudbury—those to illustrate my point—you could establish bilingual schools in the province of Ontario among English-speaking students. In other words, you could start to develop a school among people who were not French to begin with and who would like to, by the time they got to the secondary school level or at some stage in the school system, get to a position where they would be getting bilingual classes instead of just having bilingual classes among those who are French. Because the interesting thing is, if we are going to accept bilingual classes as only being those which started out with French, we are still operating on the old concept of bilingualism—it is all right for the French-Canadians to learn English, but why do we English have to learn French? I think it is desirable for cultural, national and other reasons that more English-Canadians should learn to speak French.

There are difficulties involved in the realization of this objective, but I come back to the proposition that the hon. Minister has said that he is going to sit down with Gerin-Lajoie and his senior officials and work out some of the problems that have emerged in the educational system. I am presuming to suggest some of the problems that I hope will be discussed. In the course of these meetings undoubtedly one of the first things you are going to have to face up to is the prospect of exchange of teachers, because here is the really crippling problem. You can teach history or geography in French, but the teacher must know history and geography as well as French. We are not going to be able to develop this kind of group of teachers overnight.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that a few months ago—a few weeks ago, as a matter of fact—my counterpart in the province of Quebec, the New Democratic Party leader Robert Cliche, made a speech which has had a very interesting response in the province of Quebec. Indeed, it was so

interesting that it even got reported on and carried in the Toronto dailies. His contention was, instead of the province of Quebec being so preoccupied with the right or the desirability of making treaties internationally, why did it not consider the proposition of making "treaties" with other provinces.

In other words, essentially the same thing as this horizontal relationship that the hon. Minister is now pursuing in his meetings with Gerin-Lajoie. He argued, for example, that the roads to Canadian unity do not all lead through Ottawa; many of them may lead through the development of a relationship with the provinces. If you were to sit down and discuss this you might be able to work out with the province of Quebec an exchange of teachers which would make it possible for each province to meet the minority needs or the broader teaching of French in the province of Ontario. Indeed it might have another very salutary effect: Within the province of Quebec today there is a trend—I find a little difficulty at this distance to assess its strength—but a trend towards unilingualism, a reaction on the part of French-Canadians, that, "Oh well, if the rest of Canada is not going to learn French, they are going to be unilingual, fine let us be unilingual." It is an effort to put history in reverse and try to make Quebec become a purely French-language province.

Now this would be very, very regrettable, and it seems to me that one way we could undercut it is by showing evidence of good faith in the establishment of a bilingual country through developing these horizontal relationships—to have the kind of meetings that the hon. Minister is proposing with Gerin-Lajoie, to consider particularly our educational needs and the need for teachers so that we can build greater unity in the nation, through stronger ties between the provinces as well as with the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I shall endeavour to reply to some of the issues raised by the hon. members for Brant and for York South. If I neglect to cover them all in the course of my remarks I am sure they will pick them up as we go through the individual votes. I think I should point out that we are in complete agreement with the remarks made by the hon. member for Brant with respect to the place of a teacher within the school system. I would point out to him, though, just speaking generally, in view of his concern—which is our concern, too—as to the number of specialists in the school system, that if he would look carefully at

the tables, I think he will find, Mr. Chairman, that actually the number of type A people is not decreasing. He did not take into account the number of certificates, some 460 people who were granted their certificates on the basis of their third summer course. The 191 that are presently in this year's course are really a higher number than were in last year. The number is actually going up. But I would say this, Mr. Chairman, that there still is need and we recognize it, and this is the reason for the provision for the bursaries or scholarships to increase the supply of type A personnel. But I would point out that it is not decreasing; it is in fact increasing.

Mr. Nixon: If the hon. Minister will permit me—in 1958-59, 35 per cent of the candidates for teacher-training were type A and 33 per cent in 1964-65. I must say it is up from last year, but it is down from, let us say, 1958-59.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, it may be down, but it has gone up since last year and the year before; it is on the increase again. Now, dealing with the question, Mr. Chairman, of television. As I understand the remarks of the hon. member for Brant, I am a little disappointed to a degree, because I can recall two or three speeches he has made on the subject, not only in the House, but in several other areas where he suggested that the Minister was perhaps not moving as rapidly as he might in the field of educational television. I can recall—I think it was in this House—when the hon. member suggested that the department move in and establish it. In fact, I think he used the word "government"; the government should move in and establish a provincial network.

I should point out also to the hon. member that we have had a committee studying educational TV; they have made a report to me, there were personnel on it, as I recall, from the CBC, CFTO, the teachers' federation and many other interested groups, and we have followed in what I think is a very general and specific way the recommendations that were presented to me as to the establishment of educational television within the department. Now, one area in which there has been no departure from their recommendations because there were not any specific recommendations, is on the question of the licence and I would have to say this, Mr. Chairman, that really the application by the department for a licence is an attempt to move TV along the road with as much rapidity as possible to bring some order into

the situation, and also to deal with a situation that potentially concerns a very expensive medium as far as instruction is concerned. It is an effort to co-ordinate the activities and, quite frankly, to centralize them. I am familiar with the article that the hon. member read; it was really a newsletter giving the opinion of one of the personnel. I do not think it represents necessarily the feeling of the board. There is some concern here that the control be in the—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Davis: Yes. There would be some control in the department, but I should point out that there are some 22 state departments or local boards holding licences and I do not think you can draw any parallel with the United States.

There are a number held by school boards or state agencies within that jurisdiction and, of course, there are licences held by colleges and by universities. Really, I think, Mr. Chairman, you can draw a parallel between the approval and the issuance of textbooks and the material that is being transmitted or will be transmitted by television. Actually, one of the recommendations from the personnel from META on this Minister's committee was that any programme that is transmitted would be approved by the department. I think, really, this is an issue that can be determined as we progress.

We are starting out in a field and, while we are behind, one might argue that if you study other jurisdictions you will find that there are many problems facing them still in the field of educational television. You refer to the one from North Carolina, and, as the hon. member pointed out, this is a state-controlled system. It is one of the more effective systems in the United States and yet they still will admit, I think, that they have a long way to go. I say to the hon. members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that this is our approach. We expect it will alter and change as conditions vary but we think that this is the best way to get the ETV programme in this province off the ground.

I do not think there is any need to comment on the views of the hon. member on the question of history. I think we share these views. I would go back to the teachers for just a moment. I do not have the exact figures in front of me but the statistics on teachers' salaries can be interpreted in many ways.

Actually, if you break them down and you take the 1962-63 or even the 1963-64 figures,

I think it will be found that we are behind Alberta and BC in the elementary schedules. I think part of this, quite frankly, can be traced to the separate school situation that has existed.

The salaries in the separate school system have been less than in the public school system in Ontario. I think this has been substantially rectified within the last year, but nonetheless we may be slightly less. There are a number of teachers in the separate school system who do not receive an honorarium, though I cannot tell you whether these figures take this into account. But at the secondary level—

Mr. Nixon: They may be rated as zero?

Hon. Mr. Davis: On this I am not sure, but I can tell you that at the secondary level the average salary here in Ontario is in the neighbourhood of \$7,400 to \$7,600, whereas in British Columbia and Alberta it is \$6,900 and \$6,500, so that the average secondary school teacher in Ontario is receiving a salary, I think, substantially in excess of that in the two western provinces. There is one other reason, I think, which may be altered here as time goes on, why the salaries for elementary teachers may be higher in our two sister provinces. It could relate to the fact that they are paid equal remuneration out there on the basis of equal qualification, and many of their elementary teachers go through their faculties of education and come out with the same degree, perhaps, as the secondary people. This, I think, could perhaps account for some of the figures to which my hon. friend refers.

Dealing with the grade 13 committee report, Mr. Chairman. This is a very basic document. It is perhaps a very fundamental one and relates to our whole structure of education for this province. There are many matters that relate to it—the community college programme; perhaps, to a degree, the university programme—many factors are involved in the eventual conclusion of the grade 13 committee report.

The initial report recommended certain changes that were implemented for this present year, changes which I think were welcomed by most people. I am sure they would have been welcomed by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman), because we have not gone to the full extent of marking the papers locally, or doing it on the basis of the principal's recommendations. But this year 25 per cent will be so marked, that is 25 per cent of the mark will be allocated on the basis of the term work.

The initial report did recommend consideration of the general and advanced levels. A committee was established with representatives from the universities to consider this general proposition. While there has been some discussion recently in the press as to the university's reaction, I think when the committee stated to me in the report that the principle of a general and an advanced level was generally acceptable, they did this with every justification. The presidents of universities had had the initial grade 13 report and my understanding was, at least until the past few weeks, that there had been no opposition to the principle of a general and advanced scheme. I think where the difficulty is coming, if there is to be difficulty, is in the number of subjects to be taught at the general and advanced level. This is why we have distributed this report rather widely, and we have postponed the experimental stage until next year to give an opportunity to develop curricula and to have further discussions with the universities.

I think I should, in fairness, point out, Mr. Chairman, that our responsibility must be with the students who are going through the secondary school system. In most other jurisdictions the admission requirements to universities are established by the universities, usually through the college entrance board. As for the rest of the school system, the state system, the graduation requirements or the curriculum, and the number of subjects in the curriculum of the secondary school are left to the state authorities.

I would like in this province to work closely with the universities because I think there is an obvious relationship. This is what we intend to do. My reaction to date is that there may be some areas of debate—I am sure there will be—on the specifics of a general and advanced level. But I think that the principle of having two levels for grade 13, or what may be eventually grade 12, has had fairly wide approval.

Certainly at an informal meeting, all the directors who, I guess, administer on behalf of boards covering three-quarters or certainly two-thirds of the secondary school students, were unanimously in favour of this approach to the final year of our secondary school programme. But we are having further discussions and we are making a very careful analysis. If the hon. member thinks the report itself is not complete in detail—it is a general report—I can assure the hon. member that there was a lot of detail work in material that went into it that has not, of course, all been published.

Perhaps I can deal with the references of both the hon. members to Justice Hall's committee. The committee has had two meetings; it plans three or four meetings for the fall. The purpose initially was to deal with grades 1 to 6. I must confess that I am to a degree responsible for the thought of the establishment of this committee, because I feel very strongly that in some way, Mr. Chairman, we should be identifying the aims, objectives and the philosophy of education. I am not at all surprised if some of the hon. members are now realizing the task is going to be a very large one. I do not know whether this came as any great surprise to Mr. Justice Hall or not, but I can assure the hon. members that he now realizes this is a big job. And I think it is going to be a big job for the whole committee. To me it is a very important project, and I think that if—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister if the comments of the hon. member for York South about his information concerning the committee were essentially correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I could not say. I assume that the hon. member for York South has been chatting with some member of the committee who himself might not have known the full extent or the great depth of this problem. This I could not say, but I say from my standpoint that we recognize the overall scope of this and that it will be a very large task, and one that will take some time.

Mr. Nixon: Is "we" the hon. Minister and the chairman?

Hon. Mr. Davis: When I say "we" I mean myself and the department.

Dealing with the adult education centre, perhaps this is related to the arguments raised about programmes 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, but I had better deal with this specifically. I notice the editorial in the *Globe and Mail* which was suggesting there were some political motives here. I can only assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the request to attend the graduation of the Jones Avenue school came to me long before the by-election in Riverdale was announced. I accepted this invitation to attend this graduation ceremony; this was their class at the Jones Avenue school of the retrained people. I indicated to the officials of the department—I am giving a little history here—that when I attended this graduation I would like to be in a position to announce a decision as to whether we would get in the field of adult education in a formal and

specific way. This decision was announced some time in September.

There has been some discussion about site. Mr. Chairman, we have not as yet selected a site, although there are two or three areas that are presently under consideration. In case my hon. friends opposite are concerned, I can tell them that we have had personnel from the department visiting Vancouver, Denver, California, and three or four other centres, gathering information. We have accomplished some of the specific planning. We had many discussions with the Toronto board of education; I can assure the hon. members there is no intention of delaying this development whatsoever, although I would have to say, and I think I indicated this in my remarks on the colleges of applied arts and technology, it is conceivable as this programme is developed that this adult education centre—I would have to be frank about this—may form part of a college of applied arts and technology, with one faculty of it here in the Metro area. I would not preclude this possibility, but at the present time our arrangements are with the city of Toronto board to administer this school for us. As I say, this could alter as the centre itself materializes.

I am sure I have missed two or three of the points of the hon. member for Brant, but he will have to remind me of them as we go along through the estimates. Of course, I am not unfamiliar with the article which the hon. member for York South referred to in *Maclean's* magazine. I was somewhat instrumental in arranging the meeting with Dr. Jackson and the young lady who wrote the article. She also interviewed two or three other people on the staff and I think, generally speaking, it was an article that was rather worthwhile.

I should point out it did not appear in print and I cannot find any record of it, but Dr. Jackson did make a reference, and I am glad that the hon. member for York South has as much confidence in Dr. Jackson as I have. He observed that some four or five years ago we were 100 years behind. He was not referring to Ontario; he was referring to education generally in the western world. He had some very provocative and good thoughts about the direction in which we should be moving as time goes on. So if we make as much progress over the next five years, Mr. Chairman, as we have made in the past five years, perhaps we may catch up, at least in Dr. Jackson's own figuring. This leads me to the question of the Robarts plan, and the principle of streaming, the question of being

out of date, and some comparison to what is happening in Sweden and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to make comparisons with other jurisdictions. I hesitate to do it, particularly within our own country, because comparisons are sometimes misleading. I would only say that I do not think that we are making the mistake here in Ontario in having the streaming of youngsters so long as we maintain a high vocational-academic ratio, which we are doing—50 per cent wholly vocational and technical areas. I think the prime purpose behind secondary education today must be to make the student as adaptable or as flexible in his approach to education as possible.

I should also point out to you that, in my view, at least, many of these youngsters would not be in our school system today if it were not for the Robarts plan, and you will find this in Great Britain. If you check the number or percentage of students in Great Britain, say, in the age group from 14 to 16 or 17, you will find that it is substantially less than it is here in the province of Ontario. You will find, I am sure, that one of the reasons that many of these youngsters have remained within the system is because they found there a course that has some appeal to them.

I had the pleasure of attending the state superintendents' meeting just before Christmas in the United States. These are gentlemen comparable to Ministers of Education, except that 50 per cent of them have the good fortune, or misfortune, of being appointed by the governor rather than being elected. These gentlemen were discussing this whole question of vocational education. The director of the Chicago board was here some time in January, as I recall. Mr. Willis, when he was referring to the need for vocational education in the United States where traditional background has been primarily academic—and I had the pleasure of listening to Dr. Conant, who has done something of a full cycle in this regard—was making, I think, a very strong statement to the state superintendents in favour of what they call the comprehensive high school—we call it the composite high school—and this is coming from the federal aid.

It will be made available under an agreement, not dissimilar to the one we have with the federal government here in Ontario. I do not like to make statements about other school systems, but I think you will find there will be a tendency in many jurisdictions south of the border to move into the technological or technical area within their secondary

school programme. Those people who had the pleasure of visiting California to view the community college situation there, will recall, I am sure, that traditionally this was an academic situation that has moved now into the area of technician and technological training. Many of the people there who were responsible raised the point with me that it is difficult for us to deal with these students at this level because they have had no vocational or technical experience at the secondary level.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of unanswered questions in this regard. I do not ignore this for a moment but I would say, generally speaking, we are moving in the right direction as long as we maintain a very high academic content as far as vocational and technical courses are concerned.

Getting into the area of the community college and its relation to adult education in a broad sense, I stated here on page 12 of my statement, and I will repeat it again:

Our efforts here could, I suppose, be considered also as a co-ordination and culmination of all previous work in this area, a welding into a coherent whole, so to speak, of the parts which have sometimes seemed fragmented and unrelated, so that we have a complete system extending from the kindergarten to the post-graduate level.

I would say, generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, that while the council of regents and others will be asked to direct their specific attention to the relationship of our existing institutions to the new colleges of applied arts and technology, that out of this will come a recognized pattern, or recognized establishment, so there are no tag-ends, as referred to by the hon. member for York South. I would have to point out this one area. I am going to ask the council to look very specifically, for instance, at the position of Ryerson; whether there is a place in our educational system for a single type of technological institute, I do not say approaching MIT, at this stage. Whether this should fit into this pattern, I am not in a position, Mr. Chairman, to tell the House at this time. I think this will require a very careful study.

I have already touched on the question of the possible future position of the adult education centre itself, and I hope that I have indicated to the hon. members that we have moved in the planning of this. We are fitting it out for educational television, because we think, quite frankly, that ETV will have its greatest role initially in the adult field. We think there is great scope here.

As I mentioned in the University Affairs estimates, we have allocated—and the grants will be going very shortly—some three-quarters of a million dollars for ETV at the Scarborough college.

Now I think the hon. member for York South touched on the question of a purported dispute between The Department of Labour and Education, with respect to apprenticeship training. I think he was really referring to programme four, and that is training on the job. This whole question is the subject of a study committee that has been appointed between the two departments and I must point out, Mr. Chairman, this is a new field in this province. The programme in the secondary school has really only been in effect, practically speaking, for three years. I do not pretend to understand some of the intricacies to the question of getting approval from the designated trades, but I do understand that the matter is in the process of resolution. It is not just a question of any jurisdictional argument, but I understand there has to be some co-operation from the trades themselves.

When it comes to the question of programme four, I think the hon. Minister of Labour made a statement to the House that I could only probably repeat; that is, on-the-job skill training to be done by The Department of Labour. The Department of Education is to look after training those within its own institutions—the actual educational aspects. We think this works out very satisfactorily, or will, as the programme develops, so that we can specialize our activities; whereas those in The Department of Labour who are familiar with the skill situations on the job can do their task more effectively.

As far as programme 1 is concerned, this is primarily the secondary school programme, and I would say that it is working effectively. We have, I think, the largest programme in this area of any province in Canada in a percentage way, or any other way that you might prescribe. We are reasonably satisfied with the progress that has been made to date.

The hon. member for York South has raised this whole question of the availability of technicians and technologists and skilled craftsmen, and, Mr. Chairman, I do not stand up in the House here today and say that this is not a problem, or that we have it solved. I think we are moving in the right direction. I think the increasing acceptance and the number of youngsters enrolling in our vocational centres and institutes of

technology indicate an acceptance by many of the public that a technologist, or a technician, has an important part to play in our society today as a man of professional training. This has been one of the traditional barriers, Mr. Chairman, in this province; many parents have insisted that their youngsters enter the professions. I know that the hon. member for Brant has suggested on occasion that the Minister of Education has been overemphasizing technical education. I can recall this in one of his speeches. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is the case. I think it is a case that, over the years, technical training has been underemphasized in Ontario and we are doing our best to rectify it.

Mr. Nixon: I think your total recall slipped there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, my total recall might have slipped a bit, Mr. Chairman, but I know there was an observation of this nature.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the hon. Minister, in the 1964 figures there has been a percentage drop in the number attending the technical schools. In the previous year, in grade 10, there were 40,000 in the academic schools, against 44,000 in the technical schools; and in grade 9 it was 58,000 against 46,000 in the technical schools. There is a percentage drop in there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, it all depends on what one defines as a technical school and what grade level you are moving. I would say we are hoping to strike a rough balance, as this programme develops, of somewhere around 50 per cent in the straight academic and perhaps 50 per cent in the technical-vocational and occupational programmes.

Those tables will not show this accurately for another two years.

Then dealing with programme 4 and programme 5, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South has pointed out that we have had success with one or two pilot projects; the one here in Toronto. We have two others underway and we hope this will extend through industry into other sections of the province. We have had many inquiries from outside our own province as to the success of these projects and we feel, quite frankly, if we can interest industry we must also interest the individuals. I point this out to the hon. member for York South, that the individuals on the jobs themselves have to

show a greater interest in the availability of programme 4. I have discussed this with a number of people, and it is unfortunate that there are some people who will not face the fact that they need an upgrading; or will in two or three years' time, and must face it at the eleventh hour, so to speak. I think we can do more, perhaps, to promote the availability of programme 4. I think this is really a better approach, if we can, than through programme 5 area where we are doing it at the eleventh or the twelfth hour.

As far as programme 5 is concerned, once again, I am sure some of the hon. members have had discussions with programme 5 trainees. I would say to you that our percentage enrolment in Ontario is higher than the other provinces but, nonetheless, we do still face some problems. One of the main problems is that we have trainees who, partially through their course, are offered a job opportunity. Perhaps financing is part of it. I think some of them, quite frankly, would prefer to take the immediate opportunity of a job rather than carry on with their course. How this can be resolved, quite frankly, I am not sure, but we have had fairly good success, certainly with the graduates themselves, in that our figure is now approaching the 90 per cent mark as far as employment ratio is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, touching on this question of what can be done to assist the development of those people that are needed not only by government, but by other agencies. This is a very difficult problem, not just from an educational point of view, but from the acceptance point of view by the existing professions, for example in the field of social work. I am going beyond the extent of my own specific knowledge in this area, but will professional social workers accept the idea of having people who have had perhaps a two-year course at Ryerson—where we have a course now for people interested in welfare and for nursing assistants—will they accept these as being a necessary part of an approach to a social work problem or in the field of welfare?

Mr. MacDonald: Will engineers accept technicians?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think they will; I think they have to.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt the hon. Minister to remind him that at the 1964 convention of the Canadian association of social workers, they passed unanimously a resolution

endorsing a welfare-worker-career line reflecting exactly that principle. Indeed, they passed a resolution reflecting several career lines requiring even less educational status. The attitude of the profession has obviously altered.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this has not fully permeated through—and I do not say particularly in this province—but there are still some professional social workers who—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not use it is an excuse.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not using it is an excuse because I think this is one of the areas in which the new colleges of applied arts and technology can fulfill a role in this whole paraprofessional—if that is the right term—field. If you will notice in my statement, this is an area that we intend to cover specifically. I think that, as you say, the engineering profession, I would gather, the social workers' profession and other areas, will now be accepting the principle of having technicians—if you want to use this word—or technologists being an integral part of whatever programme they are pursuing. I think you will find that as we develop these programmes at Ryerson on a private project basis, these will become two of the areas—at least, this will become one of the main areas where we can perform some services as far as the colleges of applied arts and technology are concerned.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You could have another look at Waterloo Lutheran University.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is not the answer because, Mr. Chairman, we are talking there about a graduate school. I am referring to the vast numbers of people that are needed at this other level.

Now, touching on the question of French—just very briefly, Mr. Chairman—I think there is a distinction, perhaps. They are different problems and I am not sure that the editorial writers in the Oakville papers really covered the difference in problems. One is the question of the bilingual schools. We have a large system and, I think, a good system, of bilingual instruction in the elementary grades in many sections of Ontario. At the Easter convention of the association of bilingual trustees I announced that as soon as books were available and staff was available in the secondary area, the programmes in instruction in French could be extended to Latin, history and geography.

After some discussions with the association—and there is not complete agreement on this—I am sure that most of the educators feel this is a good division of responsibility in the areas of instruction—Latin, history and geography in French, and the math and sciences to be instructed in English—

Mr. MacDonald: But you are now talking about secondary schools.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, this is secondary. In fact, there is some misunderstanding in many people's minds. Most of the elementary programme is almost entirely in French as far as the elementary instruction is concerned. Part of the proposal that we put to the association is an upgrading of the English course in the bilingual elementary schools. They have accepted this and we intend to move into this area to assist these youngsters improve their English in the elementary school system.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister how widespread are elementary bilingual schools in southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It all depends on one's definition of southern Ontario; but in eastern Ontario, in Ottawa and the Ottawa Valley, in northern Ontario—and there is one in Georgetown and there are several as I recall it, in the Essex county area; these are generally the areas for bilingual instruction. Instruction in the elementary grades is primarily in French and it gets into secondary where there will be now something of an equal division. We hope through this to have more of the secondary school graduates able to move into our universities and teachers' colleges.

I will be very frank; one of the problems the bilingual system has had is the availability of teachers, because some of the students did not move, perhaps because of language, through the secondary grades to the Ottawa teachers' college. We think that this will now be altered.

I think I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that while, I think, we all agree in principle as to what we should be attempting to achieve as far as bilingual interest is concerned, nonetheless you must realize that many of these youngsters in this province will be working or earning a living in primarily an English-speaking province. We must make a real effort to see that they are properly prepared to take their place, because many youngsters will not work where they went to school. They will have to move from one section of the province to another

and, as I pointed out to the association, we might be doing these youngsters a disservice—certainly at this stage—by having an exclusive French instruction programme in the secondary grades.

Mr. MacDonald: Make them genuinely bilingual.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a distinction between bilingualism as we understand it and the system established in Quebec. Their English school system is completely in English, and the French system is almost completely in French, whereas in Ontario we have been developing a bilingual system as far as the French-speaking youngsters are concerned.

I should point out, too, Mr. Chairman, that in my statement I did establish the departmental policy for 1966. It is not compulsory and the reason that it is not compulsory, I think, is obvious: We just would not have sufficient qualified staff to make it compulsory. But there will be a provincial curriculum and this is the first time this has been accomplished for grades 7 and 8. Now some people could debate here, and quite successfully, that you could start from an educational viewpoint at the grade 4 or grade 5 level, but we think that to tie it in with the secondary programme, it is essential to start at grades 7 and 8. As the supply of teachers becomes more available and the programme increases, we would move down then from grade 6 to 5 to 4, whatever would be the reasonable starting point.

You will notice from my statement, that we have taken, I think, a very flexible approach to teacher training. The regulations say that a person who has grade 13, or the equivalent, and at the discretion of the Minister, may be certified as far as French instruction is concerned, for French only, if they have fluency in that language. We think, from the response to date, Mr. Chairman, that we will have more than sufficient applicants for the course here in Toronto this summer and that we can develop sufficient teachers to build this programme on a very sound basis. But there is no point in saying that it can be accomplished within one or two years.

This will take time if we want to do it properly and intelligently. I think that the acceptance has now been made and we will have a provincial curriculum in grades 7 and 8, starting in 1966. I, for one, feel that this will go a long way to develop the spirit that I think should exist between the two peoples of this country, and we are very encouraged,

quite frankly, by the progress that may be made.

Mr. Newman: Recently the hon. Minister announced the reorganization of the department. Is that reorganization leading to economies?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I wonder if the hon. member would mind repeating his question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Newman: Yes. Is the recently announced reorganization of the hon. Minister's department leading to any substantial economies and if so, where?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to say what the economies may be. The final outcome of this reorganization—as I pointed out in my statement, there were three or four basic reasons. One was a philosophical reason, and that is combining or bringing a much closer relationship between elementary and secondary, which I think most educators can accept. The other was to relieve professionals from administrative chores. In this, we think, in the long run there may be a saving. At the same time we feel that our approach may filter down through to the various school boards in Ontario so that we have maybe a board-of-education approach, and we think there will be administrative savings in the long run in this area.

I will be very frank. The costs or the economies were not the prime purpose behind this. There may be limited economic saving in the department by having different types of personnel doing the administrative work rather than having professional educators concerning themselves with grants and so on. But this, I would say, Mr. Chairman, would be a marginal benefit, it was not the prime purpose.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

May we discuss programme 5 under this vote or would that come under some following vote?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Chairman, that programme 5, if we wish to go into that further, would actually come under the federal-provincial agreement, 512.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, having to do with the reorganization of the department, I understand that the hon. Minister's executive assistant would be very close to him and not come under the regular organization. But I was wondering about Mr. St. John. Does his office come under the direction of

the Deputy or is it, in fact, directly responsible to the Minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is no hard-and-fast rule as far as this is concerned, because I have stated to Mr. St. John and to the Deputy Minister that I want the Deputy and the Minister to work very closely together. If the Minister is not available, I want the Deputy Minister to feel he has the benefit of Mr. St. John's group and his advice responsible or available to him. If one were to be technical, you might say that the planning and development council was responsible technically to the Minister, but the way it is developing in the department, it will really be responsible to both the Minister and the Deputy as we tend to work very closely together.

Mr. Nixon: If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I have said in other places, and I would like to say to the hon. Minister, that since Mr. St. John's column ceased in the *Globe and Mail* about a year ago, there has not been an adequate centre for public discussion on a good many educational problems. While Mr. St. John may be very valuable to the hon. Minister and the department, and his advantages come down to the public good in this way, I think the hon. Minister did a great disservice to those interested in education, since nothing has come in any of the widely read newspapers to replace him. I hope the hon. Minister realizes that this is a significant criticism. I do not suppose it would be possible for him to do any public writing while he is in a position as a public servant. It is difficult to have it both ways, and I think it was better the other.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I might just add this. I had some thoughts myself along this line, but I felt, in looking at it carefully, that in the common good, or in the overall analysis, Mr. St. John can do more for education within the department than writing for one of the newspapers. I think this was his own personal feeling, too.

Mr. Nixon: I think the *Globe and Mail* should buy him back. I do not know whether it is fair to ask, but how difficult would that be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: You would have to ask the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. Nixon: What would they have to pay in order to get him back?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have no idea.

Mr. Nixon: You do not know what he is paid?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but I do not think one could assess whether he would even want to go back, Mr. Chairman. I do not know.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He wants to work for a great government.

Mr. Nixon: I think he was bought off. I want to ask some more questions about community colleges. Does the hon. Minister intend, in the setting up of the colleges between now and September, 1966, to have any new construction at all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is once again difficult to state. I pointed out in my remarks about the possibility of the vocational centres or the institutes of technology, whether these will form sort of the nuclei. There are plans still going ahead for the physical additions or construction of these buildings, so it is very difficult to state at this point.

Mr. Nixon: Could the hon. Minister tell us what the earliest time might be when an entirely new institution or community college, would be set up in Ontario that would be of new construction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say. I could not tell the hon. member this as far as new construction is concerned. It is theoretically possible that a college of applied arts and technology could be in operation by September, 1966. Many community colleges have started in the United States, as the hon. member knows, in warehouses. I cannot tell you how soon it would be in a completely new physical facility.

Mr. Nixon: Does the hon. Minister expect to start that way—that is, get a thing going and then build—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think, Mr. Chairman, there is a possibility that one or two areas may, in order to get started immediately, start in something that is not a permanent facility. I think this is possible.

Mr. Nixon: Good!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, could not that community college set-up start practically immediately, using the secondary schools on a 4 o'clock to 10 or 11 o'clock basis?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We could spend a lot of time discussing the pros and cons of this. I

would have to give this some consideration. It would depend on the availability of secondary school accommodation; perhaps in the evening-class programme it might be possible. I do not think it is the most desirable way to get it started, but perhaps this could be considered. But I have reservations about it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the secondary schools in any community, not all of them, are used for evening programmes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, they are not, I agree.

Mr. Newman: There would be one secondary school in practically every community in which you could initiate your community college idea.

In the setting up of the community colleges, is it the hon. Minister's intention in communities in which an institute of technology is to be newly built to, at the same time that that institute of technology is being constructed, incorporate a community college?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I really think I have touched on this two or three times. I have said that the council of regents, when it is appointed, will be asked to investigate the possibility of having the institutes of technology and the vocational centres become colleges of applied arts and technology. I cannot prejudge what the council will determine, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: Has there been any indication to the hon. Minister of a university that is anxious to begin a plan of university work in any proposed community college or in any centre?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I think the interest has come from perhaps two or three communities who are interested in having a university actually operate a year or two-year programme within their community.

Mr. Nixon: Is one of those Orillia?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a group in Orillia, as I understand it, who are interested in having a college established in affiliation with Waterloo Lutheran, and I understand there is a representative committee also from that area who are interested in establishing a college of fine arts and technology. I cannot tell the hon. member any more than that at this point.

Mr. Nixon: Speaking specifically about that problem, would the hon. Minister be in a

position to make a decision on this basis? From his vantage point he should surely be able to advise them whether they should go for a university or whether they should perhaps have a community college with university facilities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to advise at this point until the regulations and the proposals, that will be drafted by the council of regents are ready. This we have communicated to the people in the Barrie area.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on the decision of—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member; he obviously has more remarks to make on this vote. But I would move the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West) moves second reading of Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to pronounce the central term of this bill accurately—phenylketonuria. PKU, as it is better known, is a metabolic disorder of childhood causing a chemical imbalance in the blood which leads to severe and permanent mental retardation of the infant concerned. It is an irretrievable kind of mental retardation, Mr. Speaker; it results in an IQ level of roughly ten to 30, a range which in many ways is beyond rehabilitation.

The central principle of this private member's bill is to provide for testing of infants during the first 28 days after birth and the recording of such tests to establish the presence of PKU. Once established within this 28-day period, a special additive to the diet can avert a lifetime of severe retardation, human misery and obvious despair. It is, I suggest to the hon. members of this House, an astonishing medical discovery. Amongst

the over 200 known causes of mental retardation, this is one of the very few for which a correction is now available. It is a dramatic breakthrough in the field of preventive public health, and has been recognized as such in several jurisdictions across North America.

The hon. members of the Legislature will be interested in the incidence of PKU. According to a New York state testing survey, one out of every 10,000 infants is born with phenylketonuria. According to a Massachusetts survey, and I read from the *Medical Tribune* of July 22, 1963:

Nine cases of PKU have been confirmed among the 53,000 new-born infants tested in Massachusetts; a surprisingly high figure. That would be approximately one in every 6,000, and a cross-nation survey in the United States of some 400,000 infants established an incidence of one in 10,000 in the years 1962-63.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that in Ontario the number of live births in the years 1961-62-63 averaged around 158,000, which makes it possible to predict that there are 15 new cases of PKU each year, 15 cases of people confined to a lifetime of hopeless retardation.

It is estimated that 0.1 per cent of the retardates in our society are retardates as a result of PKU. Dr. Frank at the Ontario hospital at Smiths Falls, with whom I have discussed this matter, suggests that he has 23 children at Smiths Falls suffering from PKU. Let it be said for those in this Legislature to whom the economic factor is important, a lifetime of institutionalization can run upwards of \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, the test to which I am referring is itself exceedingly inexpensive; 50 cents or 60 cents for each test; tests can be processed at the rate of 150 an hour; there can either be a urine sample or a blood test, the famous heel prick as it is known—the Guthrie assay process which is being used widely in the United States. Similar legislation to that which I am proposing in this Legislature, exists in the states of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut and other jurisdictions. Let me read into the record of this House, Mr. Speaker, the Act from the state of New York, January 8, 1964—almost a year and a half ago:

An Act to amend the public health law in relation to the testing of infants for phenylketonuria.

It shall be the duty of

(1) The administrative officer or other

person in charge of each institution caring for infants twenty-eight days or less of age, and

(2) the person required in pursuance of the provisions of section 41 of this chapter to register the birth of a child, to cause to have administered to every such infant or child in its or his care a test for phenylketonuria in accordance with rules or regulations prescribed by the commissioner. Testing and the recording of the results of such test shall be performed at such times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the commissioner.

It is mandatory in the states which I have mentioned; it is permissive in Nevada, in Delaware, in Kansas. The Mead-Johnson survey in the United States reports that 41 of the 48 continental United States have laboratory facilities for conducting PKU tests.

It seems to me a totally logical piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. I hope it will avoid contention but let me anticipate the arguments that might be put forward, I suspect, by my friend from Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) when he speaks subsequently.

First, it can be said, and it doubtless will be said, that there are much better tests on the horizon. That you can test for 10, 15 or 20 metabolic disorders simultaneously as they are apparently in the process of devising in Montreal, and that this is the test that we should ultimately apply. That may very well be true, Mr. Speaker; no one is averse to the introduction of such tests in Ontario but the truth is that in the process of time we may lose another 15 lives. We know that the Guthrie tests work and I urge this Legislature to adopt them as a first step and expand the metabolic testing later, if necessary.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it can be said that most carriers of PKU are known. This is true, but it has been demonstrated by medical practitioners with far greater expertise than myself, that it is impractical to test the entire population for carriers, and, frankly, we will never know them all anyway. And I suggest that society has a moral obligation, when such a test is available, to avert even the incidence of one new child with PKU, because not even in this society—in fact, in no society—is it acceptable that a life of retardation can be countenanced when prevention is possible.

Third, there may well be an objection to that part of the bill, subsection 2, which puts the onus on the parents. If government wishes to amend that section in committee, we, on this side, will be pleased to have them do so.

It does not really relate to the primary principle of the bill but let me say that it is necessary for the Opposition to phrase it in that fashion because we are not enabled, as you know, on this side of the House to introduce financial bills and that was the only alternative.

Fourth, it may said that there is an element of compulsion in this bill. I hope this debate will not deteriorate into that traditional argument. If it is the intention of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) subsequently in his estimates, or if it is the feeling of the House generally, to introduce generally spread PKU testing under the OHSC to all hospitals in Ontario, through the central laboratory of the public health agency, then again no one on this side will object—as long as not a single child in this province filters through that apparatus. I would not want to see this bill scrapped or adjourned, Mr. Speaker, simply because there is another academic and semantic argument over compulsory vs. permissive legislation. The basic PKU testing is a fundamental principle.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that they are testing at Kingston general, they are testing at the sick children's hospital, they are testing at the East general in Toronto; all these hospitals have clinics with tragic cases of PKU infants. All these lives destroyed, can be avoided and I strongly urge the principle to commend itself to the hon. members of this Legislature and hope that they will join with me in approving second reading.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a few words to what the previous hon. speaker has said in support of this bill. This is another instance where we know that something can be done to effect a cure. When I say "effect a cure," if the disease PKU is caught early enough, and we now know it must be caught in the very early stages, a great deal can be done. I have seen from my own experience in my riding where there have been two children in one family—one where the disease was caught at the very beginning, the child has been able to lead a normal life; and where the PKU is left for a considerable length of time, the child is now a hopeless case in one of the hospitals for retarded children.

As the hon. member for Scarborough West pointed out, PKU, unless caught in the very early stages, can lead to mental retardation. The maximum amount of brain damage occurs in the first month or two of the life of the child, and that is why it is so important that steps be taken with every child so

that we know beforehand if action must be taken.

The disease is inherited and it is relatively rare; it occurs approximately once in every 25,000 births. Mr. Speaker, when we see it is that rare we may ask, "Why be bothered going to the expense, or why be bothered being involved in legislation?" Well, again, it may be rare to the general population, but if it happens to your family or to your child or to your next-door neighbour, it is something that becomes of the utmost importance. In fact, more recent researches have ascertained that it can become even more common than once in 25,000 births.

A recent study, published June 6, 1964, in the Canadian medical association *Journal*, indicated that in case studies in Ontario, PKU was found to occur once in 1,100 to 1,900 births, and this conclusion which has been supported by other researchers, on different grounds indicates that PKU is becoming a more serious problem. It may become more serious, Mr. Speaker, because it may be one of the diseases that, over a period of time, is gathering force within the bodies of various individuals; it is passed on from person to person over a period of time, and it eventually appears to such an extent that it leads to mental retardation.

A case study in the Canadian medical association *Journal*, May 6, 1961, indicated that there were approximately 250 cases of PKU in Ontario of which only 83 were known. Over the 13-year period 1961 to 1974, the number of births expected with evidence of PKU is 111.

We know already from researches made that in this period from 1961 to 1974 that these cases are going to occur. So for two reasons we should take action. Here are 111 cases in which, if we take action, people who would be completely retarded could lead reasonably normal lives; also, we can step in and stop the continuation of PKU—in other words, this matter of carrying on the disease from generation to generation. Now, 111 cases may be a relatively insignificant figure when considered as a percentage of the population, but, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, it becomes tremendously important if it is your family, or if it is your neighbour. When we think of the cost of the drugs that are fed to some of these children, it amounts to a very high cost in the long run on the Treasury of the province of Ontario.

There are several reliable tests that can determine whether or not a young child is suffering from PKU. The test depends—and here I use a technical term with which I am

not familiar—on amino acid phenylalanine being present in excessive quantities in the blood and urine. The hon. Minister of Health can define that technical matter for us, but in essence we are not trying to deal in technical terms. It is a fact that the men who are learned in this type of disease know that something can be found. If we provide the facilities and the necessary law, those who have the medical learning can do a great deal to protect our children here in the province of Ontario.

When it is true that these tests show a positive reaction for this disorder of PKU, the steps can be taken to supply the drugs. Tremendous steps have been taken in this field in recent years; it is unfortunate that we allow one single child to become retarded when the retardation could be stopped.

Both urine and blood tests are effective, but studies have shown that blood tests will yield a positive reaction within four to six days after birth, whereas urine tests will not necessarily yield any positive information until four to six weeks after birth. In other words, it has been shown and proved scientifically that by taking a blood test within four to six days a doctor can determine whether a child is suffering from PKU. Once detected, the disease can be controlled by prescribed diets which are low in that acid which brings about the retardation. If the diet is prescribed early enough, present studies show that the child will be able to live a normal life and develop quite well. So again I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, our present researchers tell us that there will be, in the next 13 years, at least 111 cases that are going to require help.

In the state of Massachusetts, as the hon. member for Scarborough West has said, there is legislation making blood tests of all newborn infants compulsory. They found—incidentally, this legislation is very recent; it was brought forth in Massachusetts in 1962—that by November 1, 1964, 27 cases of PKU had been discovered and were being treated. Here are 27 individuals who, because of a law that was passed in Massachusetts, are going to be able to live normal lives; instead of being a cost on the taxpayer of the state of Massachusetts, they are going to be able to get out and pay their own way. So it is not only a matter of humanity, as in so many of these cases in this type of legislation—it is sound economics.

The Massachusetts Department of Public Health supports a clinic for children with PKU and other similar problems. This clinic is available at no charge for consultation

services or complete medical services. In December, 1964—and again I point out, Mr. Speaker, the recent figures—there were about 50 patients receiving treatment in the clinic in Massachusetts, and they test a good many children over the period of a year. The clinic in Massachusetts costs them \$30,000 per year, which amounts to about 50 cents per child that they test.

So that would mean that they are testing about 60,000 children. Out of this they have found 50 cases necessary to treat. It has been estimated that the total annual cost has been about half as much as the cost of maintaining one of these children in an institution for life. So again I point out to this House, through you, Mr. Speaker, the sound economics that the cost of the entire clinic in Massachusetts for a year is what it costs to keep one child for life in an institution.

In Canada, Saskatchewan has introduced a provincial programme for the detection of PKU in which all the hospitals may participate, and a pilot programme has been introduced in Nova Scotia, in British Columbia and Manitoba. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is time for Ontario to get moving.

In Ontario, only the East general hospital in Toronto, and a few hospitals in other parts of Ontario, are doing PKU tests as a matter of course. Case studies in this province, according to the Canadian medical association *Journal* of July 1964, have shown that laboratory time required to administer a study and to study the blood tests amounted to some four hours every two weeks, while the cost of the tests were approximately ten cents per newborn child. So we are not asking the government to spend a tremendous amount of money. When it is figured it costs ten cents per child for this test, it is a very wise and proper thing to do.

What forms the basis of a well-planned programme for detection and treatment of PKU, Mr. Speaker? Of course, there are many answers to this, but basically it is a matter of research; it is education, it is publicity, and counselling is of prime importance. But in addition, there is room for positive government action in this area. This would basically take three forms.

First, instituting compulsory blood tests for newborn infants and possibly for mothers during pregnancy. Again, along with the hon. member for Scarborough West, I hope that the government is not afraid of the word compulsory.

Two, financial help for the programming of tests and for families with a PKU patient under treatment. This treatment represents,

for some families, a financial burden and arrangements should be made to assist families of low economic status. One practical aspect of that, Mr. Speaker, is this: I remember a few years ago where they discovered a PKU baby in my riding and the drugs were found to be so expensive that the family could not afford to pay it. Fortunately the hospital for sick children—even some of the members of the staff—chipped in to see that the drugs were provided and eventually—I give the government credit for this—I notified The Department of Public Welfare and they saw to it that drugs were provided. But it is common sense to see to it that a child who needs this type of treatment receives it immediately. Otherwise the child is going to be a charge upon the province of Ontario as long as it lives.

Third, the registration of PKU persons in a central registry is of the greatest importance. It would serve a dual purpose: one, the keeping of statistical data; and two, the continuity of supervision for families with high risks. Now this could be done, and the beginning of doing this, if such legislation was made law by this House.

I have one or two criticisms of this bill. I repeat, we support it in principal. I believe that the hon. member for Scarborough West would agree with me, his problem was that this involves the spending of public money and therefore he could not make it as broad as he would wish. But I would like to say that this could be done. The bill before us in this Legislature makes PKU tests compulsory within a period not to exceed 28 days from the date of birth. It in no way covers either recommendations 2 or 3, in which I mentioned we should supply financial help for families with PKU children—

Mr. S. Lewis: It is done.

Mr. Trotter: The government will supply drugs when asked through The Department of Public Welfare and I have got the help here financially from them, but you have to go to The Department of Public Welfare. I am glad they have improved it, because I know that when I not so long ago had—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): It was done last year.

Mr. Trotter: Well, I am glad to see it has been brought up to date because I know when I applied to the government I got it, but it was a matter of compassion more than law and regulation. So if that is true, number two then has been done.

The third suggestion I had was the list-

ing and keeping of a central registry for all people and all families suspected of PKU, because this is passed on from generation to generation. This is something that could be stopped. It is in our own interest, in hard-boiled financial terms, to see to it that this disease is conquered.

In addition, there is room for this agreement to the extent that the test is made at the behest of the parents. I would rather see a law that the request should be made by the hospital, because what if the parent does not bother, does not know or does not want to? It means, if the child does have PKU, it will be condemned for life to a hospital for retarded children; or it means that the disease will be carried on for another generation. Therefore, instead of the test being done at the behest of the parent, I would rather see it the law of the land where the child must have a PKU test. Basically this is a good bill. It is a good beginning and I wholeheartedly, and this party wholeheartedly, supports this bill. I do wish that the hon. Minister of Health would stand up and agree with what we have had to say. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in this discussion of a very interesting topic. First, in speaking on the principle of this bill, I would like to indicate some points on which we all agree and that is that there is now considerable evidence that a low phenylalanine diet will prevent mental deterioration in patients with phenylketonuria. Although much has to be learned about the optimum use of this diet, it certainly seems evident that the younger the baby starts on this type of diet the more intelligence he will retain.

Now, because of this medical discovery, tests were developed to try to trace down this metabolic abnormality and we have heard of some of these tests today. I think that we all have to agree that the whole development in this field is certainly a significant development in scientific medical diagnosis.

I also think we all agree that all newborn infants should have this test. I certainly wanted my children to have it, and they did have it as long ago as 1960. I think that we can understand and appreciate the concern of the parents of children who to live with this condition now, and who have banded themselves together into an association to try to help prevent future children from suffering the mental deterioration which their children suffer. But, I think, Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us today is just not a practical

bill. I think in saying this we should reflect on the great impact that this type of testing will have.

First, we have the two tests: The ferric chloride test where they put some ferric chloride on the wet diaper of a young baby, and from that they are able to test for PKU; and the other test, as the hon. member for Scarborough West has mentioned, is the Guthrie test. This consists of a prick in the heel to collect a blood sample. At one time the ferric chloride test was thought to be the ultimate, and then the Guthrie test was developed. Now, in Montreal, tests and studies are going on to show that you can not only test for PKU, but for many other metabolic disorders in children that need to be treated from the very outset, and that multiple tests are now being developed.

What this all suggests to me, Mr. Speaker, is that—as this testing for enzyme abnormality is changing constantly—what we want here is a pattern of flexibility, not a pattern of rigidity. In other words, this field is moving so fast that, from one day to the next, types of testing are changing. Why should we be tied down by legislation in specifying one specific test? I think that we need this flexibility. What may be a good test today, next month may not be; what may be a test for PKU now, may develop into a test for four or five metabolic disorders. What we need is an urging of voluntary use of testing, which certainly any recognized doctor and hospital today—through education—is being urged to do. This is part of his adherence to his professional studies, and I am sure he will religiously carry this out.

The second thing specifically on this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that I think as it is worded—and it is all very well for the hon. members to talk about how they would like to have this bill worded—to make the screening of the newborn infant mandatory on the parent. I think that, in this, there is a potential trespass on the rights of the citizen. There are those, who for religious grounds, feel they should not have any tests done, particularly a blood test, and I think that this represents an infringement on the citizens' rights.

Mr. S. Lewis: How about the rights of the child?

Mr. Wells: Now I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for my friends to talk about this. They bandy around the word "compulsory" very lightly.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. member is the one that bandies it.

Mr. Wells: What they should realize, Mr. Speaker, is that there is now no case anywhere in the legislation where any medical test is compulsory. The only thing in this allied field that is compulsory, is the putting of silver nitrate on the eyes of the newborn infant. So that all these other things that we may think are compulsory, are not compulsory by law, but they are done. Vaccination for smallpox, the antitoxins for diphtheria, all these various tests that we all know must be done on the newborn, none of them is compulsory.

I think, as I have said, that making it compulsory could be a potential trespass of the citizens' rights.

The third thing I would like to deal with, Mr. Speaker, is, as I said, that we have to study the potential impact of this type of legislation, the legislation which makes mass screening compulsory. We may arrive at a point of mass screening. I think we will arrive there through a voluntary method. I believe we will arrive there through a voluntary method. But no matter how we arrive there, we must study the potential impact of this type of testing. The first thing we must study and we must prepare to institute, is an educational programme, because no programme of mass screening will eliminate the false negatives and the false positives.

In other words, there are going to be people who will actually have PKU, but will, through testing, come out negative. Now this may be a very small group, but we must be prepared to educate the citizens of this province to the fact that this is a possibility, that not everyone will be caught by the testing. Further, we must have the extensive facilities to track down thoroughly and analyze every positive result, because we will obviously come up with some who appear positive but who are, in reality, negative. For this, of course, we will be very grateful for any battery of laboratory tests which could show this. But I think that we must realize that with any system of mass screening, must go a programme of mass education as to the value of the screening programme—what is being done and what are the potential hazards of the programme.

As I said, we must be prepared to make sure, as we go into this field, that the special tests for the confirming of false positives are available just as readily as the mass screening tests. We must be prepared to have the laboratory, clinical, hospital and therapeutic facilities to treat the people—the children who are found to have PKU—and we must

be prepared, I think, not to offer this test in areas where these facilities are not immediately available.

Now, another field that we must look at—and I am going to quote from the medical literature here, because it is a field about which, of course, the hon. Minister of Health knows more than I do, or probably any other hon. member of the House; this is in this field of phenylketonuria and genetics. If we are going to have mass screening, the medical literature says that:

If mass screening is effective, undamaged individuals with genotypes homogenous for several of the hereditary metabolic diseases such as PKU will be the legacy of this exercise.

That is the exercise of mass screening.

And approximately half of these people will be women whom we presume will be fertile and desiring children of their own. We have to be prepared to look at this problem and consider what we shall offer these women during their pregnancies, knowing that abnormal homogenous maternal phenotypes can constitute a hazard to the foetus. What facilities for counselling and testing will be available for prospective partners in marriage who might question their own phenotype.

These are some of the things that the medical literature suggests must be seriously considered, as we embark on a programme of mass screening.

Now I think, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we all agree that this test should be done. I feel that it can be done on a voluntary method, as all our other tests are done. I think that, as has already been pointed out, we should realize that it is being done in the Kingston general hospital, in the East general hospital, in the sick children's hospital in Toronto.

We should realize also that the college of general practice of Canada carries on a campaign with the general practitioners in Canada. They have been distributing booklets explaining phenylketonuria, sending testing material, sending log books, urging the doctors to do this test. This is a fairly new procedure, and it is becoming very effective now, as these men become more accustomed to this test, which, as I said, is really a new test.

These things are going on, and I am sure that more things will be going on, Mr. Speaker. I feel that the prime consideration here is to seek to carry out this type of testing on a voluntary basis without infringing

on the rights of our citizens, as I feel this bill does.

I would like to conclude these few remarks by reading a quotation from a doctor, who is eminently qualified to comment on this programme, because he has done much medical research in this field, and is doing much at the present time. He is one of those groups who are actively interested in this field of metabolic disorders in children. Dr. Charles R. Scriver, of the Montreal children's hospital—and these are his words, from a paper which he has presented:

There seems to be every reason to encourage the cautious use of screening methods for detection and study of metabolic disease in the newborn period, under controlled circumstances. In some cases we can prevent harm to the infant through early detection and therapy. In other instances we are bound to learn anew. Whether screening programmes can be made community-wide now is, however, still undecided, because there is much more to be understood about the problems of mass screening than the technical tests. In the meantime the Canadian medical community can do much to assist in pilot studies, which will determine the best use to be made of the available screening techniques. At the same time the broader problems of resources and organization for mass screening programmes can be investigated.

It would seem advisable to discourage any legislation which may be brought forth now, which specifies how screening must be done, and the fact that screening should be mandatory. The field is advancing too quickly not to have flexibility in planning.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of an eminent doctor in this field and I think they sum up my reaction to this bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to contribute to this debate, but I think in fairness to the House this is one time when we can all say that we are in agreement on principle. I think that the thinking behind the underlying intention, if I may put it in an Irish way, is very sound. It is very encouraging to all of us in medicine to know that tests are being devised to bring to light these conditions and to help us prevent a life of despair, as the hon. member described it.

I do want to say, however, in the case of the remarks of the three points emphasized by the hon. member for Parkdale, that only

one is not being done in Ontario—that is, compulsory testing, we have now for over a year been providing the phenylalanine diet to families because it is a very costly diet. We also have a central register of all cases on record.

Mr. Trotter: All the cases the hon. Minister knows of.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If my hon. friend would just wait a minute and not bite my tongue off before it is even protruding.

I was about to say, sir, that we have completed testing of all the children under our care and we have established a register of all of those known in the province and we have them on record already, so the two points are already under way.

I would just like to advise you, sir, that when I present the estimates of my department I will have a positive proposal to put before the House, which we believe will produce the desired effect inherent in the bill proposed by the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) moves second reading of Bill No. 32, An Act to provide for the appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies, and to define the commissioner's powers and duties.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill No. 32, and in moving second reading, I would advise you, sir, that this is an Act to provide for the appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario, and its agencies, and to define that commissioner's powers and duties.

May I say, sir, at the outset, that I believe that Ontario today needs this sort of an official. He is sometimes described as a parliamentary commissioner, and sometimes described as an ombudsman.

The growth of government business and services has made it necessary, in the interests of all of the people in Ontario in 1965, to have a tremendous administrative machine, and hundreds if not thousands of civil serv-

ants to look after it. This sort of procedure is necessary today because of the new role that government is undertaking in these complex times. In several countries, administrative machinery actually stands between the individual and the state. Certainly it does in this province.

The private citizen has often been frightened and frequently completely overwhelmed by the very formidable task of attempting to deal with matters which so vitally affect him through the ministrations of nameless and faceless civil servants. We have reached the point where, in some cases and in certain ways, and with substantial justification, the personality is perhaps being crushed by the overwhelming growth of legislative services. They feel a particular awe by this machinery which, of necessity, must have an impersonal character in their relationships with the machinery.

That is why I think that we must make sure that the citizens of this province are not led to believe that their personal interests and their security can be vitally affected by a group of persons over whom they have no control.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the points about which we hear more discussion than anything else in this House relate to the concern that individuals have in their relationship with the vast overwhelming machine of government, how do they cope with it, what do they do about it. On occasion, they come to their member of Parliament. The member of Parliament investigates as best he is able, and he attempts to lay the facts of the individual's problems before the House in the hope that something will be done about it. The tenor of my remarks is that this is not good enough in the complex world in which we live; that there is another remedy, and that this is the remedy that we are putting forward and is contained in this Bill 32.

In brief, as I say, Mr. Speaker, in this bill I am presenting today I am suggesting that Ontario appoint a parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman, who would have the duty to examine citizens' complaints, and, if he deems them unwarranted, which he might on many occasions, convince the complainant that he has not, in fact, been ill-treated or placed in an untenable position, and the state has not been unfair towards him. I think this is important because all complaints that we hear as members of the Legislature are certainly not justified. But I think the citizen who feels he is aggrieved should have the opportunity to have an impartial official examine his complaint, and

a great deal of the concern about government and its size and its impersonality could be done away with if there was such a person or such an office available to explain to the apparently aggrieved citizen that he is not too badly aggrieved at all.

On the other hand, and we see many of these instances too, sir, if the complaint is warranted the commissioner would make to the state or to its officials the necessary recommendation so that the situation could be remedied.

This officer, of course, must be impartial. He must be a completely independent person who works first of all for simplicity in all procedures. And what greater boon could we give, sir, to the people of the province of Ontario than a limitation on red tape, a cutting-through of complicated and hard to understand procedures? And what greater job could any official of the province of Ontario accept as his first task than the taking on of a real examination of complicated and unnecessary administrative procedures and to make them simple and understandable? He should have the same independence, in my opinion, as is presently enjoyed by the only other official we in this Legislature know—the provincial auditor.

The concept, sir, of an ombudsman developed initially in the Scandinavian countries. We may well ask if this concept can be transmitted or transplanted into Ontario, where there is a somewhat different system of government. We have a parliamentary system of government, of which one of the basic and fundamental principles is a ministerial responsibility. Government is not conducted in the same sense in the Scandinavian countries. While perhaps the concept cannot be transplanted in toto, certainly such an official has a most important role to play, in my opinion, in this province, in connection with protecting the rights of the individual. How this might be done and in what areas this official would operate, and what would be the nature of his authority, are matters that I have attempted to outline in my bill. I believe that as a community we must provide ourselves with another instrument of control, operating in a manner somewhat different from that used by our courts, in order to fill in some of the gaps which are glaringly wide in modern circumstances. The Legislature must attempt to penetrate at certain specific points this apparently impenetrable shield which protects such a vast area of legislative and executive decision from proper scrutiny. The ombudsman can be used as a weapon to penetrate that shield.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, is modelled substantially upon the provisions contained in the New Zealand bill of 1962, which I have attempted to adapt to the mood of Ontario. I am suggesting that the principal function of the commissioner would be to investigate any decision or recommendations made, including any recommendation made to a Minister of the Crown, or any act done or omitted to be done relating to a matter of administration and affecting any person or body of persons in his personal capacity in or by any of the departments, or any of the agencies of government of Ontario, or by any officer or employee thereof.

Section 9 of the bill is an important section, within which all the essentials of the parliamentary commissioner's jurisdiction is to be found. I have departed in section 9 from the New Zealand precedent of naming in the schedules setting out specific departments and government organizations and have, in fact, suggested that this bill be made applicable to all departments of government and to all agencies of government. The jurisdiction which I am suggesting be given to the ombudsman extends to matters of administration, with the consequence that matters concerning policy only would be, as they should be, excluded.

In so doing, I hope I am removing from discussion and I hope, sir, with this bill before the House, that we will hear from government, and particularly from the Cabinet, some real analysis and opinion in connection with this suggestion, which is one that has been before the people of Ontario and the people of Canada for some months and some years. It has also been discussed at various meetings of Bar associations. The Hon. Guy Favreau, the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, has suggested that a committee of the House of Commons be set up to investigate this. Briefs have been presented to Mr. Justice McRuer in connection with this, and I would hope that in a matter of such importance—in a matter that I believe is so needed in the province of Ontario—that we would hear some real discussion and real criticism emanating from the government benches, particularly from the front government benches.

The jurisdiction which I am suggesting be given to the ombudsman extends to matters of administration. I say that matters of policy—I am repeating myself—only would be, as they should be, excluded.

I would think that where a matter arises that might concern the parliamentary commissioner, which involves both administration

and policy, he could still be empowered to investigate; if he strays beyond the bounds given to him, resort could be made to the courts to restrain him. This very question was posed to Sir Guy Powells, who is the New Zealand ombudsman, when he appeared here in Canada a couple of years ago. He suggested that the mere thought that he might be straying into fields of policy was an ever-present warning sign in his mind, but where he thought that he was dealing with mixed fields of administration and policy, he went in and investigated. He said that insofar as his actions had been concerned, while there was, of course, resort to the courts to restrain him if he strayed beyond the four walls of his enabling statute, no one had, up to the time he had been here, and he had been in office for a few years, had seen fit to go to the courts in an attempt to restrain him.

It goes without saying, of course, that should this bill be accepted by the Legislature, the person whose appointment I envisage must be a person of the highest possible integrity, of the utmost ability, a person who by reason of his training and experience and reputation, could at once command the respect not only of all members of the Legislature, but also of all of the people of Ontario. He must be a person whose tenure of office would be determined not by government but by the Legislature; he must be a person who could not be arbitrarily removed at the whim of a new Prime Minister or of a new government; he must be a person whose abilities would command at least the equivalent salary to that of one of the supreme court judges. In other words, sir, he must be a person of extremely outstanding ability, and a person who I think we could find without too much difficulty in this province if we set our minds to it.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The hon. member would take it himself, would he not?

Mr. Singer: If my hon. friend wants to put my name in nomination, I might seriously consider it.

Mr. White: The hon. member is the only man I can think of with all those attributes.

Mr. Singer: This bill, sir, advisedly stops short—and I think this is an important point—of giving to the ombudsman the authority to inquire into the decisions of Ministers themselves. But any recommendation made to a Minister or by a department, even if the Minister has already acted upon it, may be

re-inquired into and, if necessary, reported upon. I can imagine cases where a Minister has refused the advice of a civil servant and made a decision that has caused complaint. In such cases, surely the complainant should be entitled to know that the decision he does not like was not that of a civil servant but of the Minister?

I think this could be a very important method of procedure so that if a citizen says: "I do not like such-and-such a decision," he should be in a position to be able to say: "Well, if it was not the civil service who recommended it in usual procedure, it was the Minister." And the Minister should as a responsible Minister be prepared to say: "This was my opinion and I think it was right." There should be the ability for the citizen to find out who really made the decision. I think this type of inquiry which the parliamentary commissioner, the ombudsman, could carry on would have very substantial dividends in satisfying the concern of people who are affected by such decisions and to feel that they might or might not be unfair.

Contacts with government departments and agencies could and should be kept on an informal basis. The idea behind this bill would enable a parliamentary commissioner to find out the truth about the facts surrounding a particular complaint. He could, by personal contact with the heads of departments, obtain co-operation that is possibly denied to an ordinary citizen. We all know of cases where the ordinary citizen is just completely overwhelmed in an effort to try to get through to the person who can responsibly advise him or responsibly state the basis for a decision. His operations to be successful must, of course, not only have the confidence of Parliament, they must have the confidence of the administration. And what I mean in that, sir, is obvious. He not only must be a *persona grata* to all of the members of this House, but he must be a person who can get along with the Deputy Ministers, with all of the people who make up our civil service, with the heads of commissions and boards and agencies.

He must, of course, be given very complete official powers of investigation. He must have the power to summon and to examine persons on oath and must have complete rights of access to departmental records and to departmental premises. Questions, of course, will be raised on the issue of Crown privilege. And I am suggesting in section 15 that any rule of law in effect authorizing the withholding of documents on the grounds of

public interests should not apply to any investigation by the ombudsman unless the Attorney General certifies that the disclosure might, in the circumstances, involve matters which would disclose deliberations of the Cabinet or would involve matters which might in his opinion be secret or confidential in nature and which would be injurious to the public interest. As in New Zealand, Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to limit this privilege as it now exists so that it can be exercised only by a certificate by the Attorney General.

It would be my thought that departments and agencies would be most reluctant, as a general rule, to approach the Attorney General for such a certificate; except in the most unusual circumstances, because such a request would obviously convey to him—and in saying this I speak particularly of my hon. friend who occupies the post at present (Mr. Wishart)—and subsequently to the people of Ontario, that they have something to hide. I would think not only would there be a reluctance in an approach to the Attorney General to ask for such a report, but there would be real reluctance on the part of the Attorney General to grant such a certificate just as a matter of course. He would want to

satisfy himself on every occasion that the granting of such a certificate was fully authorized and justified.

Of course, the ombudsman himself, and his staff, would be required to maintain secrecy in respect to matters coming before him, except insofar as disclosure may be necessary in the interest of carrying out the investigation to support his recommendation.

As to the actual power and authority of the commissioner, I know—as hon. members have read the bill—that they will realize that he has no power to make anything in the nature of an executive order or decision. He is not going to be a legislator; he is not going to be a law-maker; he is an investigator and a reporter.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out to me that it is 6 o'clock; my remarks will take some time yet. Is it your intention now to leave the chair?

Mr. Singer moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, June 3, 1963

Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, continued	3653
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3693

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have guests to the Legislature and tonight we welcome the students of Lakeshore elementary school, Burlington.

Clerk of the House: The sixteenth order. House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (continued)

On vote 501:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I was interested to read today in the newspaper that the Mennonite community in the Elmira area has decided to leave the public school system and establish its own schools. I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment on the reasons for this and to what extent other religious groups are interested in establishing parochial schools.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, the only group that we know of is the Mennonites, who may or may not in that area—it is not confirmed yet. I think that one of the reasons for leaving will be the question of the central school, or perhaps the question of transportation. I understand that this is one of their problems. Also, over the years, they have become used to having a concentration of their own youngsters in the one school. We regret this development; I think perhaps we all do, and to date we have had no indication of this happening with any other group. We do not think that this is a general condition.

Mr. Nixon: In my own constituency there are a large number of Dutch Reform Church members who have established their own schools, and I believe they are of very high calibre. Would the hon. Minister be in a position to provide us with any statistics as to the rate at which parochial schools of this type are being established in the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I might be able to get this information. It is difficult to obtain the number that are going into the

so-called parochial system. One thing with which I can help the hon. member is that a year ago we agreed to inspect the schools, so that they are now under a system of provincial inspection. The rate of growth of the Dutch Reform or Christian Reform schools is very hard to predict at this point. Whether the families will continue, we quite frankly do not know. It is not a large percentage but there are some; there is no question about it.

Mr. Nixon: Is there any thought that, in the schools of this type that have been and will be established the government would be able to give some assistance, let us say, in connection with the textbook programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this has not been the policy, Mr. Chairman, and I doubt that there will be any change of policy unless the whole question is opened up, which I do not think the government would be doing at this time.

Mr. Nixon: In connection with private schools, there has been from time to time, announcements in the metropolitan papers of small groups getting together to form their own private schools as something less than a large commercial enterprise. Does the hon. Minister have any statistics that would indicate if this is a programme that is accelerating or is this the way it has always been in the past? I am under the impression that there are many more of these being formed now than in the past.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, unless the hon. member is referring to some of the Jewish parochial schools—I would say that the number of private schools today is not substantially increased in the metropolitan area except with the natural growth, say, in the separate schools—if the hon. member is referring to this type of private school. If he is referring to this type of private school, they are increasing—Neil McNeil and Michael Power and so on—in size, but I think it would correspond roughly to the growth in population. I think the two could be related.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Minister in his opening remarks commented on the St. Catharines flag day proposal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, Canada Day.

Mr. Nixon: Canada Day, yes, and I understand there is a possibility that in the future this might be declared a school holiday if it were a programme that were received with favour in all parts of the province. Perhaps the hon. Minister might serve the purpose of that discussion if he would say more about it himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is not a great deal more I can add, really, to what was in my preliminary remarks. The St. Catharines board decided to observe a Canada Day; they prepared their programme; they invited us to attend but unfortunately we could not be there. We thought it a very excellent programme and that there was some merit in the idea. We brought it to the attention of other principals to get their reaction. I would not want to predict at this point, Mr. Chairman, whether it would become general across the province as a school holiday, but certainly we felt the idea had merit and as a result we encouraged them. We will sense the reaction over perhaps the next year, as to how the other school boards feel about it.

Mr. Nixon: Dealing with flags and problems arising therefrom: It is interesting to note that around these buildings there seems to be some confusion as to what flags will be used, say, in this chamber, at the entrance to this chamber, and in various areas around the Parliament buildings. As a matter of fact, when the bill calling for a provincial flag was introduced, I made some comments, I believe, that were construed by one member of the press as calling for a brainwashing of the students of the province of Ontario into the acceptance of our national flag. Now perhaps I will be taking the risk of being accused of the same thing, but it seems to me, in driving through the countryside, one sees a variety of flags flying. I suppose it will not be long until our provincial flag will be seen flying in front of some schools; and of course our national flag is flying in front of many schools.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that it would not be beyond the realm of financial possibility if a suitable flag were made available at no charge to the school board that had the facilities and the desire to fly it. My own feeling is that each school in this province should fly the flag of the nation and I would make this strong suggestion to the hon. Minister, but perhaps he will not care to comment on it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would like to think about this, Mr. Chairman, but in my travels around—and I have seen a number of schools even in the last two or three months—I think the great bulk of them are flying the new Canadian flag, at the schools I have observed.

Mr. Nixon: I felt it was rather unfortunate that flag day, as such, was missed by most schools. Unfortunately, it was difficult to get the new flag in time and it has been suggested, I believe, in the Parliament at Ottawa that this historic day might well be properly marked in the years to come with fitting ceremonies and with an appropriate remembrance of the great occasion.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): You mean the Ontario flag?

Mr. Nixon: No, I mean the flag of the nation, and this is the one I would propose to the hon. Minister of Education and to the government, to take the place of honour in the schools of the province.

Vote 501 agreed to.

Vote 502 agreed to.

On vote 503:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on vote 503. Our school system is more and more beset in the minds of some teachers, and assisted in the minds of some school boards, with people who are taking over various administrative duties in the schools themselves, and certainly for the various school boards. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on a programme that might be already established in his department so that school administrators would have an opportunity to be kept up to date with the latest methods and the best methods in this expanding business of education.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there are two or three things of interest in this area on which I could spend some time. The whole question of school business administration is becoming a very important one as far as the growth of education in this province is concerned. It is related to the availability of technological equipment, such as computers, and we have been doing a very substantial study in this area to try to develop—within the department—a system of computerized statistical processing that will be able to assist the boards, the business administrators and relieve a lot of pressure from the teachers themselves.

There are two areas, really, of use as far as the computer is concerned: one is in the

area of instruction which I think will take some considerable time to develop; and the other is in the administrative area where we can, I think, assist the teachers with records, such as attendance, and assist the principals, we hope, in the development of timetabling.

The business administrators have their own committee, and we have a joint committee with them to look into administrative practices. We think we are making some progress. Our concern is, quite frankly, that some of the major boards might be moving into this area of data processing and not relating it to what other boards are doing. But we are trying to co-ordinate their efforts so that eventually we can tie in our own data processing systems with those to be established by the major boards and, of course, we eventually hope to provide some form of uniform provincial service for them. We have also had, through the CEA, a committee looking into the feasibility of tying the provinces in from this standpoint as well. Dr. Jackson has been chairing the committee that has been looking into this for the past, roughly, nine months now and they, I think, are coming to the conclusion that we must solve our own provincial problems before we can relate it on a national basis; however, we are encouraged by the response of the other provinces. They have been, I think, very co-operative and interested in what we are doing, and Quebec has made very major advances in this area. All in all we are encouraged, but it is a very important section. A lot of people tend to look at education in terms of curriculum, teachers and so on, but administration is becoming a very key factor. This is why, in the re-organization, we have given added emphasis to the whole question of school business administration.

Mr. Nixon: In the calculation of grants by the individual school board the business administrator must surely take some considerable responsibility. Is there a tendency with the building up of the computer facilities here in Toronto for these calculations to be done centrally and with the main responsibility taken at the central office, or do the people out in the field have to go through the laborious procedures of first interpreting and then finally calculating the grant procedures?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that they are still going through the procedures, and there is no point minimizing the complexity of the grant regulations. But we think, as the number of boards decrease,

as the units become larger and our own equipment becomes more refined, that we will be able to relieve the boards of a lot of this burden. Obviously, if we can have the ideal system so that we can have up-to-date accurate information almost on a weekly or monthly basis, the day may come when we may be able to centrally calculate the grants for the boards. We are dependent, of course, on their information and much of the work is still done by the local boards, although our own grants office endeavours to be as helpful as possible in assisting the administrators in their calculations.

Mr. Nixon: Are all the calculations checked by your office before the money goes out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they are checked.

Mr. Nixon: Have there ever been cases where an incorrect grant has been awarded following which the board would have to receive a short grant for some years to make up for too much money in a single year? Excluding the case of the illegalities in the Renfrew area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I would think there perhaps have been two or three situations, Mr. Chairman, out of the some three or four thousand grants that are calculated every year. I would have to be very frank in suggesting there may have been three or four errors of this kind during the course of this time. I do not think there is any doubt about this.

Mr. Nixon: I remember hearing—I do not know how accurate it would be—when an error in the other direction took place in the case of at least one school board. It appeared that, following a change in the directorship of education in the area, an error was brought to light involving very heavy repayment on behalf of the government to the school board. Have errors of this nature taken place in the past which the hon. Minister is aware of?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot recall, Mr. Chairman, any major errors in the last, say, two or three years, of large sizes. No, I cannot recall any. If the hon. member has any specific situation in mind, I would be delighted to check it.

Mr. Nixon: The point of my question is this: the grant system is extremely complex. Many hon. members will surely remember the hon. Minister explaining it at the session last year and we all felt at the time that it

was quite complex. Unfortunately the hon. Minister would not be available to give assistance to every school board and perhaps it might be advisable for the computer facilities that are at his disposal to make these calculations on behalf of the various school boards and these could be run through rather rapidly. They would, I suppose, still have the right and responsibility to check them on their own behalf, but it might save a lot of wear and tear on the abilities of a good many of the people concerned.

Further in the matter of administration, I would presume that principals would come under this particular vote, or our dealings with principals. Would that be correct?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not—

Mr. Nixon: Would you put them under teacher training?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps you might, but if the hon. member has a question we might as well deal with it here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: All right. I do feel that principals of schools are, in fact, a part of the administration at the local level; and although many of them do retain their membership in the teachers' professional organizations, this is always up for some discussion. In my own experience they have always supported the teachers in every way in that connection. But I would like to say a word or two about the process whereby the department selects individuals for training as principals and thus, in fact, takes them out of the teaching situation. It always seems to me a great shame in many ways that the very best teachers, those I believe rated by the departmental inspectors at the level of 6 or 7 on the scale from 0 to 10, are more or less informed in a quiet way that their application to the department for admission to the principals' course would be greeted with favour.

My understanding is that once the application of an individual to the principals' course is accepted, then there is no chance of him failing the course or the examination. I believe the hurdle is the acceptance by the department.

I realize that it is imperative that the principals in any schools have a close association with the teachers in the classroom and have an understanding of the problems they face. But as the school system increases in complexity and size there are becoming a significant number of our best teachers removed from the situation where they are needed most and put into positions of admin-

istration where, in almost every case, they no longer have any teaching responsibility. I do not know whether there is any answer to the problem that this presents, and I would ask the hon. Minister to suggest his own views on this and perhaps his department is considering some departure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it is obvious that you want to select good personnel for your principals. The source of personnel obviously is the teaching staff or the members of the profession, and I do not think there is any real solution to it. You cannot go outside the teaching profession to select principals. I do not think we could accept this principle, any of us, and to suggest that you do not pick a good teacher to become a principal or take the course, does not really serve the purpose either.

I think, really, what we should be attempting to achieve is to free the principal from his many administrative tasks to become the intellectual leader of the school besides being the administrator. He should be free to devote a lot of time to the development of the members of his staff. If this is the case, I think that he is really performing as important a service as if he were head of a department or a specialist in the school itself. I think if we can free our principals to do more of this type of work, to give guidance particularly to the inexperienced members on the staff, that he is performing a function not dissimilar to superintendents or inspectors. In this way I think we could reconcile the fact that we have lost a good teacher from a staff itself.

Mr. Nixon: Just before this vote carries, I want to say that this is precisely the view that I, and many teachers, would have of the function of a principal. It would surely be one of the responsibilities, one of the biggest responsibilities of the administrative branch and the administration in the individual school, to see to it that the principals are relieved of the many responsibilities—paper work responsibilities—that have tied them down heretofore.

I think the same is true of department heads who could very well, with efficient administrative leadership, be freed of many of the responsibilities that now keep them from performing the duties that would be most obvious for them. In most cases they are the specialists who are in such short supply and who could give the assistance to junior teachers who would be needed in this connection.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under this vote, I would like to ask of the hon. Minister if he is aware of the recommendation made by the Ontario physical fitness study committee in its report submitted to the government in 1961? The recommendation asked that action be taken to bring about better co-ordination, communication joint planning and pooling of resources among provincial government departments, local authorities or voluntary agencies.

I refer to the construction of gymnasias and gymnasias facilities in communities. The community quite often approaches The Department of Agriculture to get financial assistance and, because of having to approach several departments, often finds itself quite confused. Were the approach to be made only to The Department of Education, where the grants that would normally come under the community centres branch—I think it is some branch of The Department of Agriculture—then the community would not be so confused.

The authorities would simply go to one central body and obtain the grant for the construction of the gymnasium. In my own community it was the construction of a swimming pool that necessitated the board of education and the recreation department to set up sort of a phoney community centre on paper to be able to get that grant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not really familiar with the particular situation. I think the hon. member is referring to The Community Centres Act under The Department of Agriculture, not the community programmes branch of The Department of Education. The only observation I have to make here is that it is not often that this is related to the actual school building programme as far as gymnasias are concerned. It is, in many areas, as far as swimming pools are concerned; but usually this is with the community centres branch and the individual community itself.

I would be quite pleased to look into this if there are occasions when the school grants form part of the programme, but I have not heard of this happening where the community centre programme is also involved. I would be pleased to look into it. I do not really recall this happening on any occasion. We have made a point, though, of informing the trustees that we feel that the facilities of the schools should be available for recognized community recreational activities. We have made this quite clear to them.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow through with this. One of the other recommendations made by the same report was that playrooms adaptable to gymnasiums be provided in all elementary schools. This, I presume, would come under school planning building research. Has the department followed through and made any suggestion that facilities in new schools being constructed be multi-purpose facilities?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this probably would come under school planning and design, but we have encouraged the elementary boards to have—as we call it—multi-purpose rooms for both physical and recreational activities; and also to use it for auxiliary instruction if the timetable permits. I could go into this at great length. We also think, in the whole area of school design, we should perhaps become more flexible in our approach to size of room allocation and so on to accommodate team teaching; as well as the variations we may be finding in classroom sizes, but it is a big subject.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow through with this same topic, may I suggest to the hon. Minister then that he establish a few experimental centres where this community—what is called now?—the community school set-up be promoted by the department so that a programme somewhat similar to the programme in the city of Flint be experimented with in various parts of the province, and I would suggest at this time that he possibly use my own community as an area in which this experiment could be conducted. The city itself is seriously considering the establishment of a community school; in fact, they actually do have the beginnings of one in one of the elementary schools where they have obtained grants and put on a small addition to the school and now it will be used—this is an elementary school by the way—and it will be used not only during the regular school day, but also during the evening for adults and other activities.

Vote 503 agreed to.

Vote 504 agreed to.

Vote 505 agreed to.

On vote 506:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, in the programme branch the responsibility for educational television is referred to in item 7 and I have some questions to ask concerning this.

I understand that the hiring of staff for

this began some weeks ago. I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on some criticisms that have been voiced from both the CBC and from META as to the qualifications of the staff that are presently being brought together. I do not think there is any personal criticism at all, but merely the fact that surely the people who are going to put together this new educational television branch must have wide experience both in educational matters and in television programmes. I think it would be worth while if the hon. Minister would comment on the qualifications of the staff that he is gathering and what he hopes to do in the time that is available before we go into operation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, quite frankly I am not aware of any criticism from the CBC.

Mr. Nixon: That word is perhaps not the one that I should have used; concern would be better.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think perhaps there is some concern, or there was initially, which we have cleared up, as to the ultimate responsibility for educational television and that the responsibility should lie ultimately with a person who is a professional educator. This we have accepted by having it as part of the curriculum branch and responsible to the director of curriculum. At the same time, to get this programme off the ground we have placed emphasis on the personnel that has been acquired to date in the technical area because, frankly, the development of the programme depends on answers to technical questions. The whole problem of Channel 19, and where to locate antennas, and whether in fact it will function in this area, and the material that is required for the application to BBC, is primarily of technical character, so that we have initially acquired personnel who are competent to do this. But I think, in my statement, I hope I made it really abundantly clear that the ultimate responsibility would be in the hands of a professional educator, because it is obvious we want the content to be academically sound; in the final analysis this is what we are concerned about, and this is what we will achieve.

Mr. Nixon: I agree with the hon. Minister that the programme content is all that we should be primarily concerned with, and I wonder what sort of timetable is established for the development of the courses that would be provided. Is there any thought that programmes already established on tape and film

from the United States or other areas would be purchased or leased for use?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had said in my statement, that we would avail ourselves of the national film board material. We have actually a library now with some material; META has some excellent programmes that could be used again, and we would avail ourselves of any material that we felt was sound for use. There is no limitation on what material would be used as long as we feel it will fit into the academic programme.

Mr. Nixon: With the technical staff that you have had available for some time, have you an estimate what the first station in Metropolitan Toronto, channel 19, would cost to put into operation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we have not had this yet, Mr. Chairman. This is what they are presently working on. We have to have this finalized for the BBC. We have not got any final figure on it yet.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the youth committee in their travels to California were much impressed with the tape system of education used at San Mateo junior college. Is there any experimentation being done in this province with the use of tapes as teaching aids at the secondary school level?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is some experimental work going on. I visited the same library in San Mateo. It is confined at the moment to the junior college level. It is a fairly expensive programme. It has not been thoroughly evaluated yet and yet we think there is great merit in it. There has been no establishment of this nature in the secondary school programme here other than the language labs which are really individual situations that are quite comparable to the library facility at San Mateo. But this is one of the very intriguing and I think helpful things educationally that are coming. I think you can anticipate such development within our university structure and within our colleges of applied arts and technology. How general an application it will have, say, in the secondary system, I think we would have to evaluate very carefully.

Mr. Newman: In other years I have asked the hon. Minister if he would consider marking departmental exams on the local level. What is the drawback, really to the marking of the departmental exams on the local level? It certainly would facilitate things here

in Toronto, where marking be done in each of the metropolitan areas of the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, we could get into the whole question of the validity of external examinations in grade 13, but to be specific as far as this question is concerned, the prime reason why the papers are marked centrally is to try to maintain a uniform provincial standard. Now I think we will be able to get some idea as to the possibilities of extending the 25 per cent to a third which is in the committee's recommendation, and eventually to 50 per cent on the basis of local recommendations, when we see how the recommendations of this year tie into the final marks. We are really doing this, quite frankly, to be as fair to the students as possible and to have a uniform provincial standard.

I fully appreciate that there are some who feel that we could do this locally, that the individual teacher is quite competent to give the student a grade. I think, statistically that probably they could come fairly close, but we want to be very careful before a departure of this nature is made. We feel there is still some benefit in the principle of external examination. The day may come when we can mark these more readily on a local basis; I don't know, but we have made a fairly major advance in this present year by having 25 per cent of it done on a recommendation of the local people.

Mr. Newman: As a result of that policy can the students expect this year to receive the results of their departmental exams much earlier than they have in previous years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will have to be very frank. With the numbers of students in grade 13 this year we are hoping to achieve the same goal as we did last year. It will not be easy to better the examination result release date of last year. The number of papers has increased very substantially and this is hard for people to understand. But the number of good markers has not increased apace, and the actual compilation of the material does not become any easier. I think we were fortunate last year to get the information out as rapidly as we did. I would point out this to the hon. member, that while this obviously causes a nervous strain to the student, I think the students now are making earlier and multiple applications to the universities, so that there is not quite the same confusion about getting into the university which existed three or four years ago. I think most students do know by the

third week in August whether or not they have been accepted into the university to which they have applied.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned that there was a difficulty in obtaining markers. Were it marked on the local level, you would have solved that problem, more than likely.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I put your proposition to the committee, I can assure you.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister then, if the department plans on allowing grade 13 students to write supplemental exams?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this has been the subject of some discussion and I must say that I am quite sympathetic to a student in grade 13 who misses, say, one or two subjects. We have had several discussions and there has been no decision made on this partly because we are concerned about the ultimate place of grade 13. We are considering this at the present time, and also the great problem that is created by supplementals. I could give a long and detailed explanation of this, but if the hon. member realizes that if they get the results, say, the first week in August, the students have been out of school, there is no opportunity for a further period of instruction. The student would be given, perhaps, two or three weeks to review certain material on his own, and it might mean that by the time these papers were marked again and compiled, it would be well on into the middle of September or the later part of September, before the supplemental results would be available to the student. Because the schools would not be functioning, the student would have to do whatever studying he could on his own, without any additional help.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it would still be better to have the student do all that on his own and save himself a whole year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If it were possible to do it. As I say, we are very sympathetic to this problem, but there are difficulties in the way of trying to solve it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, being sympathetic does not help that youngster who is to be deprived of one year of education at the university, simply because he has been held back by one subject, especially when it happens to be English. Universities generally will not admit students unless they have English.

Now, the next is under item 8, the centennial youth travel programme. May I suggest to the hon. Minister that he extend this programme and accept students who do not necessarily come from the top level of the class—the top bracket of the class, the first-class students—but accept some of the students who may be just barely pass-mark students; because they, more than likely, would benefit a little more by this programme than would those who are simply top-notch students.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the selection, quite frankly, varies from school to school. Some of them do it on the basis of drawing lots. There is no hard-and-fast rule as far as academic requirement is concerned. It is a very difficult task for teachers to select those who will be privileged to participate in this programme, but in many schools that we know about the academic line has not been drawn. It has been done on the basis of what youngsters might be interested. To a degree, I think you might say it has been based on the flip of a coin, although, quite frankly, there are some schools who have selected their best students, because they feel they perhaps might benefit more from it. I think this is one of their reasons. We have left this primarily up to the school authorities themselves to determine what youngsters will participate.

I should point out also, that this is a shared programme with the federal government. We think it has been very worthwhile to date, and we look forward to an extension of this up to and including the centennial year, when we hope many hundreds of young people in this province will be participating.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest at the same time to the hon. Minister that this not only be an interprovincial programme, but an exchange programme right in the province itself, so that students, say from Toronto could go up into Timmins and students from Timmins might come down into Kingston, students from Kingston might go to London, and so forth—an idea of twinning. The mayors and municipalities at one time used the idea of twinning municipalities and it was a very effective way of promoting goodwill between municipalities. Likewise, a means of passing on information from one municipality to learn of the problems of other municipalities.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, in this programmes branch portion, I have some material here which I think might be interesting because it deals not only with programmes and particularly programme 5, but it also deals with the

Indians and I think that also comes under this vote.

I think it is possible we could be witnessing the early start of some dividends from programme 5 in an area where it is extremely welcome. The union of Ontario Indians had a meeting at Moraviantown on May 15, and this meeting was reported extensively in the *Chatham Daily News* and the *Windsor Star*. I am especially interested in this fine group, because the present secretary is a young man from the riding of Lambton West, Simpson Brigham, who is also a councillor for the Walpole Indian reserve. He is one of the young men that I spoke of earlier this year as having enrolled in programme 5 at Windsor. Now since I spoke last, Mr. Brigham has successfully completed his grade 10 course and he is now enrolled for the fall term, to work to his grade 12 standing. His expressed intention of taking this course in the first place, was that he could work in Indian Affairs when he had properly educated himself. Because of this experience, he is realizing just how much can be learned through our Department of Education, and how much help he can get and give to his people.

At the meeting of May 15, the union met with Mr. Wilfred Pelletier, executive secretary of the Indian centennial advisory committee in Ottawa, who is presently on a nationwide tour to promote centennial projects among Indians. Out of this tour, any request to the centennial commission will be made under the voluntary programme established by the commission to assist in educational work among the Indians. I have the feeling that one of the real sparks of this union is its secretary, Mr. Brigham, and as a result of this meeting on May 15, the union will seek grants to finance a provincial conference in North Bay in August, to discuss various centennial ideas and finally select one or more.

One of their pet projects is to hold federal-provincial conferences of Indians across the country, of which only one has been held in the past. Said Mr. Brigham: "We know the government discusses us at its federal-provincial conferences; now we are going to get together to discuss them."

Many other projects were talked about, but two catch my imagination; one is a plan to set aside one day in each year, to be known as National Indian Day, beginning in 1967. The other is the possibility of establishing an Indian library and a cataloguing of Indian songs, stories and legends. In connection with this, Mr. Brigham was able

to tell me that back about 1910 or 1912, he thought that the annual report of The Department of Education contained several very valuable and authentic reports, or stories, or legends, of Indian personalities, which were very valuable and which he felt he could not procure anywhere else; and he would so much like to be able to get those to refer to them. I did a little research of my own library and it established the fact that such fine records do in fact exist but they are contained not in the actual report of the Minister itself, but in archaeological reports which were published from 1886 to 1928, as appendices to the Ministers' reports. Now, sir, these are available in any first-class library. In the area in which Mr. Brigham lives he will have access to at least three such libraries.

I noted that it was stated at the Moravian-town meeting, that Indians are misunderstood and misrepresented by a great many Canadians and that one of the great goals before this union of Ontario Indians is to help the white people to understand them better, their culture, their background and their tradition.

While Simpson Brigham was in Toronto on May 17 and 18, he inquired if I could help him get display and information material on all adult education programmes from The Department of Education here, with someone to explain them at one or several conferences of Indians to be held across the province. You see, this is as a result of his own participation in these programmes.

I may say that the co-operation I received from the department of yours, Mr. Minister—through the Chairman—was most commendable. In order to see this young man, one official had to forego most or all of his lunch hour, but see him he did and Mr. Brigham was most happy about the arrangements he was able to make. Beyond this he has revealed to me—and I do not know if he revealed this to the department or not—that he hopes to get programme 5 courses set up on certain Indian reserves, Walpole being one example.

He also asked me to see if he could get someone to set up a series of courses in councillor training—and that councillor is municipal councillor—so that Indian councillors could be trained in parliamentary procedure and efficient methods of handling resolutions and bylaws. Again I appealed to The Department of Education officials and again got a hearty and eager response. As a result a regional representative from London will call upon Mr. Brigham at his home

where all of Mr. Brigham's ideas can be thoroughly discussed, and, if possible arrangements made for a course or courses on this subject operated by The Department of Education.

I think that this demonstrates one more avenue, this time education, through which this government is helping the Indian reach his proper place in the life of this great province, and as I said earlier this year, I believe that if we will listen to the Indian and help him when and where he wants help, he will solve a great many of his own problems.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are two, perhaps a third point, that fall into this vote, which I would like to raise with the hon. Minister.

The first one has to do with the programme that he has announced in connection with educational TV. In general terms, and without going to great length—I will leave that to the government backbenchers—I would like to commend him for the start that has been made on this programme. I can recall some years ago when we were discussing the possibilities of the use of TV in connection with coping with the explosion of population at the university level, I raised the question whether or not the practice that had been adopted in Quebec—of grants being made available to the universities as an incentive to the use of TV—would not be a good practice here in Ontario. From that point forward, apparently, we have moved a considerable distance. But I wonder if the hon. Minister could give any assurance to the House: Are the plans envisaged to secure channel 19 by application some time later this year from the BBC; are these routine? Has the BBC indicated that the government will be granted channels for educational purposes and, therefore, it is just simply a matter of making an application and you get it?

And in relation to that, do the regulations lay down, and, if so, what are the limits in which you can go in educational material? Without dwelling on it at great length and letting my imagination lead us too far, one can envisage an argument arising as to exactly what does fall in the category of educational TV and therefore what it is appropriate should fall under the direction of a provincial government in a field that might be construed as "propagandizing the people of the province." I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think I should make it clear, I do not think it is a routine situation. The policy of the BBC has

been not to issue licences to governments but there has never been an application for an ETV channel, and we have had some unofficial discussions about the policy with the chairman of the BBG. My impression is, and it is just an impression, that they are very sympathetic to the idea of an ETV channel in the Toronto area. Whether the policy will be laid down as to whether or not they will grant this to a provincial department, has not been determined.

One purpose of our application to the board will be to have this matter resolved. I would think, once again from the informal discussions, that the limits or the policy will be laid down by the BBG as to the type of programme that will be allowed on the particular channel. I do not think there is any doubt that they will impose some ground rules. I cannot tell the hon. member specifically what they will be, but I am sure there would be some. In fact, we would like to have some.

Mr. MacDonald: One other aspect of the whole ETV programme that I look forward to with considerable satisfaction is the involvement of private stations. There is a great deal of soul-searching and discussion, particularly among people in the business today, as to the quality of TV broadcasts and the whole tendency of the medium to aim at the lowest common denominator and be attached pretty closely to commercial interests.

It would seem to me, since this would fall into the category, no doubt, of Canadian content, that the development of certain programmes that would be available on a local private TV station, available for the schools, might even develop an interesting communion between the parent and the pupil in that the parent might be able to see the programme at home. It is my guess that some of the programmes which might be most kindly described at the moment as "fillers" could usefully be replaced by educational programmes that were both entertaining and educational.

The second point I want to raise with the hon. Minister is that in this year's presentation of the Toronto and district labour committee for human rights on behalf of a list of some 19 community organizations, their concluding paragraph read as follows:

We would suggest also that a greater effort be made to involve The Department of Education in the human rights educational programme. The elementary and secondary schools provide a splendid forum

for human rights education. It would be well to prevail upon The Department of Education to consider the introduction of course material designed to promote greater knowledge of racial, religious and ethnic groups throughout our community in the world. A greater insight and understanding of pluralistic composition of our society is an indispensable element in democratic citizenship.

I wonder if the hon. Minister has given any consideration to this? Is there any prospect of a fuller integration of the educational material of the Ontario human rights commission in our school curriculum, where we would meet what everybody concedes to be the long-term answer to discrimination, namely, a change of attitudes on the part of the people in the community?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is no specific programme with respect to curriculum yet but over the past three or four months now, we have been distributing from the department—on the first occasion at the request of the Minister personally—the human rights bulletin to these schools.

We had a very interesting response. For example, the hon. member will recall the issue that was devoted to the Indian problem.

I had scrapbooks from one school in the Ottawa area from every student in the class, addressed to the Minister; it had pictures of the Indians' home yesterday—which was the wigwam; today—and it was not a very flattering picture; and tomorrow—and I saw homes of \$40,000-\$50,000, where these youngsters were envisaging the Indians might be living in the future. It was really a very interesting experience and this all came about because of the human rights bulletin that we distributed.

We have also sent out the most recent one, but there has not been to date a formal integration of this into the programme, and we are quite concerned about this. We have adopted this method, at least for the time being, of bringing this to the attention of the school system.

Mr. MacDonald: I am very interested in that scrapbook; I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Education that he pass it on to his colleague, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), who thinks that Indians like to continue living in wigwams in the 20th century.

Is this the appropriate estimate to raise the question of free textbooks?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not really. It should be under the legislative grants, but I have no objection to it here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if I may raise it here, Mr. Chairman; basically, I do not think there is any doubt but that there is very widespread support, at all levels, and particularly the parent level, for the proposition of free textbooks. But I have been a little disturbed by a number of comments I have heard, particularly from teachers—perhaps along the line that my hon. friend from Brant raised this afternoon—as to whether or not there are not inefficiencies and costly factors creeping into this that would be ignored because, after all, the government is paying.

It was all rather neatly summed up, and perhaps I can make my point by referring to a letter—something of a circular letter, I think—that I received a few months ago from John Strebig, who is speaking on behalf of the Etobicoke secondary schools association of English heads.

He pointed out that the concern had reached the point that the Ontario secondary school teachers' federation had set up a committee to study the issue and to make representations to the hon. Minister and, indeed, he expressed some unhappiness that the hon. Minister had extended the free textbooks further throughout the high schools without awaiting the representations from the OSSTF.

His complaint, I think, could be put in two categories: one was that the system is inefficient and wasteful, the cost of ordering, marking, storing, distributing and collecting and checking texts is exorbitant and unnecessary, in addition to which it takes a great deal of time by school staffs who, apparently, are getting more and more burdened with administrative details far beyond the days when I was a school teacher.

Secondly—and I personally respond to this—the idea that a student does not own the text, therefore he is told that he cannot mark it. If a text is something that I am studying, I consider it a work sheet and mark it accordingly. It is in my possession and is mine alone, and perhaps everybody else will be unhappy with its appearance, but that is not the point. The student is forbidden from doing this in most instances, because it is not his property. Indeed, he adds, in the course of his letter:

All teachers, but especially English teachers and even the department's English inspector, condemn the idea of expanding the present grant text system.

My question to the hon. Minister would be,

after the experience we have had in the system so far, are these criticisms justified? What can be done to correct them—and why did he not await the representations from a body like the OSSTF?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, actually I met with Mr. Strebig and one or two others. I also met a formal group from the OSSTF when this policy was announced, if hon. members will recall, in September of 1963, when we introduced the policy for grades and 10—

Mr. MacDonald: I think there was an election going on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I understand there was at that time.

Mr. MacDonald: No association whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was indicated at that time that this would be extended into the senior grades in the following year and I think even the OSSTF, in fairness, acknowledged that they had let it lapse themselves before bringing it to our attention, and they did this after the decision was made. It was not a case of not waiting until they made their representations. However, after their representations were made we set up a joint committee—composed of personnel from the curriculum branch and a representative committee from the OSSTF—to go into the problem of textbooks. Quite frankly, there is an economic saving on the broad provincial scale; there is no question about this. The duplication of orders will decrease and the purchasing costs will be less. The problem that arises, and it comes primarily from the English teachers—and I have every sympathy with their concern—is that there may be a certain rigidity in the selection of textbooks available to them. It is our intention through the joint meetings with the teaching profession to try to resolve this the best we can. We think we have made the grants sufficiently generous that, in the English subjects, it will be possible for the boards to provide in paperback form, which I know appeals to the hon. member for Brant, many of the English novels so that the student can have these to keep. After all, they are only 50 cents—or perhaps \$1 in some cases—and we think the grants, after the system has been in operation, will be sufficient so that the students can have these.

We recognize this problem. You have to examine the disadvantages with the advantages, and we think the advantages outweigh the disadvantages that will be experienced. We think also that we can effectively work

out the problems in co-operation with the OSSTF as the scheme develops.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister if he has any intention of carrying this textbook programme into grade 13?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is no intention—certainly at this present time—to carry it into grade 13 until we have resolved the overall problem of grade 13 with the possibility of the general and advanced levels and also with the possibility that is recommended in the grade 13 committee report of the grade 12 structure, and so on. We thought it advisable not to advance it into grade 13 at this time.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question of the hon. Minister? Under examinations. I have had about three cases that have been sent to me in connection with children who have physical difficulties in writing examinations. One of them is an eye difficulty and another has a type of word blindness which apparently makes it difficult to spell properly. From all I gather from the principal and the teacher, this is a very conscientious young student. They were of the opinion that he never would be able to spell too well, and if his examination papers were to go to a central location where the person doing the marking does not know his particular problem, I presume he would fail. What is your procedure in such cases?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear: When there are exceptional circumstances such as this, and they are brought to the attention of the department, the revising board takes these matters into consideration. There is no question about this at all.

Mr. Thompson: I have three of these. Do they write to the department or the principals?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The principal should communicate this to the department.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, on the question of textbooks, I have obtained this afternoon from the assistant Deputy Minister a copy of circular number 69 regarding textbooks. I have had many communications from people in my area regarding this, and I think now is the time to say a few words about it.

I think, for the record, I would like to read paragraph 2 of circular number 69:

The extension of the policy of providing all texts in grades 11 and 12, as well as in all grades from kindergarten to grade 10, inclusive, according to previous regulations, is an integral part of a carefully considered programme to provide equality of educational opportunity for the youth of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this memorandum does not state anywhere that private secondary schools are excluded. Everyone I have talked to in my area was left under the impression that this applies to all secondary school students. It might be useful to tell hon. members of this Legislature that there are a number of private high schools that are not operated by religious orders. I believe there is one—of which our friend, the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), is a member of the board administration—that falls in that category.

All those private high schools do not participate in this new plan. My main criticism, Mr. Chairman, is that Reverend Father Kavanagh, principal of St. Patrick's college, on behalf of five high schools in the area, wrote to the hon. Minister of Education on February 23, regarding the free texts. Now, not having received a reply, Father Kavanagh wrote again to the hon. Minister. I think the date of his last letter was April 13. I know the hon. Minister is a busy man with plenty of problems, but it is hard to explain why to this date Father Kavanagh has not had a reply to his letter or his letters.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments on that part of the statement that reads as follows, and I would like to repeat the phrase that I have read from circular No. 69, that the intention is to "provide equality of educational opportunity for the youth of Ontario."

I would like to say that in many other respects, Mr. Chairman, these high schools are treated in exactly the same way as the public high schools. For instance, films issued by the department are made available to these schools; all students are eligible for scholarships; all teachers have to obtain the same diplomas in order to teach in these schools; the regulations in force are the same as in public high schools.

Now, the parents, who are also taxpayers at all levels, contribute to the cost of education in the province and, adding insult to injury, these schools have to pay a \$200 fee for the services of the department inspector.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, first, why Father Kavanagh's letters were ignored and, secondly, why these free texts are supplied to non-resident students when they are not supplied to students in private high schools.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, since the announcement from the department, the book stores in the Ottawa area do not carry those textbooks, sir, and that tends to complicate matters for the administrators who already have enough problems. I wonder if the hon. Minister would care to comment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I understood that Father Kavanagh, or some of the group, had been informed about the difficulties of this but I will check and make sure that he is informed.

I think the hon. member appreciates that we make every effort to assist the private schools through inspection. The teachers do not have to have the same qualifications—the hon. member should know this—they are not required to have the same qualifications as in the public school system. It has not been a policy of government to make grants available to the private schools, and this applies to the private school whether it be in the Ottawa area, whether it be St. Andrew's college or Upper Canada college. Private schools generally do not receive government grants. This is the policy, Mr. Chairman, and this is the difficulty. The textbook grants, I think, must be considered in the same way as other types of financial assistance.

Mr. Racine: I would like to make one more point. I believe that there is a difference here; this grant is not made to the schools—this grant is made to the students.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. Minister to tell me whether any students that are not attending any of the schools but may be taking a course—a correspondence course—would they be entitled to the free texts? I would like to make myself clear. This grant goes to the student and not to the school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is quite a distinction. The correspondence course is treated as a government school, so that if the person is communicating and taking his work he is taking it from the department, he is not taking it through a public or a separate or a private school, he is taking it from a departmental school. So there is quite a distinction, Mr. Chairman.

The grants are not made to pupils; the

grants are not made to the parents. In some provinces, grants are made directly to the parents or the homeowners. We have not adopted that policy here in Ontario. The grant is made to the school board, the school board is required to provide the textbooks for the youngsters. Mr. Chairman, this is the policy of the government, that grants are not to be made available to private schools. It really is as simple as that.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment of the hon. Minister that he thought that someone had answered Father Kavanagh's letters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will make sure that Father Kavanagh knows about it.

Mr. Racine: I think he knows this afternoon. Possibly in the future, any announcement of that kind should be made so that everybody understands exactly what it means, because I have had letters from other sources and I have some editorials from the newspapers, and in every case no mention is made that those grants are not available to private schools.

I think possibly it might be better for the record if in any future announcement it might be specified that the certain type of high schools do not share in these grants.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister, are grants made available to training schools—textbook grants?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which type of school, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Newman: The schools under The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In training schools—and I would have to check this with the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman)—I understand that all materials are supplied in their schools. I am not really familiar with it.

Mr. Newman: Does The Department of Education supply them with any materials at all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not that I know of, Mr. Chairman, no.

Mr. Newman: May I ask the hon. Minister if grants are available for boards of education that conduct summer schools, that is schools in the summertime, to enable a student who may have failed one or two subjects to catch up on that subject?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, the summer school programme, Mr. Chairman, has been operated to date on the responsibility of the local board. There have been no grants, up to this point at least, for summer school programmes.

Mr. Newman: Then may I suggest to the hon. Minister that that is one of the reasons why some communities have been a little backward in establishing summer school programmes. Were grants made available to the boards of education then more than likely we would find programmes in practically every large community—summer school programmes to enable the student to save one whole year of schooling.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister about the \$17,000 under physical education services, what does that include? Does that pay for the salary of the individuals in the physical education branch of the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this does not include salaries. This is the general item for the physical education programme in the department. It does not include salaries.

Mr. Newman: Where could we discuss the physical education portion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Maybe two areas, Mr. Chairman. I would think that perhaps the appropriate vote would be 511.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Then may I ask the hon. Minister if the department is prepared at this time to follow the recommendation as presented to him by the committee on physical fitness? The recommendation was that the present time allotment is minimum and should be interpreted for grades 7 to 13 as 120 minutes a week. They suggest that the word "suggested" be changed to "required"; and also that physical education be restored as a compulsory subject in grade 13. Is The Department of Education considering any changes in the physical education programme in both elementary and secondary schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this matter has, of course, been reviewed from time to time. While I think there are many of us who are personally sympathetic to physical fitness or education programmes in the school, at the same time certain priorities must be established. I think there is very substantial debate as to whether grade 13 should be compulsory. I do not want to let my

personal views enter this. I might say that I am enthused about this, but I think I would have to be very frank and say that perhaps in the grade 13 year if, in the opinions of the principal and the school administration, they felt that physical education was not essential for the grade 13 year, that I personally would not object.

We have also discovered from our physical education people that the amount of time being devoted to physical education in the school programme is on the increase and there is a greater interest in it. Now it does not perhaps come up to the time allotment that has been suggested in the physical fitness report, but I think there is progress being made.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister, then, that he consider the physical education in grade 13 as being a prerequisite to anyone intending to take a degree course in physical and health education.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, because of the affection which we on this side of the House have for The Department of Reform Institutions, I was rather intrigued by a question in which the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville suggested that in view of the widespread commendation for the hon. Minister in taking over the educational requirements in Ontario hospital schools, would he or his department consider entering the educational field in the training schools? It is not as far-fetched as it seems, because, of course, the United Kingdom system is essentially organized in that fashion, which thereby places the emphasis on the educational and training aspects, an emphasis which was obviously thought desirable in the Ontario hospital school system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is an area of considerable discussion and I am not, quite frankly, prepared to pass an opinion on it. I think it is a very valid question in a general sense, but I do not think I can comment whether we could be prepared or whether the department would feel this advisable. We may perhaps be going to do this, I gather from past reports, in the Ontario hospital schools. Whether this could be extended to reform institutions I think would have to be studied.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the hon. Minister announce that he was having a meeting shortly with the Minister of Education of the province of Quebec

and some of his officials. I have no doubt that this meeting will be very fruitful.

I have two questions of the hon. Minister. First, will some of the radio broadcasts and television programmes be prepared in the French language? Second, would it be possible to discuss with Monsieur Gerin Lajoie the possibility of a joint programme with The Quebec Department of Education, especially on certain subjects?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the items that the hon. member has mentioned, of course, are two of many that will be discussed with Monsieur Gerin Lajoie. The invitation has been extended. We believe that he is going to come with his officials and, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member has other subjects that he feels might be discussed between the two groups we would be very pleased to have these suggestions.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) yesterday introduced amendments to The Liquor Control Act of Ontario and in his introductory remarks he indicated that when the hon. Minister of Health brought down his estimates we were going to hear of a programme on alcoholism education, anti-alcoholism, the like of which has never been seen in North America. I would think that if this programme is going to be nearly as significant as is predicted, the place of The Department of Education in it would be paramount.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) may very well have the money and the facilities to look after those who are already afflicted with alcoholism but if there is going to be any significant decrease in its incidence it seems to me that a programme in the schools, a factual programme drawing to the attention of the students the relevant statistics and facts, is something that would have to be introduced. I understand that it is already a part of certain aspects in the teaching of health, but in my own view this is inadequate. I wonder what part the hon. Minister of Education will play in this new programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister of Health, if he is going to announce such a programme, will be doing so. I would as soon—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Does the hon. Minister not know about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —if there is such a programme, if the schools are to participate, I

think the same co-operation, Mr. Chairman, will exist as has existed in the distribution of material with respect to smoking and the problems of cancer that result. That material was prepared by The Department of Health and has been distributed very widely to the schools. I might report, Mr. Chairman, that the most popular piece of literature, apparently from the reaction we have had from the schools, is a comic book that went out.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Particularly in Brant!

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister's distribution of anti-smoking pamphlets is not particularly popular in Brant; neither are the efforts of the Minister of Health and Welfare at the federal level.

But I would like to say, before I leave this subject, that if the educational part of the programme that we will look forward to hearing about later, are not paramount, then the programme will be completely inadequate. I would like to know what instructions go with the packet of material on smoking—the anti-smoking literature—so that it will be used in the schools; or is it just mailed to the schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, the material is sent out with a letter asking the principal and the staff to bring this to the attention of the students and to spend a certain amount of time pointing out the dangers that are involved from a statistical or factual point of view. They try to stay out of any other type of discussion. They are also asked if they want further material to distribute.

This is made available to them primarily on an information basis. We try to make available as much information as we can to the students. I cannot report to the House, I have no idea, how effective this programme is.

Mr. Nixon: What education is there on alcoholism? I notice a grant is provided for the Ontario temperance association. I suppose this would assist them to visit the schools; is this the effort that the hon. Minister is putting forth?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As far as alcoholism is concerned, Mr. Chairman, we co-operate with the addiction research foundation; we make reference materials, manuals and films available to the teachers. The two guides in common use are the teachers' manual for alcohol education by Mr. Spears produced by our physical education branch and an

alcohol studies guide for teachers prepared by the alcoholism research foundation of Ontario. These materials are supplied to the schools in quantity.

Mr. Nixon: Is it a formal programme to have the temperance federation visit the schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking now from memory. I do not believe it is a formal part of the programme to have the temperance federation visit the schools.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us if his department's approach is a prohibition approach in line with the so-called temperance federation, or if it is an approach to promote understanding. While his colleague, the hon. Provincial Secretary, got up yesterday afternoon and said we are making certain changes in our liquor legislation which are hardly a prohibition approach, I wonder if The Department of Education is promoting, through its grants to the temperance federation, the prohibition approach. Are we hiding our heads in the sand and suggesting in the schools that the approach is prohibition, whereas the hon. Provincial Secretary gets up and says that the approach is reasonable liquor laws, with reasonable supervision and proper control? What real role does The Department of Education play in this, if any?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We give a grant to the Ontario temperance federation to assist with their youth work. The material is distributed to the schools and the attitude generally taken by the school people is one of reason, not one of prohibition. In fact, we would like to take the position that we do this with all subjects in the schools.

Mr. Singer: My hon. friend mouths very nice words, but my hon. friend knows, as I do, Mr. Chairman, that if he finances the efforts of the temperance federation, even though the temperance federation calls itself a "temperance" federation in the proper English sense of the word, it is in fact a prohibition movement.

What I would like to know, and what I think the people of Ontario are entitled to know, is whether or not The Department of Education is promoting the prohibition aspect while his colleague, the hon. Provincial Secretary, is promoting, in the true sense of the English word, "temperance"; or whether in fact The Department of Educa-

tion is advancing its money to promote a real understanding of the use and abuse of alcohol.

The day is long since past in this province where any politician can stand up and say the answer to the liquor problem is to prohibit people from drinking. We have recognized, and I am sure my colleague the hon. Minister of Education recognizes as well as anyone in the province of Ontario, that you can no longer prohibit. He must encourage real temperance if he believes in the things in which his colleague, the hon. Minister in charge of The Provincial Secretary's Department, believes. He can no longer prohibit the use of alcohol.

Are we spending money in one department to advocate prohibition, whereas in another department we are encouraging reasonable use, temperate use; and through his colleague the hon. Minister of Health, control, treatment and that sort of thing? Are we having again, as we have seen so often, two or three different departments going off in two or three completely opposite directions? I think the hon. Minister of Education should be prepared to be quite frank and honest in this field, as he is in so many other fields, and really tell us what he is doing by giving these grants to the Ontario temperance federation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, actually I would think discussion of the grant to the federation would more properly come under the miscellaneous grants, but I can tell the hon. member that I do not know how much experience he has had with the Ontario temperance federation, but this grant is given for the Toc-alpha programme, which is a programme with young people primarily, quite frankly, in various churches. They have seminar meetings, discussions and annual meetings. It is an attempt, as I understand it—and having had some personal experience with it—to bring the problems of alcoholism, not in a prohibition way, to the attention of the young people. I might say it is done, in many instances, through the church. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is a very excellent programme and I make no apologies for providing funds to the temperance federation to assist in its sponsoring. I am sure that there are hon. members opposite, Mr. Chairman, who have had some experience with this programme and know what it is doing for the many young people who are participating.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am impressed with the sincerity with which my friend, the hon. Minister of Education promotes this

programme. As I understand it, this description of Toc-alpha is taken from the Greek letters T and A, and it is not a temperance approach. T, as this association uses it, is total, and A, as it uses it, is abstainer. It means total abstainer.

What I am trying to figure out, Mr. Chairman, is this. Is the government out of one side of its mouth advancing money to a group that believes there should be total abstention from alcohol, and out of the other side, through the hon. Minister of provincial affairs, getting up and saying that our liquor laws must be more lenient, and does one side not know what the other side is doing? Does the government believe that only in Education we should be total abstainers, but that in the hon. Provincial Secretary's department our liquor laws are not those that the people of the province believe in?

Let us be honest, let us be frank and let us be completely clear about this. In one branch we are supporting a group that says drink is bad no matter to what extent it goes. Do we support a group which says the only answer is total abstention—Toc-alpha, TA, total abstention? I say that he and his colleague, the hon. Provincial Secretary, are working at cross purposes. I am suggesting, and all the applause in the world and your colleagues—

Mr. McKeough: That is nonsense.

Mr. Singer: No, it is not nonsense. My hon. colleague from Kent West is taking the typical Tory ambivalent approach. They want to be all things to all people at the same time. Does the government believe that what the hon. Provincial Secretary said as early as yesterday afternoon makes sense or does the government believe that the hon. Minister of Education tonight makes sense? Does the hon. Minister of Education believe that you can promote total abstention on one side and have reasonable liquor laws on the other side?

In other words, let us get off the fence, let us be reasonable. What approach are you taking in The Department of Education, what approach is the hon. Provincial Secretary taking and what approach is the hon. Minister of Health later going to take?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to prolong this. I would point out that in my understanding of the statement of the hon. Provincial Secretary yesterday, he did not extend the privileges as far as liquor is concerned to young people, and this is dealing with young people, many of them

16 or 17 years of age. As I understand this programme it is not a case of total abstention, it is a case of—

Mr. Singer: TA, the letters are all there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wishes to go to some of their meetings, attend them and see just exactly what these young people are doing, I would be delighted to arrange this for him. I have been to one or two of their meetings and I say to the House they are doing a worthwhile job. It is not just related to alcohol, it is forming into a group where these young people come together to exchange ideas and some of their discussions go far beyond the problem of alcohol.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that the words of the hon. Minister speak for themselves. The government through one face, through the face of its very eminent representative, the hon. Minister of Education, espouses one word, while his colleague, the hon. Provincial Secretary espouses another and his colleague the hon. Minister of Health is going to get up in a few days and announce this great programme that he is going to take in attacking the dangers of alcoholism. Let all you fellows get together and emerge with one programme and not be phoney any longer.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, there is nothing at all incompatible with the policy of the government. What is incompatible are the things that the Liberal Party have over the years been attempting to do by way of a liquor policy because it really has no liquor policy at all. The members keep talking about "sane liquor laws" but they will never lay out, chapter and verse, what sane liquor laws are. As a matter of fact, I am familiar also with the work which Toc-alpha does and it does a wonderful work. There is nothing incompatible with, on the one hand, saying that if you can get along without alcohol through life that is a good thing for you, but if you are going to drink, this government is going to see to it that you are entitled to drink under respectable circumstances and in decent surroundings and there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, since we seem to have got into a liquor debate at this point with my good friend, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions—

Mr. McKeough: Completely out of order.

Mr. Singer: It may well be completely out of order and I did not encourage the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions here. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to get into this, let me say this, I think the government has a duty to present at least a joint face through The Department of Education, through The Department of the Provincial Secretary, even through The Department of Reform Institutions, as my hon. friend gets into it, and through The Department of Health. Let us face it, we have a serious problem in this province in relation to the consumption of liquor and the old problem that goes on here—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, sir; the order of business tonight is the estimates of The Department of Education. The question of liquor is a very important matter and it is one which interests not only your party but the government of this province. With respect to the grants, and I gather that the debate arose over the grant of The Department of Education to an organization which represents a certain position with respect to the use of liquor, I think it is the position of the government to see that all aspects of a subject are explored and researched. Regardless of the position that anyone may take, this government has always accepted and advocated the policy that we want the whole subject researched. I would say that as long as the temperance federation exists we will accept its researches, it being an accepted and respectable organization, so that we may have—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to my hon. friend who rose on a point of order. He is answering an argument. There is no point of order that he has made as yet and I think that I had the floor and I think that I should continue to have the floor.

Mr. Chairman: The member, if he cares to debate this subject, may well do it in the Budget debate.

Mr. Singer: That may well be, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Now we will get on with the estimates.

Vote 566 agreed to.

On vote 507:

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: If I may finish my remarks—

Mr. Thompson: Is that on a point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: You have been told.

Mr. Thompson: But do you not tell us if it is a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is a point of order.

Mr. Singer: He is debating, it is not a point of order. Mr. Chairman, if you are holding the submission is improper, then my hon. friend should sit down and I should continue.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The point of order is simply this, that the debate which has been advanced by the hon. member for Downsview is completely out of order, and I, on behalf of the government, object to it being admitted at this point. I will simply add this comment that—

Mr. Singer: Oh no, Mr. Chairman, there is no comment—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Will the members be seated, please? This concludes the argument at the present time. We are going on with the estimates—vote 507.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): What have we come to now?

Mr. Chairman: Vote 507.

Mr. Nixon: If you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, one remark on 506. It has been indicated that there should be some sort of adequate recognition as a centennial project by way of writing a history of the province of Ontario. This was raised last year and I was wondering if the hon. Minister has reached any conclusion on the subject. I had a bit of research done and apparently there was an official history of the province published in 1907 by a Mr. Fraser, and one published in 1928 by two authors, Middleton and London. It would appear that the time is now ripe for another history that would be brought up to date, and it might be advisable, as a centennial project, this might be commissioned as a part of the programme of our educational system. I was wondering if the hon. Minister has any thoughts on this.

I know that there has been some criticism, even by the school groups who come to this Chamber, that there is not an adequate publication to put into their hands having to do even with the history of these buildings or the history of this assembly. The hon. leader

of the NDP mentioned some time ago in this debate the usefulness of some of the pictures and folders that had been brought out by the hon. Minister of Education, but it seems to me that we might have something more adequate for the visitors to this Chamber and also for the students across the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, on the two aspects: I talked to the hon. Provincial Secretary about *The Commonwealth* booklet which I think was rather well done this year—I take no credit, it was done by one of the officials in the department—and I think there is some thought being given to perhaps extending this or enlarging it and updating it, and making it available to the students and visitors who come to the Parliament buildings.

The observation made by the hon. member for Brant last year about an Ontario history has received consideration. I am not in a position to elaborate on this at this time, although we understood, too, that perhaps two or three other organizations are contemplating perhaps just not an Ontario history but a Canadian history as well, that is related to the centennial. We understand that there are perhaps two or three agencies that are interested and we are certainly concerned ourselves.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: On that point, Mr. Chairman, may I say this: that in presenting the history of Ontario we will do so neutrally and independently so that the people of this province can judge history in its proper light—in the same way as our donation to the temperance federation is given so that both sides of the question may be presented to the public.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I am provoked to ask, since I have heard this gratuitous comment from the hon. House leader: He will present the history of the province neutrally and independently of what?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is a very good question; we will endeavour to do it and see that it is done to the best of everyone's ability.

Mr. Sopha: I still have not heard and I am asking for elucidation—and I may be a bit stupid tonight, but what was the meaning of the comment? “We will present”—I hope I paraphrase it correctly—“we will present the history of the province neutrally and independently.” My question is, neutrally and independently of what? What is the end of the sentence?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: To the extent that anyone can produce an opinion independently.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I take it that what was meant—and it was meant to provoke us and we are suitably provoked—was that “we will write the history of the province and we will not give a forward place to the part of the Conservative Party.” My reply is that the Liberal Party has played as great a part in the history of this province as has the Tory party.

Mr. Singer: Greater even.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member resume his seat and let us get on with the estimates? Vote 507.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I would like to get on with the estimates. If, every time the Liberals get up and give something that the government thinks is out of order, the House leader gets up and gives something that is equally out of order, we are just playing games, so let us get on with the business. We have something to deal with when it comes up.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on 506, I have just sent over to the hon. Minister of Education a pamphlet put out by the Michigan state Legislature. He can see how big an improvement it is over the seating plan that we have in the House here.

Mr. Chairman: I think the member could save that until after the House adjourns. He had his opportunity to speak.

Mr. Singer: Well, if we are on vote 507, why can he not say it now?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, one of the big difficulties that the youth committee has found in their studies was a lack of an appreciable amount of guidance in the schools. We found that in the secondary schools there is generally a substantial amount, but that the individuals involved in the guidance of the schools were not always the best qualified. One of the suggestions was that guidance—rather than start at the secondary level—start right at the elementary level so that the youngster would have the advantage of instructors who would be well versed with the topic and be able to direct him into the phase of education which he would like to follow once he leaves the elementary school.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we quite support this, we have an extensive programme

now for both summer courses and a regular programme for the elementary teachers, particularly at the grade 8 level.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have something to say on that in another vote, but I am a little disturbed about the hon. Minister's addendum, particularly at the grade 8 level. The need, it seems to me, for an interpretation in its broadest sense, of not merely indicating occupational or vocational patterns, but providing some kind of emotional centre or security for children, appropriately fits at the kindergarten, grade 1, grade 2, grade 3 level. The process of identification is profoundly important there and it seems to me that we have developed an emphasis in this province at the secondary school and grade 8 levels, which is doing very little to reveal the problems that exist at the very early and indispensable stages. I wonder whether it would not be possible to expand that kind of programme downwards?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think we were—and it is perhaps my fault—discussing the two aspects of guidance. I was referring primarily to the occupational aspect of it. This whole question of being able to guide or assist children right from kindergarten through grade 13 in the other sense, I think, is obviously needed. It is difficult to bring this about with many teachers with the numbers involved, but I think it is one that gives us all concern. It is related, to a degree, to the subject on which I know the hon. member is going to speak in a few moments.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, my hon. colleague, in his main remarks, made some reference to the upgrading of standards for public school teachers. He advocated, I think, very efficiently and very forcibly, the thought that we should be striving to have public school teachers at least with a BA degree. I listened very carefully to the hon. Minister's reply and I did not hear him deal with that. I wonder—because I know the hon. Minister is most interested in upgrading public school teachers—what progress is being made and what sort of plan the hon. Minister has in advancing along this line, and when he can anticipate that public school teachers throughout the province of Ontario will at least have the qualification of a Bachelor of Arts degree?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Brant also related the fact that we have established a committee for elementary teacher training which has been

studying this problem for some months. This year we have, as another step towards this ultimate goal, also made grade 13 the broad general requirement for admission to the teachers' colleges this fall, into the one-year programme, instead of two years from grade 12. This has been the next step. I cannot anticipate when the committee's report will be available; I think it is obvious that they will be headed in this general direction although it may be they will have other suggestions—that have been observed elsewhere—to make at the same time. We have two pilot projects this year as the hon. member for Brant knows. The course we are going to have here in Toronto for BA graduates will be arranged so that they will not be taking the regular programme. In this way we hope to interest more BA people in coming into the elementary field. We also have the pilot project in London which, I think, is a very interesting experiment. The students will actually have related courses at the teachers' college and at the Ontario college of education.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, in fairness, it would be unwise for me to attempt to pre-judge the opinions of the committee that has been established. There is no doubt that we are all in favour of the upgrading of the qualifications for our elementary school teachers.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I commend the hon. Minister for his approach in this but I wonder why Ontario again, notwithstanding the words of the eminent gentleman on the front benches, seems to be lagging behind in some of the standards achieved in other provinces. The province of British Columbia, as I recollect from some reading that I have done quite recently, seems to have come awfully close to achieving this standard.

I have listened to the hon. Minister's various colleagues. Not only is this the leading province in Canada, it is the leading jurisdiction in North America, if not the western or the entire world, and I wonder how long we are going to take to advance at least to the same level as other jurisdictions in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier today, I do not really enthuse about comparing provinces. I should point out that BC and Alberta are both following the faculty of education policy that is prevalent, particularly in the state of California. But I should point out that I paid a visit to the faculty of education at the University of Alberta last September. I heard about this

institution when I was at the CEA. I went out there to observe, along with Dr. Jackson, and we discovered that on paper they have an excellent programme. But we discovered also that they are faced with the same problem we are faced with here, that is the demand for teachers. There are many youngsters who go into the faculty of education at the end of grade 12, take two years of study and then are granted letters of permission to go out into the elementary field, and interestingly, into the secondary field as well—after two years within the faculty of education. I cannot tell you just how many of them there are. It is done, I think, in rather substantial numbers; and if you calculate this, two years from grade 12 is really not too far from the equivalent of one year from grade 13, as far as this province is concerned.

They carry on their programme in a different environment. There is no question about this and it may be that the committee will recommend a trend in this direction, but I think we have to be careful, because we read or we see something that is happening in some other jurisdiction, to naturally assume that it is all working very smoothly and they do not have their problems as well, because I can assure the hon. members they are all faced with this difficulty.

Mr. Singer: I appreciate the comments of the hon. Minister. He carefully avoided saying what they do in British Columbia. But perhaps the most vulnerable situation in Canada is the one in Alberta; and my hon. friend has many more facilities available to him than I have to obtain, just off the top of his head, the comparable statistics.

The ones that impressed me were the ones that emerged in the province of British Columbia. I cannot help but compare in this department, that is of such great importance to all of us, at least with the ten provinces of Canada. I have heard so often, and all of us have heard so often until we are bored with the statistics, that not only are we the greatest jurisdiction in Canada, we are the greatest in the whole world. But in The Department of Education, where we would hope we would be at least the leader in Canada, we apparently seem to fall far short.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the sort of impression that one of the hon. Minister's predecessors conveyed to the province of Ontario, and I talk about Mr. Dunlop, was that we were satisfied with the little red schoolhouse, we were satisfied with just putting bodies behind schoolroom desks. This

should have pushed the hon. Minister on. All Mr. Dunlop did in his time was claim that everything was great because all sorts of wonderful people emerged from the little red schoolhouse.

I am very pleased with the hon. Minister's immediate predecessor, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). He and the hon. Minister himself have long since departed from that sort of talk.

But I would have hoped that here in the province of Ontario we would at least be striving for what we see in British Columbia, what we see in California, what we see in the leading jurisdictions of the United States. We are paying good salaries to our teachers. My friend, the hon. member for Brant has outlined improvements that could and should be made, but today we are encouraging youngsters to come forward into the teaching profession; today we are encouraging, through challenge and through salary, a new invigoration into the science of teaching. I would have hoped that tonight the hon. Minister could have said that within a year or two years or five years we would anticipate that behind every school desk in the province of Ontario we will have a person with at least a university degree.

He has dodged this. He is a careful man and he is an artful man; he is the artful dodger and I think he evaded this issue very carefully. I would think we would have been proud to say that within a few years Ontario will really be the leader, at least in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into a lengthy debate with the hon. member for Downsview, because quite frankly I think he is speaking, to a degree, from a certain lack of knowledge as to what the qualifications are in other jurisdictions. For one thing, Mr. Chairman, many of the teachers in Alberta and British Columbia do not have BA's; they have their Bachelor of Education degrees and there is quite a distinction.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member for Downsview if he realizes the number of extramural courses that are being taken by our present public school teachers; the number of summer courses, the in-service courses given by boards of education. I do not know of any other group in our society, any other professional group, that is as self-education conscious as this group.

I do not think the question is quite as black and white as the hon. member makes

it. In other words, it probably will not for a long time come to the point that they should have a BA when they step into a public school classroom. It is a continuing process of education with teachers. I think this is desirable and I think that it should be said that there are many teachers, many excellent public school teachers who are really teaching our children, who have not BA's and who probably will never have them; but we pay tribute to the job they are doing and we could not get along without them, Mr. Chairman.

These people, a lot of them, form the backbone of our elementary school system. They have taken just as many extra-curricular courses in teaching as possible, but they have never arrived at the state where they can formally get a BA.

Now I think this needs to be said.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Scarborough North is trying to put words into my mouth to the effect that I am criticizing the dedication or the integrity or the zeal for further knowledge of our present teachers. He is barking up the wrong tree. I think we have in our teaching profession in Ontario the most dedicated group of people who are serving the public that we could possibly have. What I am suggesting is that the leadership and the initiative should come from our Minister, from our government—

Several hon. members: It is!

Mr. Singer: No, it is not. It is far short of that.

I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that we should be in the position to say that our teachers are going to be better. I am not denigrating for a moment from the dedication, the intelligence and the integrity of our present group of teachers, but I am suggesting that this Minister who clothes himself, and perhaps rightly, in the armour of a bright knight on a new charger, should be the agent to push our teaching profession to higher heights. I am suggesting that he is failing in this because he is prepared to accept the hollow mouthings of our hon. friend from Scarborough North.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, I might say that one of the difficulties with the hon. member for Downsview, is that he is talking about something of which he knows very little.

Mr. McKeough: Nothing!

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): He says a lot about nothing.

Mr. Knox: The teachers we have in Ontario are as good as any teachers, if not better, but at least as good as any you will find in this country. Further, I may say that when the hon. member says "Why do they all not have BA's?"; why did he not say MA or PhD, because the letter they have at the end of their name is not the only criterion by which they are capable of educating our children.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, a remark like that cannot go unchallenged. Go across into the state of Michigan; you have to have a BA to teach in an elementary school. What do you need here? You teach in an elementary school with a grade 12. So you cannot compare the two at all.

Mr. Knox: There is not any teacher in the state of Michigan who can walk into our schools and do the job that our teachers are doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: We are going from bad to worse.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a remark or two in this respect. I looked back tonight over some 31 years of teaching in an elementary school and I value my experience much more than a university degree. But I do congratulate the hon. Minister of the department on the steps that are being taken to promote higher qualifications for our teachers.

I myself have had the privilege, practically every summer up to the time I went into the political field, of taking advantage of those summer courses, which are most practical and have been most useful to me in my experience as a teacher. But I do not value my teaching services as I look back on my experience, because of the fact that I gained greater knowledge, greater values from an academic point of view from those courses. I look back at the success of my teaching upon the pupils that I turned out who have come to me years afterwards and said, "We appreciate what you have done for us in giving us the inspiration and the desire to go on and further our education."

Mr. Chairman, teachers are not necessarily produced by university education; teachers are born, in my estimation. You must have the proper attitude, you must have the personal qualification of understanding young people—

Mr. S. Lewis: Heredity?

Mr. Carruthers: A good deal of it is hereditary. In my own family the teaching profession goes back for many years and I think this is one of the attributes.

Mr. MacDonald: That is environment.

Mr. Carruthers: This does not mean that I do not urge that steps be taken to increase the qualifications of teachers. I would say this, Mr. Minister: I think rather than a BA degree, perhaps some special degree should be granted to teachers which would distinguish them from a general BA degree; because a BA degree in my estimation does not necessarily apply to any one profession. I think we should have a distinguishing degree which would mark teachers as a special group to give them prestige and standing in the field of education.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this series of remarks—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You cannot sit down.

Mr. McKeough: He cannot shut up.

Mr. Singer: I am modesty incarnate, if I could just get this across without a further comment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is hardly modest and incarnate.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I would think I would compare, very simply and very obviously, the remarks made by the hon. member from Durham with the remarks that we used to hear from Mr. Dunlop, who was the one-time Minister of Education. He used to extoll the glories of the little red schoolhouse. I can understand far more readily the remarks of the hon. Minister of Education saying we are striving for this standard, than I can understand the remarks of the hon. member for Durham. I can understand the hon. Minister of Education saying we are not going to achieve it overnight and I would hope that the message we are putting forward to the people of Ontario tonight is that we are trying to raise our standards. When my hon. friend from Durham says that just because you have a BA does not mean you are going to be a teacher, then I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that we should call in the services of our hon. Minister of Health and have a genetic test. We should have him evolve some sort of test that puts people under a spotlight and determines whether or not they are going to be good teachers.

Our modern science as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, is this, that we project our potential teachers through an educational process, to a

series of more difficult tests, which insofar as we are able to determine, evolves some sort of standard of ability. This is the reason why we have BA's or MA's or Ph.D's, and I am very surprised that a member as learned as the hon. member for Durham can get up and make the same sort of speech that we used to hear from the member for Eglington who was the one-time Minister of Education. I can accept the thesis put forward by the present hon. Minister. I can accept the thesis that he is doing his best to raise the standard, but my quarrel, and the reason I raised this in the first place, is the oft-repeated self-praise that we in Ontario are the best in the world. I say we have a long way to go. I commend the hon. Minister in his efforts to raise our standards, but I think we should be humble at a time when we are approaching the estimates of this department, and we should say we are striving for something better. I think that the pats we get from the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are tired of hearing that every other jurisdiction does better than Ontario.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for Durham harps back to Tory doctrinal approach which says that it is good enough because we do it. I commend the hon. Minister of Education for saying that at least we are trying to improve. I condemn the sentiments put forward by the hon. member for Durham.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I never intimated anything of the sort. I said we should encourage higher standards for teachers with degrees as soon as possible. I do say that we should have a special degree and not necessarily a BA degree. But the hon. member for Downsview is completely wrong; he either does not understand what I said or he misinterprets it.

Mr. Chairman: Is the vote carried?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have 13 teachers' colleges, is that right, and the hon. Minister announced this afternoon, that there might be a fourteenth? These institutions deal with young people who come out of our high-school system, at present at the grade 13 level, and for some years past at the grade 12 level. I wonder if there was any thought that the rather extensive facilities at the teachers' colleges be expanded to form the nucleus of our community college campuses that have been discussed. So far, the possibility of community colleges being established around the nucleus of vocational schools has been put forward. I would suggest many of these institutions are very handsome and

modern; they are often built on rather large plots of ground, and they would have facilities that would work in with a college of applied arts and sciences.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, once again I do not want to prejudice the committee to which I referred, which is studying elementary schoolteacher training. I would only pass the personal observation at this moment that perhaps these institutions may become more closely related to the universities rather than to the colleges of applied arts and technology. This is a personal view, Mr. Chairman. The new college, for instance, in St. Catharines is being located on the Brock University campus; the new college in Sudbury is being located on the Laurentian University campus. As I say, personally I think this may be the relationship which will be developed over a period of time rather than a relationship with the colleges of applied arts and technology.

Mr. Nixon: Would the hon. Minister assume then that the teacher training at the primary level would eventually be associated with university work?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think there is a greater possibility of this happening, Mr. Chairman, than perhaps becoming related—

Mr. Nixon: I think that is very reasonable. The suggestion that came from one of the hon. members a moment ago that a degree in teaching might be instituted, of course, is a problem for people who have gone to university outside of Ontario and achieved the Bachelor of Education standing often with four university years, as I understand it. This is not accepted as competence, or academic competence, in any way in the province of Ontario and there may be good justification for this. But as time goes on it appears that Ontario is going to be standing alone in this field in Canada. I believe six provinces now, and I could be mistaken, do grant Bachelor of Education degrees and with that background the individual is permitted to go on into teaching at the primary or usually the secondary level. This is not possible in Ontario as I understand it. I know the hon. Minister has had some people apply with this background; they are turned away as a matter of policy. Is there any thought that as the education degree gets more and more acceptance across Canada as it has in the United States, we will perhaps, while not instituting it in our own universities, accept it as a qualification for teaching? I wonder if I might be permitted to suggest this? Perhaps the hon. Minister could answer while remaining seated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am in a position at this moment to make any observation on this. I really anticipate this will be one of the matters dealt with. Even though it is an elementary teachers' training committee that is reporting, I anticipate the members may touch on this question of Bachelor of Education degrees and the relationship between elementary and secondary training. I do not think I can anticipate a pattern for the hon. member tonight. I am quite familiar with the problem and the development that is taking place in the United States and in other provinces. The one thing that I think we would all accept is that whatever we do, we want to maintain our own standards. It is not a case of lowering our standards to meet other jurisdictional requirements. I think it is a case of trying to fit our own in with others, while at the same time maintaining the integrity of our own courses.

Mr. Nixon: Does the hon. Minister have any information as to the progress of this committee on primary teacher training? I believe it has been sitting for a full year or more now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am guessing here, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is about seven or eight months at this point. We have had the two preliminary recommendations: the experimental projects this summer—one for the BA students and one course here in Toronto—and the combined course at OCE and the teachers' college in London.

Mr. Nixon: Were those public reports?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, these were just two preliminary recommendations; they were not reports, they were just two recommendations to the department to institute these two programmes for this coming season.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the various teachers' colleges I notice that the teaching expenses are down substantially. Is that as a result of the elimination of the two-year programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, this would be one of the reasons.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on vote 508, I was frankly—and I think the hon. Minister knows this—

Mr. Chairman: That is on vote 508.

Mr. S. Lewis: I thought we had moved to 508.

Vote 507 agreed to.

On vote 508:

Mr. S. Lewis: I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that I was frankly a little self-conscious about making extended remarks on any individual branch, but in view of the amount of time consumed by the Ontario temperance federation and related matters I no longer am reticent.

I was interested that the hon. leader of the Opposition earlier on raised via a question one of the central themes which I would like to deal with at this time. Throughout the session, Mr. Chairman, we in this party have laid a certain emphasis on children with various handicaps. There has been an over-riding concern because of the large numbers involved and we pursued the courses as faithfully as possible. Inevitably, I say to the House, the emphasis has centred on singularly dramatic cases, the Ann Xs and Jamies of this world; and Opposition is often restricted to such cases to communicate the enormity of the problem—a problem that is never grasped, if it is left in purely general terms. Inevitably, too, because The Department of Education estimates have just come before the House, our emphasis has been primarily on institutionalization and the inadequacies of such, the treatment centres, training schools, detention homes, provisions of The Child Welfare Act.

We make no apologies for that, Mr. Chairman, we just like to shift the emphasis at this point because I say to the hon. Minister opposite—and I know he is well apprised in this field—that fundamentally and logically the issue at root is one of education and the answer lies in the educational process. By that I do not suggest that these young children are strewn wreckage from the educational stream but that too many of them, several thousand in fact, are neglected, damaged and even abused by a system that is at once inadequate, insensitive and uncomprehending. It represents a terrifying waste of human resources.

My basic contentions, Mr. Chairman, are therefore these: First, The Department of Education, as it is presently organized, is a vast and enormous complex relating to the normal child. As such, it has failed in its responsibility to thousands of deviants and disturbed children. The school should be the front line of prevention, and I suggest that in the province of Ontario it is not.

My second contention is the following: There are large numbers, I would say thousands, of educable children in the province of Ontario who are not receiving the education to which they are entitled, and the

fundamental premise of equality of opportunity is thereby revealed as a cruel jest for countless numbers whose intelligence is equal to or greater than the average, but whose patterns of behaviour and presence of handicaps result in alienation, despair and failure.

Now, let me be fair. The exceptional child, so-called, has been given attention in certain categories by this government. The problem of blind children, of deaf children, of retarded children, of crippled children, have received a major emphasis, special financing, special classes, special attention. The hon. Minister is to be commended.

I am not sure about the gifted child frankly; I suspect that is an area for analysis and exploration. But in three broad fundamental categories our educational system has not yet begun to understand or respond—and I refer to the emotionally disturbed child—to the perceptually handicapped child, and to the culturally disadvantaged child. I admit that the unfortunate labels are a mouthful in themselves, probably enough to clear this Chamber, but I would like to take a moment avoiding as much repetition of what I have said earlier in the session, Mr. Chairman, to advance as seriously as I can, some of the symptoms, the incidence, the successful experiments, and end with a concrete set of proposals.

First, then—and let me put it in summary—the emotionally disturbed child. Now I need not remind this House yet again—although, alas, it will probably arise under Health and Public Welfare in subsequent weeks—I need not remind the House of that spectrum ranging from the extreme disturbance of schizophrenia on the one hand to the more minor and varying degrees on the other. I remind the House that the manifestations are those of aggressive and turbulent acting-out, through to the totally withdrawn and reticent child, through again to what we regard as normal delinquent behaviour. The characteristic common to all these ranges of children is their inability to form normal human relationships.

Now the incidence, Mr. Chairman, is more and more established at three per cent of the school-going population. Dr. Angus Hood who, as the hon. Minister knows, is head of the Toronto mental health clinic, has suggested that six or seven children in every class of 35 in the province of Ontario are sufficiently disturbed to require some kind of extensive treatment or special school atmosphere; and I think it is fair to say that most educational authorities would agree. I need not cite them, they are legion. And at least

one per cent of the school-age population would require special classes or special attention within the regular school stream and that is a number which amounts in excess of 20,000 children, adolescents and young adults in the province of Ontario.

I suggest frankly, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister opposite, that the present state of affairs does not begin to approximate the need. First, there are many children in opportunity classes in this province who should not in fact be there, their intelligence quotient is in fact not retarded, it is the functioning which is retarded and they may well be damaged in such classes if not properly organized.

Second, the psychological services of this province are desperately thin. Even in the city of Toronto they serve only one in every 4,500 or 5,000 students, yet UNESCO, the American psychiatric association and similar groups have established that facilities for one in every 1,000 is desirable. The precise guidance services are very thin.

It was mentioned by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville this evening, that we have virtually nothing at the elementary school level; we have inordinate emphasis on the occupational and vocational aspects at the secondary school level. I do not suggest that every school should have a psychologist or a social worker but they should be available within any given system or board for consultative purposes.

Finally, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the capacity of the average teacher to identify emotional disturbance or other handicaps is severely limited. There are no standard courses in child development or abnormal behaviour disorders, as part of the teacher-training programme. I know that the hon. Minister, speaking to the association for emotionally disturbed children on January 18 of this year, talked about special summer courses and auxiliary courses for teachers involved in this area. But I suggest to him with all sincerity that that is perhaps insufficient for the tens of thousands of teachers either past, present or future who will have to deal with the six or seven out of 35.

We also have permissive legislation for special classes, but it is barely operative. There is, in the Metro Toronto area, a class in North York, a class in Etobicoke and a class in Toronto—but take a municipality like my own, Scarborough. They are just contemplating, for the first time, two classes in the fall of this year. They will serve 12 children suffering from emotional disturbance and perceptual handicaps. And the

total public school population in the municipality of Scarborough is some 48,000 children. Now, Scarborough claims that a class for 12 will meet the identifiable need, and it would be laughable were it not pitiful. I suggest strongly to the hon. Minister that it reflects again a lack of comprehension, a lack of grasp of the problem that exists. And the very great tragedy, Mr. Chairman, is that wherever we have tried experiments, they have been profoundly successful. Etobicoke is returning children to the regular stream on a regular basis. North York's protective classes are working well; its bulwarking of children in regular classes in the school system is working well and bringing them back into the rehabilitated stream of things.

The Elmont county experiment in New York—to which I referred earlier this session—with volunteer mothers as teacher "mums" coming out of the community, developing a one-to-one relationship with very severely disturbed children—schizophrenic children, autistic children—and gradually through whatever learning process can be adapted to suit that child, plus a tremendous emphasis on affection and love, bringing the child back into the school system.

There is also the League school in Brooklyn, which admits children suffering from schizophrenia. Over the last three years 27 of the school's 50 children, with a prognosis of ineducable, have returned to the main stream of the educational system. I hark back, Mr. Chairman, to the words of the hon. member for Russell at a standing committee of health, education and welfare, earlier this session, when he told of the two schizophrenic children who had come to his attention in the Ottawa environ and for whom absolutely no facilities were available.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is frankly inexcusable; it is unforgivable in a society of our supposed sophistication and maturity. And because we have experiments that are operative and we have the financial wherewithal and we have, certainly, the initiative, I suggest to the hon. Minister that he prosecute this area vigorously. We are sadly distant from the goal of educating all educable children in the province of Ontario. The vast majority of municipal school boards cannot even grasp that problem, let alone assume the responsibility.

After having hurtled through that, Mr. Chairman, let me move to another area which I think has not been discussed in any depth in this Legislature, and that is the perceptually handicapped child, the child to which I suggest the hon. leader of the Oppo-

sition was referring this evening. Now these children have suffered damage to the central nervous system by accident, infection or unknown cause either before, after or at birth—the hon. Minister of Health can correct me here if I am wrong, Mr. Chairman. I cannot refer to them simply as brain-damaged children because they are a sub-grouping of that category; brain-injured children can, of course, include those with severe retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and so on.

The perceptually handicapped children with whom I am concerned, and I think the hon. Minister and the Legislature are concerned, are those with normal intelligence for whom, again, it is possible to develop programmes to reinstate them in the school system. Admittedly, many of them have multiple handicaps—speech disorders and hearing disorders. Many have emotional disturbance in addition to their perceptual handicap. But they can, in fact, be brought into the regular mainstream of things and they are, as a group, I suggest, primarily categorized by hyperactivity, by distractibility and by lack of motor control.

If I can try to communicate this to this House—and hon. members will forgive me for the necessary breakdown in language to do the job—the perceptually handicapped child does not perceive and interpret the exterior world normally. His sight and hearing may be completely normal—I want to emphasize that—but the messages transmitted to the brain are distorted because of damage to the central nervous system.

As an example, imagine a telephone switchboard that went out of order and all the incoming messages were relayed at once over the same receiver at top volume, six times the normal speed and with every other word left out. The confusion, frustration and panic of the child who lives constantly in this world of loudly distorted images can only, I suggest, be imagined. It is not surprising that he is hyper-distractible, since so many stimuli enter his brain at once, unfiltered and at top volume you might say, that he cannot help but be hyper-active.

This is further complicated in that many of the children have difficulty in controlling their physical actions and reactions. In addition to hyper-activity there can be sudden bouts of laughter, sudden uncontrollable bouts of crying, sudden shifts in mood. They may be clumsy physically, the difficulties in school are enormous. Where another child may see a drawing of a house, the perceptually handicapped child may look at the same picture and perceive only a chimney or a single detail of the door. The ticking of the clock

may be as forceful to his ears as the teacher's voice.

Now the diagnostic services in the province of Ontario are hardly overwhelming, as the hon. Minister of Health can attest now and will probably attest during subsequent estimates, but where we have developed a sophisticated diagnosis, and this is particularly true of the postwar period, it has been possible to isolate the perceptually handicapped and to do something about it. The incidence, I suggest to this Legislature, is extremely high. Hon. members may be interested in some authoritative estimates. The Ontario association for children with learning disability presented a brief to the Ontario welfare council in February of this year. They said that it amounted to five per cent of the population, representing the largest incidence of handicapped of exceptionality in the population. Dr. Ralph Rabinowich, of the neuropsychiatric institute of the University of Michigan, said that at least 10 per cent of the children of average intelligence in school in the United States suffer from severe reading disorders originating from disturbances of perception. Dr. Knute Hermann in Denmark, found ten per cent of the population to have specific reading disability. I dare say that there are children of hon. members of this Legislature who have fallen into the area of the perceptually handicapped. Dr. Helmut Nicholas, department of speech and language pathology, Northwestern University, says that 10 per cent to 15 per cent of all children have perceptual problems; and so these statistics go.

It is worth pointing out that not all of these children will, of course, need special classes; just a very small percentage of them, perhaps 0.5 of 1 per cent. But again, in the province of Ontario that amounts to something over 10,000 children of school age. Put that together with the emotionally disturbed and you begin to build a number of young children for whom handicaps of this kind develop an overwhelming significance.

There have been very intelligent ways developed for treating these children and teaching them.

Basically, the classroom eliminates all distraction. There are just six to ten children in a class where there is a severity of disturbance or perceptually handicapped. The room itself will be painted in a uniform colour; all the cupboards are enclosed; the windows are frosted and the floors carpeted. There are no clocks or decorations and as little furniture equipment as possible to avoid distractibility.

In fact, in the major experimental theatre for perceptually handicapped children, Dr.

Cruikshank in Syracuse even regulates the temperature and the humidity of the room so as to remove all the outside evidences of distraction and pressure. The classroom schedule, of course, is tightly ordered. They contrast, in this sense, with emotionally disturbed children for whom all the apparatus and techniques of the modern classroom are often operative and important parts of the therapeutic scheme.

Again I suggest to the hon. Minister that in Ontario the situation is critical and unhappy. In Toronto there is a very successful class, I might say, in North York. There are certain classes in Toronto. I have spoken to the psychologist in Burlington who is setting up a class next fall and I gather that in Scarborough a class will be set up and there is some attention being paid to children in the regular school stream; but on a very minimal basis, and that a rather timid one.

I strongly urge hon. members of the Legislature to reflect upon the fact that there is a lot of tragedy inherent in this; because wherever experiments have been tried, they have had great success.

Let me mention three or four of them. The hon. Minister will probably be familiar with them and will forgive me for putting them on the record. In Glen Rock, New Jersey, between 1960 and 1964, a survey showed that the largest single incidence of handicap amongst children of the population was that of perceptual handicap. Of 30 children in specific schools, 13 have now returned to regular or auxiliary classes. The classroom is in the regular primary school so that the children could move back into the stream easily. The highly structured environment worked well and kindergarten was viewed as the best date of entry, and that is why I earlier emphasized the guidance factor.

In Columbus, Ohio, there is a demonstration project. They have had five classes for four years, and of 33 children 28 have returned to the regular school or the vocational classes. They have all overcome the initial handicaps and frustrations. In this experiment, a teacher aide—akin to the teacher "mum"—worked with these children, and worked very effectively, to demonstrate again the voluntary value that society has not exploited. I also suggest, Mr. Minister, that the expense of these classes, relative to the saving in human terms, has been so minimal as to be microscopical or irrelevant. I will not mention Dr. Cruikshank's famous experiment, the hon. Minister will be familiar with it.

However, I do want to mention London,

Ontario, as some of the hon. members here would probably be more familiar with it than I am. London began a class for perceptually handicapped children in 1960. It now has three classes for emotionally disturbed and the perceptually handicapped. The teachers were initially sent to Syracuse for training because there was no training available in the province of Ontario. Out of a total of 24 children in the classes, 14 have already been returned to regular work and only one was not successful. Normally, Mr. Chairman, these children would have been expelled from the school stream, they would not have been able to fit into the mainstream of affairs. I have a quote from a letter which Mr. Chalmers, the superintendent of special education and assistant superintendent of public schools, wrote to the president of the Ontario association for the emotionally disturbed. He said:

We have been highly encouraged with results to date. The parents of these children are among the most grateful in our school system and I would commend London on the intelligence and maturity it has demonstrated in having this programme operative for four years.

Again I think the hon. Minister can afford to act. I commend him on the forthcoming conference in August and the arrangement for experts from Purdue who are to assure expert guidance for teachers who are interested; I hope that it will lead to concrete programmes and proposals.

With even greater brevity, and I realize that I am compressing enormously complex human factors into terrifyingly generalized statements. I want to deal for a moment with the culturally disadvantaged child because I notice that the hon. Minister made a special point of mentioning that in his estimates. The hon. Minister mentioned the culturally disadvantaged child with reference to Indian children, Eskimo children and certain areas of downtown metropolitan centres, if I recall his lead-off properly.

Again, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with children of essentially normal intelligence whose degree of cultural and social deprivation makes adjustment to our prevailing middle-class-value school structure very difficult indeed. There is a tremendous gap in comprehension—books, music, language, colour, art—a minimal grasp. The stunted culture of poverty, isolation, and lack of external stimuli or appreciation results in this lack. The children develop only psychological handicaps and a very low sense of self worth.

The hon. Minister will know, of course, of the visit to the Higher Horizons programme in New York by various Toronto teachers. When a couple of them came back they wrote a report on New York programmes for the disadvantaged child. One of them was a member of the staff of Jarvis collegiate institute—I think subsequently with the Toronto board of education—and the other was William Quinn, principal of Alexander Muir public school where some of the most exciting programmes for culturally disadvantaged children are taking place. In the report they had this quote and I think it is a significant and perceptive one:

It is within the family, ideally, that provision is made for physical and emotional well being of children. Given a healthy level of self-understanding and reasonable level of aspiration the school has a natural foundation upon which to develop the child intellectually. However, when there is cultural deprivation so that the education process has to be carried on without the ideal background it becomes complicated.

The middle-class-oriented school programme can conceivably have little relationship to the experience of some children who come from disadvantaged homes. Indeed it is possible that it might serve only to emphasize the sense of insignificance and inadequacy which day-to-day living has already imposed on such a child. Need for money, family insecurity and mobility, and the failure on the part of the school to make meaningful contact with the child lead to drop-outs. The incidences of truancy and emotional disturbance are high in the disadvantaged homes.

Just to follow on that, Mr. Chairman, there was an article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, September 17, 1964, written by, if I may say, a journalist of some perception. Since the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is not here, that journalist's capacities will not be impugned—I would be surprised if this hon. Minister indulged in such. I want to read a quote from that article, "The Case of the Disadvantaged Child."

The drop-out problem is directly related to cultural deprivation and has its roots in both social background and the earliest years in school.

And then a quote from Mr. Quinn:

The children in overcrowded communities have to play in the streets and learn to cope with insurmountable difficulties. They and their parents are beaten by society. By

the time they come to kindergarten they know they are incapable of coping. Educators are beginning to recognize that this sense of defeat, though it has its roots in social background, can actually be aggravated by the schools themselves. The child from a home where the niceties of behaviour from language to a clean handkerchief are ignored, is lost when he is put in an environment where politeness and cleanliness are stressed.

The incidence again, Mr. Chairman, is very, very difficult to determine. Frank Leishman, chairman of a college department of psychology and a pioneer in the area of the culturally disadvantaged child, suggests that one out of every two children in the American school system can be classified in this area. That is probably high. Suffice it to say that there are in the province of Ontario several thousand, and again the special programmes for these children—programmes essentially of enrichment—are left to the creativity and ingenuity and perception of individual high school principals.

I mentioned that Mr. Quinn is the embodiment of that. His school, Alexander Muir, is guidance oriented. It has resulted in a lively and enthusiastic school atmosphere where children of public school age bring their problems to the principal's office and teachers are encouraged to be helpful to the children. The pupils—and this includes all of them—participate in ambitious projects like concerts and writing year books; classes are taken on outings and creative experiments are conducted in the classrooms, all designed to bolster the self-esteem of the individual child, all designed to supplement that sad gap in the child from the culturally disadvantaged home and the middle-class oriented school system.

At Eastdale school the upgraded system has turned out to be of immense benefit with girls who have been frustrated by constant failure within a more rigid school system. All children progress at their own speed and the programme is designed to enrich and encourage the child who has been disadvantaged. I might say that a few schools in the city of Toronto in the low-rental housing developments show they even write their own textbooks so that the words and phrases and situations which are incorporated are relevant to their daily life.

If the hon. Minister will permit a personal reflection I am reminded of my own stint as a teacher in West Africa and the necessity of rewriting textbooks so that all of history was not Tudor and Stuart history but West

African history, so that mathematics did not multiply crumpets by English biscuits but multiplied mangoes by bananas, and so that the relevancy of objective factors of their lives were brought into a meaningful school situation. This, of course, is what is required for culturally disadvantaged children.

In Philadelphia and in the Higher Horizons experiments in New York this has been done with great effect. Reading scores increased by 4.3 points in two years; high school completion increased by 39 per cent; the number going on to higher education increased by 250 per cent; verbal IQ scores which normally go down with disadvantaged children rose from a median of 93 in grade 8 to a median of 102 in grade 11. The staff was increased at times twofold in order to come to grips with it and there was a tremendous emphasis on cultural enrichment.

I want to suggest again that there is great room for exciting possibilities of which as yet the province has not seen fit to take advantage. I would end, Mr. Chairman—which the hon. members will doubtless hear with a sigh of relief as will the hon. Minister of Education—with the following sets of concrete recommendations for the province of Ontario in the area of the educationally disturbed, the perceptually handicapped and the culturally disadvantaged. I would say that even at a level of two per cent of the school-age population, that amounts to something over 40,000 children in Ontario. I wish to emphasize that we do not require here purely special classes, that is one fact, but we do require a greater sensitivity in regular classes and a much more judicious and intelligent placement of children in response to their needs.

The first two recommendations are in the nature of a sort of crash programme to fill the immediate gap.

1. That three to six diagnostic teams, each including a child psychiatrist, psychologist, neurologist and social worker, be established to visit Ontario municipalities where diagnostic facilities do not exist. These teams would work within the school system to identify handicapped children and would work with local social agencies in assessing difficult family situations. I can recall, Mr. Chairman, visiting one of the Ontario hospitals not so long ago, in which it was pointed out to me that almost all of eastern Ontario, with the possibility of one of two out-patient centres in Ottawa, has virtually no diagnostic facilities for children whatsoever.

2. That three to six consultative child adjustment teams be established to follow up

the diagnoses made by the first team, or indeed, to move into communities where there are diagnostic services available; to advise school boards, principals and teachers on possible solutions, ranging from protective classes to placement of children with sympathetic teachers; to run special seminars in courses for teachers throughout the province in identification and handling of special problems; to assist local school personnel in referral of certain children to facilities in other parts of the province where none are available locally. The consultative team would attempt to bridge the gap in communications between more active centres and other municipalities and would provide imaginative flexible leadership subject to local needs.

3. That the province encourage the establishment of child guidance clinics in school systems throughout Ontario.

4. That consideration be given, if necessary, to mandatory legislation for the establishment of special educational services wherever the diagnostic and consultative teams find these to be necessary. And again I say that they need not be purely special classes, they can suit a variety of educational needs.

5. That teachers' colleges and OCE include as a prerequisite for diploma, courses in early identification and sensitive handling of children with special problems. Such courses could focus on human growth and development and abnormal child behaviour.

6. That accreditation and increments be given to teachers who have taken special courses in training at the Ontario crippled children's centre, social agencies or special summer auxiliary courses provided by the department. I remind the hon. Minister that, for those 100-odd teachers who took courses at the Ontario crippled children's centre last summer to deal with children with perceptual handicaps, no credit or increment was given for the work they do, despite the fact that it is an accredited course at Syracuse.

7. That it be recommended to the department's new research institute that they study enrichment of curriculum and increased flexibility in staffing of schools to help the culturally disadvantaged child.

8. That grants be given to the Ontario association for emotionally disturbed children and the Ontario association for children with learning disabilities, to establish day-nursery and other educational facilities as has been done for the Ontario association for retarded children.

9. That the province pay the cost of education for all children in treatment centres,

particularly where such children are attending schools in the community at extra expense to the treatment centre.

10. That the province set as an objective the limiting of the size of our classes to 25 children—a step which is universally acknowledged to be of extreme importance in the identification and proper education of children with special problems, as well as for abnormal children.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the House for its indulgence. Within the confines of this private club atmosphere, we collectively recognize the pressures and the time factor. I raised this again because I think it affects somewhere in very deep particular, 40,000 or 50,000 at minimum in the province of Ontario. And I dare say, perhaps I can be proved wrong, but I dare say that there is not an hon. member in this assembly who has not himself felt a sense of despair and frustration when constituents whose children have immeasurable problems, have arrived requesting some kind of aid, and the facilities of this immensely resourceful society have not been able to provide even a modicum of assistance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there is not a great deal that I can add. I can only say to the hon. member that his contribution in this area has been like other contributions in the estimates, of a very helpful nature. We have discussed this unofficially outside the House. As the hon. member knows, we are taking steps this summer as far as summer courses are concerned, and we are also having personnel coming from Syracuse to assist in the discussions and deliberations. I guess I could go on for some length of time to get into the problem in a concrete way.

I think the only thing, Mr. Chairman, that really need be said at this moment is that the hon. member has brought this matter to the attention of the House. I personally have spent some substantial time, not only with the officials in the department by with representatives from the emotionally disturbed, the physically handicapped, and we are very aware of the problem. There is no point saying that it is easily resolved; it is a very complicated, a very difficult situation, and the only thing I think I can usefully add, Mr. Chairman, at this point, is that we are aware of it and we are endeavouring to take steps to meet this very difficult situation.

I should point out that with the perceptually handicapped, it goes beyond the school system itself; we can, I think, become very directly involved with the parents because, as I understand the problem of these, there must be some training or some genuine

interest on the part of the parents to have an effective programme for these groups of young people. But I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a problem with which we must be concerned and I can assure you it will receive the attention of this department.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Following this matter on which the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. Minister have just spoken, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister a letter which came to my desk today, from Mrs. Coxon, dated May 28, 1965. And she says in part:

Enclosed is a résumé of our research for treatment for our son. I hope it will be helpful to you in your efforts to make sure that no one is denied medical or educational services because of insufficient money. That has happened to our son and thousands like him.

The description has some body and substance to it but I think it is an important illustration of what has just been discussed.

When Earl was three years old I brought my concerns about the effects that our circumstances were having on him to the attention of our family physician. He understood the situation very well and was able to give me constructive guidance, as well as a careful medical examination, which revealed him—other than tonsils—to be of sound health and normal intelligence. Unfortunately he entered school shortly before he was five years. The teacher considered him abnormal and treated him accordingly.

After a specialist gave him a hearing test, we were referred by the school to the sick children's hospital, who promptly sent us to East York child guidance clinic. It was near the end of the school year before we were accepted by the clinic. I attended for about 12 to 15 visits every other week or so for the following year or year and a half. We were told that the case load was so heavy that this was the best they could do. No direct guidance was given to the teacher and we were left to make suggestions as best we could. While I was happy to receive instructions in good mental hygiene in the home for children, it was never made clear until the end of the clinic that my husband should participate. He would have been quite willing to attend. Their assessment of Earl was that he was pre-psychotic or mildly retarded, one or the other or possibly both. They weren't sure. The clinic definitely helped him.

In the summer after his first year in school, we moved to Scarborough. No report was sent from the clinic. He repeated kindergarten after a brief trial in grade 1 at the new school. During his second year at this school, we requested the clinic psychiatrist to speak to the principal. Unfortunately, neither family, friends or the school agreed on how he should be handled and it set the stage for a great deal of conflict.

When it became evident that he was not going to fit into the regular class, and that it was destructive to him, we decided to move to Toronto where an opportunity class would be more readily available. We moved in June and in the following September—Earl turned 8 years in December—he started in the opportunity class at John Fisher school. The teacher came to us before Christmas and asked us to take Earl back to the sick children's hospital for further diagnosis and assessment, as she felt, based on her long experience with slow learners and retarded children, that he was definitely not retarded, but exceptionally bright and possibly gifted in art, but was suffering from some type of emotional block. It was March or thereabouts before our appointment arrived.

We were given a diagnosis of childhood schizophrenia. The psychiatrist, Dr. Keeler, explained that he could not give us an assessment as his research project did not include treatment, but gave us the feeling that our son was hopeful. The teacher was as amazed as we were that no follow-up guidance would be given to either herself or to us. Our son was quite happy with this very understanding, warm teacher. So were we. Dr. Helen Mitchell of the Toronto child adjustment service offered to support us as parents as often as we would like. It became clear that it was not within the policy of the child adjustment service to provide the intensive kind of programme that our son required, but that would be seen as part of the regular programme of routine visits to the classrooms by the psychiatrist. At the time, we were quite thankful for Dr. Mitchell's generous offer of support.

The following year a new teacher took over the opportunity class. The second year the class became overcrowded, at one point 21 pupils of all kinds and description. The teacher and myself experienced considerable difficulty with a new principal and getting the co-operation and understanding of the rest of the staff. In spite

of this, our son made considerable progress and during his third year in opportunity class the teacher recommended a private tutor that we paid for, to give him extra help. By the time he was 11 he had progressed to about a grade 5 standard in reading and come up to about grade 3 and 4 in arithmetic. The child adjustment service felt confident that he would be able to pass through high school, although his emotional illness would prevent him from using his full intelligence, which is above average. Earl was at this time a fairly happy, co-operative child.

When he was 10 or 11 he was screened at the new Thistletown hospital by the then director, Dr. Alderton, at my request. They felt he was definitely progressing favourably and that only one year of treatment would be required if it became necessary to hospitalize him. It was agreed to carry on as we were.

When Earl was 11½, a new baby arrived and my health began to break down. Earl became very difficult under the circumstances. When the child adjustment service tried to get him admitted to Thistletown hospital no bed was available. We were told that since their age limit was 12 and he would soon be 12, that he would shortly be ineligible anyway. Dr. Keeler and Dr. Mitchell of the child adjustment service recommended that we apply for admittance to Smiths Falls, which had a special treatment wing for his type of problem, and that perhaps a short stay there would be helpful.

After visiting them at the end of the six-week waiting period we discovered that since he was over 12 he was not in this special treatment wing. His condition had definitely deteriorated into apathy there. We were told that it would take 18 months to diagnose him all over again before specific treatment would commence.

The conditions at Smiths Falls were completely appalling. They must be kidding. It is all on paper. We took him home.

We managed as best we could during the rest of the winter without any professional help at all, or any help from the schools. During the summer, before he was 13, we heard about a private school through the Ontario association for emotionally disturbed children. We were delighted to have at least a day programme as he was beginning to improve and come around again. During his four-month stay there he became a residential pupil. It

became apparent that the woman running the school was not only a fraud but a complete quack. This had disastrous consequences for our son and myself. He became unable to eat properly, read or write or talk coherently.

We went back to Dr. Keeler who was now in private practice and he sent us to the Toronto Psychiatric. We waited from January to August, eight months. By this time Earl would not talk to anyone. The psychiatrist there, after approximately four or five interviews, said he was hopeless, that he could not be reached and to place him in a custodial institution such as Orillia. He definitely described his condition as the same type of schizophrenia present in an adult. It was his theory that it was all biochemical and no psychotherapy was indicated. We refused to accept his prognosis. We still hoped to find professional people who could reach him. He was only 14 past.

It was after this that we first heard of Warrendale and through Mrs. Brown we were able to get some specific guidance in the home. At that time they did not have service to boys. When he was 15 we took him to Dr. Don Anderson at Queen Street.

This doctor felt that a combination of home and hospital would be the best solution and arranged that my husband and myself see him as private patients as often as we could afford to come in order to give us some guidance about Earl. He was quite honest about conditions in the hospital. This went on fairly well for about four months as the staff got to know Earl and were able to devise some programme for him.

Then we were offered the chance to send Earl to Warrendale summer camp. Dr. Anderson was as delighted as we were. At the end of the summer we received the first real and accurate professional assessment we had ever had. They recommended we bring him during the winter to their day school at Oakridges. We had moved to the country and Aurora hospital agreed to give him custodial care as they were about one mile away from the school. We drove down, picked him up at hospital, took him to school, returned daily to hospital and had him home most weekends.

He went to Warrendale the next summer and made enormous progress. He was calm, healthy, co-operative and more receptive and friendly than he had ever

been in his life. Still we knew he had a long way to go. The staff at Warrendale had informed us that it would take five years to treat and rehabilitate him and two more years to consolidate the gains. We understood their financial policy and our limited means had run out.

Warrendale also was unable to provide a further programme and we could no longer carry the transportation or school costs anyway. There is no doubt that these people know what they are doing every step of the way and were able to counsel us in a very specific definite way. They certainly reached all of the family.

We had to return to Toronto and Dr. Rice of Aurora recommended that Earl be transferred to a more appropriate hospital. Early in March he was finally sent to New Toronto as this is the closest available.

At the present time he is not on a full programme because of the shortage of staff, which as far as I am concerned results in the excessive use of drugs. He goes from one building to the next Tuesday and Friday for short periods in afternoon for group therapy. Lately he goes on group walks mornings and afternoons when the weather is suitable. Other than that he is idle. We take him out Sunday.

Despite this token treatment, he has maintained the gains made at Warrendale, but is getting more jumpy and restless. Unless some drastic improvements are made in the budget for this hospital, I see little likelihood of our son making anything but marginal improvements over a very long period of time.

Dr. Keeler, Dr. Anderson and Dr. Fischer were definitely against any form of shock treatment for Earl and said tranquillizer palliative was useful in helping him become more receptive to the various forms of psychotherapy. The staff at New Toronto requested we give permission for electric shock treatment in order to "speed things up." We rejected this because of previous professional advice. They are quite agreeable to this at present. The social worker has agreed to see us at regular intervals.

At no time has any doctor ever been interested in having him admitted to a general hospital for his condition.

It is obvious to me that had a properly trained teacher in a small class been available all the way through school, not this hit-or-miss policy to which we have been subjected, he would not now be a patient

in this hospital. I am also firmly convinced that if, even as little as five years ago, he could have received active treatment, he would not have deteriorated to the point where he has become a long-term patient.

I realize that much of the preceding is interwoven with my own personal bias and prejudice, but nevertheless it is an honest statement of facts.

I hope that this has not been too tedious a recitation, but will benefit not only our own boy but others as well.

I bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister and to the attention of the House because it arrived today and it illustrates the desperate need in this rich province of Ontario for the kind of treatment which will reach children such as Earl early in their lives and carry through to overcome the emotional handicaps and emotional blocks that occur in a situation such as this and bring a boy like this into full manhood and full citizenship.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if I may follow this up. I had not read the letter addressed to my hon. friend; I had not known of its existence. I feel as every hon. member of this House must feel. I feel compelled also to indicate that diagnoses of childhood schizophrenia are now treatable in small classes in municipalities in this province where they are established. In Scarborough, where this child at one point fell, there has been no such class and only one such class is envisaged. The child lived 12 to 16 years of tortured life as the result of the failure to provide child guidance and teaching facilities adequate for the task. Then he even is rejected from Warrendale because under The Department of Public Welfare we cannot pay sufficient per diem, under The Department of Health we will not recognize the medical attention needed and under The Department of Education we will pay for the day school facilities or schooling only in the community where the child is involved. I suggest to you that it is a total failure of government, all branches intertwined. All of us have such cases, and it is now time to act. There is sufficient evidence and sufficient understanding.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to follow on the same topic, if the hon. Minister wishes to reply to some of this. I will intentionally be as brief as possible because of the lateness of the hour. However, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister the brief presented by the Ontario parents' council for the deaf and hard of hearing. It was given to me by the association in my own community. It recommends or

suggests that legislation covering the early education of the handicapped in their hearing. Of their recommendations, I will only bring to attention the four that are most significant.

Number one is that it is proposed the starting age for the education of the hearing handicapped child be lowered to two years of age.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have done this.

Mr. Newman: This has been done?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Newman: The other recommendations, have they been followed out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would have to go back over them, but I know this is a more significant one and this is in the legislation.

Mr. Newman: Right. The second was that classes be established with a minimum of six pupils per centre, where needed throughout the province for these youngsters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the legislation provides for the boards to undertake this at the present time and with the lowering of age they will be able to do that.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, there is no use in me carrying on if the hon. Minister says this has been done so I will report to the association that it has been taken care of.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 508.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I had the honour to attend a meeting of the Six Nations Indian council this morning and at that time—and I must say they run their deliberations very well indeed—it was brought to my attention that they had requested some assistance from the community programmes division of The Department of Education to finance a recreation committee that they have established. They were informed by the hon. Minister that although this type of financing is available for municipalities across the province it would not be available to the Indians. I know that the attitude of the government, from my first experience here, has always been to correct these anomalies where they occur. In several departments, Lands and Forests for one, these peculiarities in our legislation have been gradually done away with, and I would suggest that the hon. Minister of Education might very well follow suit, and rather quickly, so that funds for

recreation would be made available to the citizens on the reserves. I wonder if he might comment on that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of this situation. As I understand the regulations and legislation, the grants must be to municipalities. I was not aware of this request; we will have a look and see if anything can be done to assist them.

Mr. Nixon: On this point, for several years now there have been specific instances—parks assistance is one and I can think of several—but in each case the legislation has been that the grants would be available only to municipalities. As it was brought to the attention of various Ministers, they have been able to bring in amendments that would make these grants available to the Indian councils. I wish somebody would go through the legislation carefully to see to it that all of the services of this nature would be made available to the Indians. I feel that they are reticent enough about asking for things like this and when they are rebuffed by a department on this basis, they tend to withdraw even further. It was really more by chance than anything else that I heard about this, this morning, because actually we were discussing highways. I hope that the hon. Minister will see to it that it is corrected.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, every now and then I am acquainted with a case of a person who seeks a permit for accreditation to teach in the province of Ontario. I get the impression that there is an excessive inflexibility in providing the right to teach in this province, when there appears to be adequate training standards.

For example, there is one case that I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister privately of a person who has a degree from the University of Alberta which would entitle this person to teach in either elementary or secondary schools in Alberta. She sought the right to get accreditation here so she could teach in schools in Ottawa for art alone, and what she was faced with was the prospect that the abstract of her degree from Alberta did not include all of the academic requirements, therefore she could not get certification here. She then sought a "letter of standing" to be able to teach and this was turned down. She simply had to go back and upgrade her degree and then take the OCE course, too.

At a time when we are moving into community colleges and where there is going to be a desperate demand for people at the secondary school level, here is a person who

was reported in Ottawa to have more qualifications than the person who was teaching the subject at that particular time. Apparently the board was willing to hire her. It seems to me that this is an excessive inflexibility. I am wondering if the hon. Minister has a comment on the general proposition. I will give him the specific case later for his review of what has happened through the registrar.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is an area that causes the Minister great complication, of course. We get many requests for certification from outside jurisdictions, and our difficulty is in equating standards beyond Ontario with our own. We are attempting to maintain the existing standards, we think, particularly in the secondary field where this occurs perhaps with greater regularity, but I think there is a greater degree of flexibility than there has been in the past and we are making an effort to equate surrounding jurisdictions. But it is a very difficult problem. I think the hon. members would agree that we want to maintain standards, and yet I appreciate the problem of the person who graduates with his degree from, say, the University of Alberta. It is pretty difficult for him to accept the fact that for some purposes in this province it is not given the same stature, shall we say.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not a foreign land after all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is not that far away and it is a problem that concerns the department, Mr. Chairman. It is one for which there is no easy or obvious solution, but it is one that is receiving consideration.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to carry that one step further. There are also teachers who would teach in private schools, degree teachers who have not attended OCE or who have no teacher qualifications whatsoever but have been inspected by the inspector and found to be extremely satisfactory. If these people have proved their ability, why is it necessary for them to attend teacher training school?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, it is once again the same argument. There are some in the private schools perhaps who are not quite as competent as they should be. No standard has been set for them, no qualifications, and I think really that while we want to be flexible we want to interest as many people as we can; at the same time I think we do want to maintain as high standards as we can.

Mr. Newman: The prime interest is the ability to teach and if the person has already proved that ability, what more is wanted? All he is going to do when he attends the teachers' college is learn or expect to learn something that he already knows. However, may I ask the hon. Minister to take into consideration our graduates who have sacrificed one or two years of their lives to go into the undeveloped countries and have engaged in the art of teaching. They return to our own province and are required to start right at the bottom attending OCE and teachers' college. I think some consideration should be given to their experience in these other countries, provided it is substantial enough, when it comes to teaching certificates.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I do not know just what the hon. Prime Minister plans for the House tonight. I have some rather extended remarks with regard to library services; is there still time to go ahead?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Carry on. Do you have another letter to read?

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, there is in this vote an extremely important matter dealing with the library service in Ontario. I know that the hon. Minister is very concerned with this, has been conscious of the need and has been working toward some solution of it, but it would seem that that work which has been done is not yet adequate and that much more is needed. I have before me a survey of the needs for staff which was published in May, 1964, in the *Canadian Library*, written by Bertha Bassin, the former director of the Toronto library school. The hon. Minister is familiar with this survey.

In the library field we have three classifications of people: those who are professionally trained and who have gone through the post-graduate studies in this regard, those who have been trained in the summer courses and who get a partial training there, and others who are working in our libraries across the province but who have had little or no training. The last are people who have been hired and have picked up their knowledge of books and of libraries as they worked, and while many of them are dedicated and fairly efficient people, they do not have the professional knowledge that one would hope to see in the library field.

During this survey of need—which I understand was undertaken by Miss Bassin at the request of the registrar of the Univer-

sity of Toronto for the university presidents' committee, in order to assess the needs over the next period of time—she called in various groups and called in various experts to get advice. I will not go into those steps at this moment. She looked into the academic field and the need there, the need in the school field, the need for a special library for industry and business, and into the public library needs. The survey revealed that by 1971 we would need in Canada more than 3,000 new librarians; 3,086 was the figure given. The Ontario figure is not given here, but they do give in the academic field, the figures, which are about 40 per cent of the total Canadian needs. I presume from that we would need in Ontario more than 1,200 new librarians by 1971.

As far as the Canadian library situation is concerned, we have the three accredited schools, McGill University, British Columbia and Toronto. Perhaps the hon. Minister could inform us later as to whether Ottawa and the University of Montreal might be accredited within the near future, because they are graduating some librarians and they are, I understand, getting fairly good courses. Perhaps we could get some information about these schools.

As far as McGill is concerned, this year 88 librarians were graduated, but they are now adopting a two-year course and so next year will graduate only about 45. In the University of British Columbia, 55 graduated and they expect to have about 70 graduates next year. The University of Toronto just this week graduated 94. They expect to have 150 next year and they are planning for something like 400 ultimately; how long that will take, perhaps the hon. Minister can tell us. I understand right now that the school is being detached and is being brought under The Department of University Affairs. We hope this will make for a more efficient administration.

But the other problem that is now being faced—and the hon. Minister again can give us advice as to where this school is going to be located, and what facilities it will have and what staff might be available.

In addition, of course, to the people who are needed for libraries—and it would almost seem from these figures that the gap is not being closed as rapidly as we would hope, that the staff needs for these schools and for expanded schools will add to the numbers that we must have. Then, of course, many are thinking now in terms of their master's courses. They are going forward to their master's degree in the library service, and this

will take some time. We do need research in this field and this will mean more people.

So I would say at the present time that there are perhaps five basic needs in this field. First of all, Montreal and Ottawa should be accredited and expanded; we are waiting to hear what the word is here. I know the University of Ottawa bill is just in process and when that is finished perhaps it will be in line for being accredited.

In the second place it seems that the facilities must be expanded in the present schools. There has been some talk of new library schools being established. This might be wise if they are properly located. But the feeling seems to be among the people and the experts in this field that if the present schools were enlarged, it might serve the purpose as well or perhaps better. If the University of Toronto school is properly located and has adequate facilities and adequate staff, it might find itself serving a far greater student body. As a matter of fact, while the school plans to take 150 students this year, we are told that about 300 have already applied for admission. Some of these 300, of course, may not have proper qualifications, some I understand have some language difficulties, so perhaps the 300 may be too large a number for us to think of in realistic terms. But there has been some word in this House about the need to interest more students in the library field. Evidently there is more interest and there are facilities available. I do not know whether this is true of other schools across the country, in British Columbia and in Montreal; but certainly here in Toronto far more people want to take the library course than we have facilities for, and so there is desperate need to expand those facilities and to expand them very, very rapidly.

One of the suggestions that has been made by experts in the field is that the BLS should be offered in summer courses, that summer courses which now train the teacher librarians might be expanded, and over a period of years the BLS might be given and that the courses might be designed in the summer to speed up this process. The present course, I understand, runs around 90 hours a year for three years, which gives a total of 270 hours. These are the people who go into our schools largely, I understand, Mr. Chairman, and look after the work there, whereas the Toronto school itself offers 550 class hours, so we can hardly compare the one with the other—to say that one gets as adequate a training as the other group.

The fourth thing that seems to be needed

today is refresher courses for graduates of some years standing, people who have been working in libraries, who have been isolated in libraries by themselves or with small staffs, who are not up to date in present library techniques, and who should come back for refresher courses. There are also many librarians, married women perhaps, who have now raised their families and who might come back into the service if the refresher courses were available to them.

So I urge upon the hon. Minister that this be considered very carefully, as no doubt he has been considering it, and that activity in this field might be speeded up. And fifth, there is the matter of scholarships for library schools. As I understand it, unless I am very mistaken, the present fellowship for graduate studies excludes librarians. A graduate can go to OCE and can become a teacher of history and can qualify for a scholarship in this field, but if he wants to qualify as a librarian then he is excluded as far as fellowships are concerned. It seems to me that fellowships for librarians are needed and the fellowship programme in this field should not only be inaugurated but should be made a very significant part of the battle to get more librarians in the field.

The next great problem that I would like to call to the attention of the House is that of the total reorganization of our library system. In this regard I would like to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, a brief which was submitted, or a survey which was undertaken, by Miss Louise Schryver, the regional director for south-western Ontario regional library co-operative; she undertook this a year or so ago and the report she brings is a significant report not only for that area but a report, which I suspect, depicts the situation in many, many parts of this province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. member but I wondered if he would like me to bring him up to date on what is happening in this area, not as a direct result of Miss Schryver's report, but what we are doing with the Ontario library association, because it does relate to this. I might—

Mr. Young: Well, if the hon. Minister wishes to do this at this point—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It might save the hon. member some time. I will deal first with the question of librarian supply. We went into it at very substantial length during the estimates of The Department of University Affairs and it was announced that we would

have the new library school at Western and the OCE library school was to be transferred to the University of Toronto and was to be tied in with their new library at the corner of Hoskin and St. George. We cannot deal with the question of the University of Montreal, Mr. Chairman; it is not within our jurisdiction and of course the Ottawa library school in connection with the University of Ottawa will become of current interest when the University of Ottawa bill is processed through the House.

As I recall the discussions in The Department of University Affairs, the statistics that were related by the hon. member were discussed then. I think generally speaking we felt that roughly by 1970 or 1971 we would come very close to meeting the approximately 1,500 to 2,000 I believe it was, that would be required within our own province. The final figure was not stipulated.

Dealing with the organization of libraries itself, some years ago we authorized a grant to the Ontario libraries association to do a preliminary survey of the structure of libraries in Ontario. Miss Schryver made her own survey in the Chatham area as well, she is a member of this group and she was with the group when they were in my office, some three or four months ago.

As a result of this, their recommendation came to the government to have the OLA do an extensive survey of organization. They recommended a Mr. St. John—I should point out that he is no relation to Mr. Bascom St. John—and Mr. St. John was retained by the OLA but his fee was paid by the government. He is presently in the process of conducting a complete survey of the library situation in the province of Ontario. He has been doing this now for the past six or seven weeks and he envisages having his report completed some time around the end of July.

It was agreed with the executive of the OLA at the time that we would not treat libraries in the legislative session until the report from Mr. St. John was complete. Mr. St. John has done an evaluation in two or three American jurisdictions, I believe in the state of Kansas—I am not sure of this—and in Pennsylvania. He is associated with, I believe, the Brooklyn library—I am not positive of this—and he is doing his study, a very exhaustive study, for us and this will be, I am sure, the subject of discussion of some substance here at the next session. I thought, Mr. Chairman, if I brought the hon. member up to date on what has transpired it would cover to a great extent the issue that he is raising.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I thank the hon. Minister for the information and I would hope that action can take place very quickly. Mr. St. John is now making a survey, as we know, but I think the situation in the province is one of great seriousness. Again it comes back, I think, to the matter that we have discussed time after time in this House, that of regional government. If we are going to find any solution to the library problem, just as with so many other problems, then I think we have to look at libraries as regional matters.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course this is the basis of the legislation which was passed last year, Mr. Chairman. We support this principle, but we get back to the problem, that is not dissimilar to the school sections that we faced a year ago. It was felt by the OLA that we should await Mr. St. John's evaluation before we took any more legislative steps.

Mr. Young: Yes, I think this certainly may be true, but at the same time I think we should face the fact that the situation that Miss Schryver found and outlined in her area, as I said, does exist and will be found by Mr. St. John in many other areas. It is one of very great seriousness because she indicates in this report that:

I am convinced, for example, that some of these libraries should not be permitted to continue to exist as they are now run. Their continuation is a perpetuation of something that is worse than nothing. Some of these should be reorganized as deposit stations, for all their books are supplied by county or regional headquarters.

She has some very severe things to say about many of these libraries, although she also points out that many of the town and city libraries are in very good shape and are doing a very significant job. I think that this situation is one we should face; and certainly the survey will help us to understand something of its nature.

It just seems to me that we must come to the place where we face up to the necessity of regional government, and part of the function of that regional government is a library service which will be financed by the region as a whole, with a headquarters library, with the smaller libraries as part and parcel of a central library. The central organization will give guidance and direction and in-service training and will give advice on the purchase of books; if indeed all the books may not be purchased centrally, as I think they must be eventually, and sent out

to the various areas, with the school libraries and the public libraries tied in to the one system.

Now, I certainly do not think we can bring the libraries in industry into this sort of pattern. But when we come to the other libraries in the universities and the new community colleges, we are facing another problem which will not be tied into the regional government problem. There is another fact which is very, very important here: we are going to find need for more librarians than we are anticipating at the present time.

The city of Toronto, for example, right now is asking for librarians to put into its elementary schools. If they are serious about this, it means that all of this year's graduates from the Toronto school can be absorbed in the city of Toronto itself; and as industrial libraries expand, as the community colleges expand, then we may find ourselves facing a very serious situation as regards to manpower. With the emergence of regional government and with, I would hope, more money for this whole field, then again I would hope to see staff expanded and standards upgraded.

Now, on this we cannot wait until the whole regional government pattern is set up and so I would hope that out of the report of Mr. St. John will come recommendations which will establish our libraries at least on a county basis so that the counties themselves will go ahead. I am not trying to anticipate his recommendation, but I do feel that it is desperately important that we overcome some of the difficulties outlined by Miss Schryver in her report. The day must come when we face up to this in a realistic way, which we have not up to this time been doing.

There is just one further matter; the whole grant structure must, I think, face revamping. With the new grant structure, of course, must come better salaries in this whole field. As we get increased standards and better training higher salaries will be demanded and I would hope that this government will provide the kind of money which should be available to bring libraries into the 20th century in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back, if I could, to the question of special schools. I am thinking again of the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West and I wonder if he could tell us of some of the facilities that are available for the emotionally disturbed child in the school. Perhaps I could ask him a series of questions.

In the training of teachers for public schools, are they taught any appreciation of the signs of emotional disturbance? I say this

because I remember a previous debate in the House when we were talking about the fact that at school level you could detect certain signs of emotional disturbance and the teachers were aware of this themselves.

I remember meeting a doctor from Saskatoon, a public health doctor, who had been doing a series of studies, which apparently he sent over to Britain, because he thought that certain physical ailments were indicative of certain emotional disturbances which developed later. I do not know whether his findings proved anything or not. He referred to such "social ailments," as he called them, as an appendix in a young child. He meant it was an indication that we should be looking further at the child's emotional background.

Interjection by Hon. Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Thompson: That explains a lot to me, Mr. Chairman.

He was suggesting, and I certainly would not do that, that this must be the reason for certain emotional disturbance, coupled with other things. To ease the hon. Prime Minister's worry about having emotional disturbance, it was linked with a number of other areas.

That was my first question, the training of the teachers going out into public schools.

The second thing is about guidance teachers themselves, whether at the public school level or at the secondary school level.

The third thing is not on preventive aspects, but I know that there are many hon. members in this House—I was outside and I do not want to identify the hon. member, but I was talking to him about this problem. He has a relative who has a child in a situation like this. I am sure that we are all extremely sympathetic to this problem of the emotionally disturbed child, and yet we are also aware of the enormity of the problem in many ways. But this does not stop us from at least trying to tackle it. Several years ago in my own riding, a Dovercourt club was organized for the emotionally disturbed child. This was done through The Department of Public Welfare. I have also gone up to the children's village in Ottawa and I must say, as I think of some of the cases—we could all meet cases that are very heartbreaking. When I went into that institution, I met a young girl who had slashed her wrists is a suicide attempt, and I think she was under 12 years of age.

We are aware of these things, but I am wondering if there are special teachers who would move into an institution. We have talked of Jamie and the problem there, and this has been raised in the House. Could I ask about institutions as well after a failure

on the part of, perhaps, the school? I do not think that it is just a question of having a small school and a teacher who can handle schizophrenia, although there may be proof, on examination, that this is an enormous help, but I think that the family itself has to accept responsibility in this. I am wondering, if a teacher finds that there is a child who is seriously disturbed, what steps does the teacher take from there? Is there a visit to a psychiatric clinic and are there enough available institutions to deal with these emotionally disturbed children? When I ask, "Are there enough?", I know there are not enough but are we working on this problem and is this connected with the schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I guess I could go into this at some length. I would say that there are really two areas here. One, of course, is the difficulty of identification. The teachers in the teachers' colleges now are having worked into the curriculum the question of being able to identify these youngsters before the problem begins. This, I think, is a very encouraging sign. The in-service training programme is helping these teachers to identify the youngsters so that they can be grouped into special areas, if the legislation permits. Many of the boards have established special classes for this. The Etobicoke area, I think, is an excellent example where they have been able to accomplish something of this nature—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I interrupt the hon. Minister to ask what kind of teaching is provided to the prospective teacher in connection with this? Could the hon. Minister give us some background on that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give the hon. member any detailed background. The material generally is related to the identification of the emotionally disturbed youngster. We are also having this year, a summer course as part of the special education summer school and education for emotionally disturbed youngsters. This is an option that is being offered this particular summer. We are having people here from Syracuse. The hon. leader of the Opposition is familiar, I am sure, with the work that has been going on in that area and we are going to participate in this course so that we can train teachers.

There is a lot of work to be done in this area, Mr. Chairman, and a lot of it relates, of course, to boards that have been too small over the years to provide the type of service that is becoming necessary, apparently, for

these youngsters. It is not absolutely certain, but we think we can handle most of them within the regular school system, and perhaps it would be more appropriate for others to remark on whether some specific type of institution beyond the school should be provided. I am not qualified to do this, but within the school system itself, we think we can—given the proper training to the teachers and the opportunity to identify the youngsters—we can handle them, and this is being proved by several boards in the province that have classes for the emotionally disturbed.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, in almost every other jurisdiction, while the problem itself is not new, its emergence is relatively new and it is coming to the fore now, and is one that we are attempting to resolve. You could say that almost every other jurisdiction is attempting to resolve at this time. We have had people outside our own province attempting to assess what might be done. We have had some excellent experience elsewhere and we think these will be of assistance to us here in this province.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the evening I mentioned to the hon. Minister about the community school—community programme type—and I would like to bring to his attention that back in 1961, one of the recommendations of the physical fitness committee was that a pilot project be set up on this. The recommendation specifically is that a community school project be undertaken in one elementary school in several municipalities on an experimental basis.

Now, in Flint, all schools have been renovated for community use. New schools are designed and built as community schools and the cost to operate the additional evening programme is only 6.2 per cent. Will the hon. Minister explain why the department has not undertaken some type of pilot project?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, we have not discouraged this type of pilot project at all. In fact, the board from the town of Brampton with which I am rather familiar, was over at Flint roughly two or three weeks ago, doing an evaluation of the school there. They have their own views on it and I do not think it is appropriate for me to comment. We do not discourage the study of this. It may be that it will have application here but we think it should emanate, as it did in Flint, from the interests of the board, because it has to be related to the community—the shared facility of park accommodation, recreational accommodation. While, I think, from the department's standpoint, we have

not had a specific proposal, if such a proposal were made, I think we would be very interested in it.

Mr. Newman: Would the hon. Minister consider increasing the grant in my own community 6.2 per cent so that it could undertake a pilot project?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We would have to see the proposal first, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: May I inform the hon. Minister then, that the select committee on youth met with the original members of the group that studied physical fitness back in 1961, and they informed us that Flint, before this programme was undertaken, had one of the highest delinquency rates in the United States and today it is one of the lowest. So surely from that aspect alone the institution of a community programme or community school programme would be most worthwhile.

Vote 508 agreed to.

Vote 509 agreed to.

On vote 510:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on vote 509—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt my hon. friend? In view of the hour—and I am sure he has some remarks to make on this particular vote—I move that

the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Mr. Chairman: Before making the motion, I would just like to clarify the situation. We are now on vote 509.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was under the impression vote 509 had been carried.

Mr. Chairman: No, the member rose to speak on vote 509.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I want clarification, nothing else.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.40 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, June 4, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Friday, June 4, 1965

Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	3697
Estimates, Department of Education, Mr. Davis, concluded	3698
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3725

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1965

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, students from Sidney township school No. 6, Belleville.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE EMERGENCY MEASURES ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the Act is a very brief one containing short amendments. The first three sections are designed to carry out some changes in departmental organization. The fourth section provides for the supplementing of the municipal plans in the event of an emergency and for the co-ordination of such plans.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the hon. Attorney General a question. Does this mean that his department is going to take an active and vital role now in the control of emergency measures?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would think this is very definitely part of the intention of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I regret to state that present indications are that there is a strong possibility that last year's drought conditions may recur this year.

Meteorologists' predictions, based on a long-term forecast, indicate that precipitation may again this year be short of normal in some areas of the province. The situation is further aggravated in eastern Ontario by reason of the fact that there is no carry-over of moisture from last year. Reports reaching our department indicate that germination has been slow and that pastures are well behind the normal stage.

In an endeavour to lessen the impact of drought conditions on the farm operator in the provision of fodder for livestock feed, the soils and crop branch is suggesting strongly that farmers in the drought area endeavour to meet the situation, in some degree, by the planting of alternative crops. The replacement of unproductive meadows and pastures is the first consideration.

It is suggested that, in meadows and pastures seriously depleted of alfalfa and other legumes, if the remaining sward consists of such grasses as brome, orchard, and timothy, nitrogen at rates of 50-75 pound actual N per acre will give substantial yield increases, provided, of course, that sufficient moisture is present to make the nitrogen available. This can be applied either before cutting or immediately after to stimulate regrowth.

Of course, it is not at all hopeless, as supplementary forage crops still have considerable promise for increased feed tonnage. The relatively new sudan-sorghum hybrids should be given first consideration. This heat-loving, drought-resistant crop, once established, is capable of producing 20-30 tons per acre of green forage. It can be seeded up to June 25. However, early June seeding offers best chances for success and is highly recommended.

Corn, as an ensilage crop, consistently out-yields the sudan-sorghum hybrids. Corn seeded at Guelph on June 23 last year yielded between six and seven tons dry matter, chopped, on September 23. Except where the crop is to be pastured, corn should be given preference over the sudan sorghums. While early hybrids are preferred, lack of seed of early varieties should not deter a farmer from using corn.

Later hybrids, while they will not have the grain content, will produce a good tonnage of green feed. Even the corn from last year's crop, in the crib or bin, will do for this purpose, so long as the germination is 60 per cent or better. If using this seed, it is necessary to adjust seeding rate to allow for possible lower germination.

Some farmers are of the opinion that oats has been underrated as a forage crop. If well established and grazed rotationally, oats has good regrowth capabilities and provides a worthwhile volume of feed. Two bushels of oats plus 20 pounds of sudan grass makes a satisfactory mixture. Oats alone for pasture should be seeded at three to 3.5 bushels per acre.

Without rainfall, seeding delays can only result in seeding into drier ground, with consequently poorer establishment. Moisture is essential for the germination of any seed and, with soil moisture at a very low level, it seems advisable to have some acreage of emergency crop planted to be ready to take advantage of the first showers.

I would advise the House that some discussions have been held by officials of our department with The Department of Agriculture at Ottawa on the subject of agrometeorology, with emphasis on long-term weather forecasts. Current plans are to appoint a special agrometeorological committee to give specific thought to the subject, with the view of determining what developments can be made in the field of weather forecasts designed specifically for the guidance of the farm people of the province.

In view of the situation as I have outlined it, the department is continuing to urge farmers to practise all possible forms of water conservation. That there is a growing awareness of the necessity of conservation measures is evident from the number of farm ponds that have been, or are being, constructed throughout the province.

It may be of interest to the House that, during the past fiscal year, 508 farm ponds were constructed in the province and that, during the year, more than 1,000 calls were made at the engineering offices of our department in connection with the design and specifications of all types of ponds. At the present moment, there are 374 pond applications on file. It is significant that, during the year, the number of calls made by engineers of The Department of Agriculture was seven times as great as during the previous year. It is anticipated that the demand and interest will continue in view of the lack of adequate precipitation. I am pleased with the accept-

ance of this programme which holds so much promise for the present and the future.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have asked the extension branch of our department in the areas concerned to give every assistance to rural people in providing advice on how to meet the situation.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventeenth order; House in committee of supply. Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (continued)

On vote 509:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, most of us received in the mail this morning a document suggesting that there may be, and I quote, "a shocking sensational textbook scandal." Under the circumstances and in order to clear the air, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) should now be prepared to state finally, conclusively and without equivocation whether or not a baseball curves when pitched by a skilled pitcher.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I must confess I have not seen this letter this morning.

Mr. Bryden: I will send it to you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Good idea.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on vote 509—technological and trades training branch. I do so to take issue with the hon. Minister on what appears to me to be the ambivalence in his attitude toward the basic question in education in Ontario, namely, the relationship between what has been variously described as the contrast of education with training, which was a phrase used throughout the statement made by the hon. Minister when he introduced the bill on the community colleges. It has been variously described as "a contrast between cultural aspects of education and vocational aspects." In economic terms it is sometimes referred to as "the consumer aspect contrasted with the investment aspect of education," or in the phraseology that the hon. Minister himself used in introducing his estimates, "the contrast between skills and facts and attitudes and ideas."

It would appear to me that if we stand back and take a look at what has happened in the educational structure in the province, we would recognize historically in the province that the whole ambit of secondary education has been conditioned to a very high degree by the very narrow funnel at the top, of admission to universities for higher education. I think that a study of the educational system in Ontario discloses that that very narrow funnel at the top has had a back pressure throughout the secondary school system—and indeed, back into the primary system—in conditioning the curriculum of both the primary and the secondary schools in terms of leading to a higher education only through the universities. I think this pressure and this rigidity within the system has inhibited the use of the tremendous potential which is certainly now available, and, I think has been available in the past among secondary school students because of their lack of higher training in branches other than the recognized university courses.

I think this restricting influence of the universities—and it is understandable in a sense—but it is an extremely conservative attitude of the universities which has led to a limiting and a raising of the entrance requirements into the universities and has, I repeat, produced a rigidity in the secondary school systems which has not as yet been alleviated.

Now, it is perfectly true that the streaming plan or the Roberts plan was an effort to take some of the explosive back pressure out of the educational system by providing other avenues for students at the secondary level. To a degree it has been a pressure valve on the educational system, but has now, in my view, served its purpose and must give way to what is in fact the trend in education, certainly throughout the western world. I do not think this government can afford to ignore it. It is not a question of introducing something which is foreign to our system, it is a question of recognizing that throughout the whole of the western world—indeed elsewhere in the world—certain trends in education are developing, which are quite contrary to the Roberts plan or to the streaming plan.

The trend is very definitely toward a common-stem approach to education with emphasis on general education, carrying through to a point somewhere half way up the scale of the secondary educational system.

Now, another aspect of this very same problem is that we all recognize and know that we are moving into a society where there is going to be a high premium placed on manpower skills, and that the emphasis

in our educational system is going to be toward highly skilled people within our economy so that the economy and the productivity of the economy can continue to increase, because it is on that productivity that the whole of our society depends to a very great extent.

But the constant and continuous emphasis which is being placed on skilful training as distinct from the general type of education is likely to lead to an overbalance in the educational system in favour of specific skills for individual students, whereas what we do in fact need in our educational system at the present time is a general education. This is gradually being proved to mean that people can, throughout their lifetimes, move more readily from one skill to another skill, if they have a proper basic grounding in the fundamentals of a general education, which, of course, is also the consumption aspect of education or the cultural aspect of education, just as much as it is an education for earning their livelihood or making their contribution in what is becoming a highly skilled society.

It seemed to me in all the discussions, whether it had to do with the university affairs or whether it had to do with community colleges or whether it had to do with The Department of Education itself, that the government has not clearly stated in any way its position on the contrast between the cultural and the vocational, and the contrast between education and training, and the contrast between skills and attitudes. It would appear that the government simply feels, and the hon. Minister simply feels, that these two parallel courses are going to continue in some way in our communities without any very definite plans being made to recognize the basic fact that they are not separate trends in our society at all, but that the curriculum, the programme and the training throughout our whole educational system must be to intertwine inextricably both aspects of education so that there is no one entering our society who is simply a skilled craftsman without having a basic general education. And similarly, that the people having a general education are also going to have the skills and abilities which come from specialization.

Earlier in the estimates the hon. Minister dismissed the suggestion made by the hon. leader of our party (Mr. MacDonald) about the programme which is taking place in Sweden, on the basis that that was foreign to Ontario and that we must preserve whatever there is of uniqueness in our own society, in our own educational system. We would be

the first to agree with that but I do not think that the hon. Minister, in the light of the studies which have been made, can continue to take the viewpoint that the streaming system, the Robarts plan, as it is at the present time, is adequate or bears any relevance to current trends in education throughout the world. Simply for the record and in order to reflect what I have been trying to say, and to try to put on the record the trends throughout the world in education, I would refer to two rather brief paragraphs in the study group, "Economic aspects of higher education," published by the organization for economic co-operation and development, last year in Paris. One of the articles deals with preliminary findings of the international study of university admissions. This study was undertaken to investigate present conditions of access to higher education throughout the world. It was established jointly by UNESCO and the international association of universities.

Its principal task was to explore the causes underlying the existing problems of admission to higher education. After discussing various problems that arose within that field, it made some very pertinent remarks about the studies which have been carried on in this field, to which I have been referring in these remarks. What it has said is:

There have been many changes in the secondary school systems of the world. According to the World Survey of Education, a UNESCO publication based entirely upon statements submitted throughout government channels, half of the 95 countries which have complete educational systems, in the sense that they offer programmes at all three levels, had in 1950, secondary systems which offered three parallel lines to the student. One line led directly to higher education via the familiar channels of the gymnasium, the college or other well established programme of general secondary education. One line prepared for primary school teaching and one line prepared for technical and vocation work. These lines separated after the end of primary school. Most of the remaining countries had in 1950 two parallel lines of general secondary education, one is already described, leading directly to higher education, the other presenting a common first cycle followed by a split cycle in which the student chose either teacher training or technical education. A few countries had other systems which might be described in broad terms as a single line of education either branching out in the second cycle into separate programmes or a single line

operating through comprehensive schools which included technical and teacher training programmes. However, by 1959 the number of countries retaining and apparently planning to retain the three-parallel-line system had dropped by almost 50 per cent to fewer than 30, with the majority changing or planning changes to the common stem type of secondary programme dividing only for the second part. Of the countries following the two line system in 1950 numbering about 40, at least one-third had also moved or were planning to move to the common stem programme.

In other words, the general trend of movement in secondary education has been toward a common programme and for a first cycle followed by a division at the upper level, thus extending general education for all to a point about midway in the secondary school. A change of this nature on such a wide scale is obviously made in response to a pressing situation, and in turn presages other changes in the direction of further extension of general secondary education which will probably become noticeable in the latter part of this decade. It is not at all beyond the bounds of reasonable prophecy to suggest that a similar series of changes in higher education may take place during the next decade.

I believe that those two paragraphs illustrate the world-wide nature of the trend which is developing in secondary education and how much out of step the present educational policy in the province of Ontario is when compared with that comprehensive and definitive study which was made of the secondary school systems.

It would appear to me that the hon. Minister should now, in these estimates, state his viewpoint as to what his intentions are to depart from the stream system into what is referred to as the common stem approach to secondary education. He should also state very clearly that the intention, so far as the secondary school system, so far as the community colleges are concerned, is to provide within the framework of those levels of education this inextricable intertwining of the two aspects of education which are going to be so very important both to the economy of the province of Ontario and the general well-being, the general educational level, in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I will just comment on this very briefly. I really thought I had dealt with this before. It is very difficult to answer this with respect to the proposed colleges of applied arts and technology. If you

were to check carefully, for instance, the curriculum existing at Ryerson or the other institutes of technology, you would find that a relatively high degree of academic work is required. This, of course, I think, will become general as far as the colleges of applied arts and technology are concerned.

I did relate to the House, and I made the observation, it is not that we ignore what is going on in these other jurisdictions, but you have to assess individual needs within the jurisdictions. I think one could say there has been a slightly different traditional approach to education in many western European countries through the gymnasia up into university, but the percentage of students retained in the secondary—if you could call it secondary—system is lower, and has been lower, in many of the European countries, particularly in the United Kingdom.

I would perhaps take issue with the theory that most jurisdictions are moving towards—as the hon. member refers to it—the common stem approach. I think, quite frankly, it could be traditional in Europe that there has been a much sharper division between the academic and the technical vocational. I think there will be a tendency—and it is very difficult to predict this—in some American states towards the type of programme that we have instituted here in Ontario. I think you will find some of the other provinces of Canada will be moving more rapidly than they have in the past into what we call the programme one situation.

We agree, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about this, that the secondary school students should have as broad a basis as possible in their entire approach to education. I think I mentioned this when I was replying to the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald).

As I pointed out, the common year is grade 9 except, quite frankly, for the occupational courses. I think even at the UNESCO meeting there was unanimous agreement that for this group of students at least you related a different type of programme to their needs.

But taking students generally, whether they be in the four or five year programme—and once again you are discussing in many jurisdictions just a four year programme not five years at the secondary level—forty per cent of the time is spent in the shop work or the vocational work in the four year technological programmes and 50 per cent is spent on academic. The academic work in many areas relates to the same work you would be getting in the five year stream. We think we are maintaining a very excellent balance to give

the students sufficient flexibility so that they can adapt to change.

We are not—and I make this very clear, Mr. Chairman—we are not giving students specific skilled training. We are trying to interest them in a wide area, whether it be in electronics or technician courses at the high school so that they can move, if five years hence they need to, into other areas of skilled work. We are maintaining a very high percentage of broad academic content. I think you will find that the curriculum here, if it is studied carefully and the situation assessed, is not such a great departure from what they are contemplating in the report to which the hon. member referred. I say, I think you will find a trend in this general direction in many other jurisdictions.

They have found, as I stated on the community college bill debate, with the straight academic approach, it has been the experience in most American states to grade 12 and on into the junior college or community college that there is perhaps—hon. members who were on the tour with the youth committee will recall from discussions where the principals or the leaders of the community colleges took part—an interest in having at least some introductory work in the technological area at the secondary level. They are establishing the system with no training or no interest in this area at the present time.

We have no hesitation, as far as the hon. member is concerned, as to just what position we take. We are very much in support of taking a broad academic approach to all three streams, but at the same time we think that having certain of these subjects available to our students has been the main reason why they are remaining within the school system for a longer period of time. We think they will be able to adjust economically and socially, to the very much changed conditions that we will face.

As I say, I think that the trend that is established here is not out of keeping with what is happening in other jurisdictions. They started from a different base. They started, I think, from a much more rigid approach to education than we have had here. I hope we are achieving something here that is close to the happy medium. We are, of course, keeping an eye on this and interesting ourselves in what is happening in other jurisdictions, but our reaction to date is that we are moving in the right direction in this province.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I have a number of specific questions I would like to raise with the hon.

Minister, but let me come back and add a footnote to the extended comments I made in my introductory statement on this point.

I was talking a bit at cross-purposes, and the hon. Minister has made it clear now that he believes people are moving in our direction, rather than in the direction—as my hon. colleague from Riverdale pointed out—suggested in an overall, comprehensive survey of secondary and post-secondary education in the world carried out by UNESCO.

The basic point is this: It seems to me that we agree that we need skills in the kind of technological aids we have available, but the significant point is that you cannot give these skills by starting an early streaming, because the student has not adequate general education as a base.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We agree with that.

Mr. MacDonald: You agree with it in principle—and I think this is rather significant. If I might just emphasize the point before I go ahead and cope with your alleged agreement and show that I think there is some area of disagreement here that we have to take a look at—it is rather significant that about 1959, to quote the actual date in the quotation that my hon. friend from Riverdale has put on record, there emerged this new trend which has resulted in half of the country moving back toward what he called the “common stem” approach. Under it you make absolutely certain that the student gets a basic general education, in the belief that skills can be acquired later. Indeed, if you do not have your basic education, you will not have the adaptability assured by a basic education to change your skills throughout life, as you may have to do, two or three times.

Let me try to make my point this way. I was rather interested to receive a letter from a person who is very familiar with post-secondary education in the province of Ontario at the technical and technological level. His comment was this. He said that he had had a fair bit of experience with people in the four-year commercial courses and that he was convinced that for most of them it is pointless to talk about higher education, because they lack the necessary base in maths and English. He went on to say:

I am equally convinced that most of these students can acquire that base, but surely the place to acquire it is in high school.

In other words, the hon. Minister says, “We recognize what is needed, so we are building

community colleges.” The community college is going to pick up after grade 12, but here is somebody who is fairly familiar with coping with students from the grade 12 level, and his conclusion is that it is idle to talk about higher education for many of these because they simply have not got the basic education in mathematics and English.

This emphasizes the fact that there is no point in talking about community colleges that will carry on beyond grade 12 because in the lower streams—if I may describe them as such—we have not provided those who are going to grade 12 and are not going on to university with the adequate educational base to enable them to acquire the skills that are needed in modern society. Here is the point that I think we have to focus attention on.

In my introductory statement I said that I was one of those who supported the Roberts plan and the introduction of the Roberts plan; I pleaded for years after I got into this Legislature, prior to its introduction. But it is rather significant and, I think, confirms my suggestion, that because we were so late in introducing it, it was out of date almost as quickly as we started to introduce it. We started to introduce it about 1959 or 1960, the thought and the discussion on it—no, the actual date was about 1961, as a matter of fact—it was right in the middle of another convention, the leadership convention.

Actually, two or three years before we got around to establishing this, other countries that had had it for years were recognizing the inadequacies of it in terms of giving a broad enough basic education to be able to acquire the necessary skills at a later stage.

What adaptation can be made of this, I do not profess to be enough of a technician to know, but I submit the view of this person who has a lot of contact with students at the post-secondary level from grade 12 and who says it is idle to talk about higher education because they do not have the basis to acquire higher education. This is the point we have to take a look at, and this is what you are going to do in your community colleges.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think, too, that we should clear up this problem. This gentleman who is referring to this, of course, has not had any four-year graduates yet from the reorganized programme, because they do not come out until a year from now. I think he is referring to the commercial students who, over a period of years, perhaps were put into the commercial course at the high school under the plans that then

existed, and they were not too complete—I think we have to be very frank about this. The students were not getting the same treatment they are getting under the reorganized programme. I do not think that we can really assess this yet, because we have had no four-year commercial graduates; we will not have them until a year from this June. There are no graduates.

Mr. MacDonald: Are you suggesting that there is a broader education up to grade 12 provided by the new commercial courses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have no doubt that the four-year and even the five-year commercial or business and commerce stream, as it has been established now, has a much broader base academically than has been the case in the past, and, as I say, when you try to relate this to European jurisdictions—and I am not that familiar with it—I think you will find they had a much more rigid approach to their technical or vocational training. It was far more specialized than what we are attempting to do here in our school system, and I think one would have to look at and make a very thorough study of the systems in Europe before one could draw a valid comparison. It all depends on the starting point as to where you are going and what you are achieving.

When hon. members suggest that they are moving in an opposite direction from ours, I think they have to evaluate very carefully where they are starting from and it may be that we are not too far apart at this present time.

There is a high academic content; we insist on this, we are very concerned with this, even in the occupational courses. We are trying to give these youngsters—who are, quite frankly, learning how to be service-station attendants—courses in English and mathematics in order to give them as broad an experience as we possibly can. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that this type of approach has been instrumental in retaining many of these youngsters in the school system and this is why I think we and you have to go jurisdiction by jurisdiction. We have a higher percentage of the young people in our secondary system compared to the United Kingdom.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I will leave the matter there for this year. In the fullness of another year—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will have a better idea then.

Mr. MacDonald: There is an assortment of questions on which I would like to have some elaboration from the hon. Minister.

I was interested in a number of the courses that were under consideration in the technological and trades training branch, as revealed in the testimony of the former superintendent, Mr. Johnston. What, for example, has been the record and the assessment of the new technicians' course worked out in conjunction with the construction industry? Second, I was extremely interested in the spelling out of courses made available for small businessmen.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman), expounded our views on the problems of the small businessmen surviving in the rough and tumble of our competitive system today, and he pointed out that one of the great difficulties is a lack of know-how on the part of an individual operator who increasingly had to cope with a very complex kind of economy. Indeed, I think it is accurate to say that those who have been directing the destinies of the Ontario development agency have discovered that one of the greatest needs on the part of industry, in some instances, is not credit, not money, but just more know-how. They simply do not know how to operate their businesses in an efficient, modern way.

Therefore, it would seem to me that courses which are going to be providing an opportunity for small businessmen to become more efficient as managers are extremely useful and perhaps as great a contribution as anything else to helping small businessmen to survive. I wonder if the hon. Minister might report on what experience there has been on that and what likelihood of expansion there is, if any.

Third in this category of questions, I was most interested in the suggestion that there was in the offing a possibility of duplicating the Leaside in-plant study in three parts of the province: one in eastern Ontario, one in northwestern Ontario, and one in southwestern Ontario. This was just prospective last September. Has anything developed on this prospect?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, taking them in order, it is too early to determine yet the effectiveness of the construction technicians' course, as it has been in its first year only. These people will be going into industry for the summer months and we are very enthused to date by the response. We think it has been a very excellent course. The students apparently are more than content with it and once again, we will have to

see on graduation just how effective it has been.

We have also had discussions with the plastics industry and with the Royal college of dental surgeons, the lumbering association, the association of land surveyors, the optical and photographic industries, even the Ontario association of architects—to try to establish technician courses—and you might call them, once again, paraprofessional courses—to relate to their specific situations, and we anticipate that we will develop courses from these discussions, along similar patterns to the construction technicians' course.

With respect to small business management, I have attended two or three of their graduations. I think that this course is an area that is being very helpful to small businessmen. We have had more than 135 courses in this province. They are sponsored usually by the local chamber of commerce or the board of trade. The enrolment has been excellent. The chamber of commerce has been very kind in its attitude and remarks about the course. It felt the course has been most helpful in the areas across the province where it has been offered.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the aggregate enrolment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say, Mr. Chairman, the enrolment would average, and this is just a guess, somewhere around 30 or so, perhaps 30 to 40 per course.

Mr. MacDonald: About 1,000 altogether then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There would be roughly 1,000, about 1,100, I think, maybe slightly more than that to date. As the communities or the chambers of commerce show interest, we intend to expand this facility to the extent that the need is shown. We think we have some very good personnel and we have, we believe, very good courses.

With respect to the Leaside project experiment, we are involved now in Peterborough, Kitchener and Sault Ste. Marie, and we have discussions under way with one or two other centres to continue this programme, which I would agree, Mr. Chairman, we should be doing more of. It is a unique type of programme, and as I said to the House the other day, we have had inquiries from all over the United States and Europe as to this approach to upgrading or retraining on the job and we look forward to an extension of this. Although it does take substantial interest on the part of industry, we cannot do this type of programme alone. But these are the three

centres where this project is now being extended.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I assume from what the hon. Minister says, that he is considering it, it is not actually established?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is in the process of being established.

Mr. MacDonald: Dealing with this latter point, Mr. Chairman, this is the distressing thing and I am not laying the blame wholly on the government—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is established in those other three centres. It is operating.

Mr. MacDonald: It is established?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, that undercuts the comment I was going to make. The basic problem until now has been the limited interest on the part of industry and therefore the difficulty of getting an acceptance of this kind of programme. If the hon. Minister was going to tell me at the end of the academic year the same thing he told me at the beginning of the academic year, that this was still under study, it would have underlined our basic problem pretty seriously. However, perhaps with these four experiments, we will have enough of an incentive for others to move into the picture.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think we have moved beyond the experimental stage. I think we have been able to establish the validity of this approach.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the final point in this connection. Let me come back to what I think is the basic requirement. I tried to underline it in my concluding remarks during my introduction in quotations from the testimony of the select committee—what is being done by way of research in this branch in terms of assessing the new areas in which it might set up classes. The proposition that there is only one man engaged in research, I think as I said earlier, is a little short of ludicrous. I know that it might be argued that The Department of Education may not be the place to do it—it may be The Department of Labour, it may be in Ottawa—but let us forget the relative merits of where it should be done, because surely The Department of Education, where you are going to be instituting these classes, is good, and perhaps better, than any other area.

I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister—and to seek his comments—that it would

be a good expenditure of money to develop a corps of even 12 or 15 people, perhaps even more, who would be combing this province, sitting down, with the various agencies in industries, pursuing in detail the development of an interest in this kind of course and then back to the development of the course itself so that it could be instituted. If there is not this kind of leadership given at the centre we are not going to have the kind of development, or the proportions of the development, that we need across the province. Even worse, Mr. Chairman, in some instances we are going to have developments that will be obsolete before they get established because it will be a well-meaning intention on the part of local people who have access to the funds, to build buildings. They will go ahead and build them and institute courses that will be based on obsolete skills.

I wonder if the hon. Minister can give us some assurance that there is going to be a pretty serious expansion of the research aspects of this programme.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member's point really is well taken. This is—and I am not making apologies—a relatively new programme, it has kept us busy actually working out the many courses we have to date and we think we have been really fairly successful in this area. The question of research, whether research, as we know it, should be done by, say, The Department of Education, The Department of Labour, particularly the federal Department of Labour that has been giving us some very good guidance in this area—I think is immaterial. The fact remains that in some way or other it must be done. We have two professors from the University of Western Ontario presently doing research on the validity of programme 5, tracing case histories, seeing how effective the courses are and whether there should be something further done in this area. The Department of Labour is doing a survey now, I think it is in the Cornwall area, in conjunction with our branch to determine the type of courses and the effectiveness of the training within that particular situation and through our own discussions—and whether you can call this research such as we had with the construction industry and are presently engaged in with these other aspects of industry—really this is a form, I guess, of research in order to establish these courses.

It is difficult—and I am not making excuses for industry either—it is, I think, difficult for industry even, to predict accurately their man-

power skill requirements for, say, 10 years hence. This is a problem, I would think, for them as well. And this is why we get back to the discussions we had before, that no matter what types of courses are developed, we have to give them as broad a base educationally as we can so that as new skills develop, new techniques develop. They can adapt to them, and this is, of course, what we are hoping to build into the entire system so that no matter what retraining or upgrading course is given—as you will know at these programme 5 centres we are trying to give them English, maths, and some general subjects so that they can, if necessary, adapt some time in the future.

To be specific, Mr. Chairman, on the question of research, just how or what will evolve and whether you refer to it as specifically research or a question of co-operation with our branch and The Department of Labour and industry, I can assure the hon. members that we think we can evolve some pattern that will do this effectively. I do not know whether the term "research" is the proper one. It may be. But whatever it is, I can assure the hon. member we are aware of the problem and we intend to work something out that will be satisfactory.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is a final area that I would like to explore with the hon. Minister. Let me set the context by a brief quotation from a study of the university presidents on community colleges. They say:

At the present time 70 per cent of the population of the province live within 25 miles of a university. With the proposed extensions of university work through off-campus colleges that percentage may well be increased to over 90.

And I may interject here, I find that a little difficult—

Hon. Mr. Davis: From our impression I think it is a shade high.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Well, I am glad to have my suspicions confirmed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have not actually analyzed this, we are in the process of doing it.

Mr. MacDonald: The study continues:

It would never reach 100 because of the vast areas of the sparsely settled north, but we understand that consideration is being given to providing boarding allowances for students from the isolated points in order

to give them equal opportunity for higher education. Residential accommodation for a proportion of the students is an intrinsic part of the planning of all Ontario universities.

Now, my comment is with reference not only to universities but to the whole range of post-secondary development that we now have in the envisaged community colleges. Is the hon. Minister in a position to indicate whether the government has made up its mind on the proposition of boarding allowances, which presumably would make it possible for students to come and live in existing accommodation; and secondly, is the hon. Minister in a position also to give us a clear picture of how far the government might go in terms of providing residential accommodation for students, not only in any of these developments that take place in the north, but again, as has been drawn to my attention, in some of our technological institutes in the south? For example, take the Eastern Ontario institute of technology in Ottawa. Here you have students drawn from across the 11 counties of eastern Ontario. They simply cannot go home, they have to be in Ottawa, they might as well be 500 miles from home as the 50, 60, 70 or up to 100 miles that they may be away. I am told that until there is more extensive development of student co-operative facilities or some other kind of facility at the student level, this poses a very serious hardship on those who happen to come from outside the city of Ottawa itself, beyond commuting distance. So my questions are really: What is the government policy on boarding allowances? What is its policy on assistance for construction of residences in the new post-secondary development, not only in northern Ontario but some sections of the south?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of policy at the moment, and as I stated in my statement on the colleges of applied arts and technology, we envisage them as being commuter-type institutions. While I think the figure that is mentioned in the presidents' brief is high, actually, if you were to encircle the existing university, say, with a radius of 40 miles—which is I think within commuting distance, certainly secondary students are travelling this far for their classes—you would cover a very major portion of the population here in southern Ontario. There is no question about this. I would think, as the colleges of applied arts and technology are established, that in southern Ontario we would like to do it without establishing residential facilities.

At the Lethbridge junior college, for instance, they are commuting 40 miles even to this post-secondary institution, in order to attend school.

Mr. MacDonald: Do they supply buses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, they have to do this on their own.

Mr. MacDonald: This is a pretty major factor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right. Now, in dealing with the question in Northern Ontario we are in the process of actually entering into a scheme at Kirkland Lake to have residential facilities perhaps available there for the students and I would anticipate this might extend as far as other establishments in the remote sections of the province. The question of Ottawa has not been raised with us, quite frankly, as to whether more students might attend if there were residential accommodation. This we would have to assess, but I think the hon. member will appreciate that it is a very expensive programme to get into—providing facilities—if it is at all possible for the students to commute. We would like to encourage this type of development, and place the colleges where they can attend.

As to the possibility that the present rates of allowances for students be raised, I think they were anticipating something that maybe was not in the last federal budget. I do not know. I am not familiar with it. There is certainly no plan here at this stage because we do have the assistance in the form of bursary scholarships and perhaps the Canada student loans really would be adequate for many of the students who are moving into the urban centres. As I say, I am not familiar with what they were thinking about.

Mr. MacDonald: While I examined it carefully, it gives no indication from where they are expected.

Hon. Mr. Davis: From where they are expected? I do not know either.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, the responsibility of the hon. Minister's department to keep the courses in our technological and trade training schools right up to date, is, of course, very great. I can remember hearing discussion in this House some time ago as to the fact that some of the old trades such as woodworking would no longer be emphasized and that trades training right up to date would be the goal. In this connection I would like to draw to the

attention of the House the report of a speech made by the chairman of the Canadian furniture manufacturers' association at a convention recently held in Toronto. I will not read very much of it but he states specifically that 400 trained people are required now in Ontario alone and more will be by the end of the year. This deals with the requirements of the woodworking trade itself, particularly in the furniture construction business. His claim is that the industry is being retarded by the lack of adequately trained people who will work in these factories.

The furniture construction business is of some special importance in Ontario. It uses one of our native products, wood, and not only that but it is not a type that can be automated on a grand style. It provides small industries that are readily set up in parts of this province outside of the Metropolitan Toronto area. His comment along these lines indicates that in his view the lack of planning is a disgrace and I quote him on this. In his advice to the educational authorities, he says, and I quote: "Stop yakking and get going."

Although a great deal of research has been undertaken as far as the hon. Minister is concerned, perhaps the direct channels of communication between the industries of the province and those who set up the curriculum are something less than clear and the hon. Minister should take steps to see that the provisions required by our own industries are met. Woodworking is one, the needle trades are apparently another. There has been some considerable discussion about importing labour to fill these needs. I wonder just what the clear channels of direct contact are. We are delighted to hear the hon. Minister say considerable research is being undertaken by his department and The Department of Labour, but naturally even ahead of that come the direct and immediate requirements.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, there are programmes going on in the needle trade. Dealing with the furniture programme, there have been sessions with the furniture manufacturers' association and they have suggested to us that we establish shops within our high schools in the Kitchener area, where the high school students would be asked to specialize in specific skills. This departs, quite frankly, from the basic principle we are attempting to maintain and the one that we have been discussing here this morning of keeping the programme in high schools as broad as we can.

We have suggested that we establish the technicians' course for the woodworking

people within the institutes of technology at a vocational centre, because, as I gather it, furniture-making today is becoming a fairly technical operation and it is the technician who is required. I would envisage that this type of course would be developed.

We do hesitate to introduce into the high school in this one specific area a specific highly specialized course. While we are very sympathetic to the needs of the industry, perhaps this would be more adequately done, say, in night school accommodation or in some other approach. But we hesitate to do this as part of the regular school programme. This might perhaps be unwise.

Mr. Nixon: I would not for a moment suggest that anything be done to take away from a basic education that is as broad as possible, particularly in our high schools. One of the main criticisms that we have of the proposed colleges of applied arts and technology is that we do not feel the hon. Minister has taken proper cognizance of the importance of this broad education but, it seems to me that with the number of special programmes that are available it is not unreasonable to expect that the needs of this particular industry could be met and could be met rather readily. We know the drawbacks of the operation of programme 5 in many areas, but there does not seem to be a suitable programme that will give them good jobs when they graduate and this accounts for the large percentage of drop-outs from the programme 5 area. While I am in this area, I wonder if the hon. Minister could give us again specific statistics relating to the drop-out rate in programme 5 effort.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, as of the month of March, the completions, or at least the discontinued, were roughly 753; there were 3,062 additions; initially there were 8,149 in the course. This would mean that the drop-out rate would be roughly about 20 per cent—20 or 25—and what we hope to determine in the surveys that are being conducted now with the assistance of The Department of Labour is specifically why they are dropping out.

We think from the information we have had to date they are finding jobs. This is really why they are leaving the course. I would say close to 75 per cent—perhaps 70 per cent—of the trainees do complete the course, and, as I said yesterday, in the neighbourhood of 90 per cent—85 to 90—have been finding jobs when they have completed their training.

We are anxious to find out exactly why

they are leaving the course, whether it is too difficult, whether they just lose interest; we think it is primarily because they have found some suitable employment.

Mr. Nixon: I would agree with the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it is an outstandingly important project that we know precisely why they do leave the programme 5 courses.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is what we are trying to find out.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly the amendment of these courses should be fairly easy. The hon. Minister has said time and time again that they should be kept flexible, that they can provide immediate training as needs come up, and this of course would be impossible unless we knew the reason we were losing such a large number of the people concerned.

Before we leave this vote, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the federal government accepts any responsibility other than the financial responsibility with the research and the general overseeing of the courses.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they assume, of course, 50 per cent of the cost, and I would be very frank, Mr. Chairman, and say they have been very helpful as far as advice is concerned with regard to requirements for courses. We have had very excellent co-operation with the federal authorities. There is no question about this, whatsoever.

Mr. Nixon: And the present programme is going to extend indefinitely, as far as the federal contributions are concerned, both in this area and in the development of vocational schools across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Chairman, we are not sure about this. We had a meeting of the Ministers of Education a week ago Tuesday here in Toronto, and this is one subject that we asked be discussed. We have unanimously agreed to request the federal government to give some indication as to whether the agreement would be extended beyond March 31, 1967. We have no indications of this at the moment, and, of course, for our own planning we think it is important that we know very shortly.

Mr. Nixon: And they, of course, up to that time, will pay 50 per cent of the cost of all construction associated with this and the equipping of the schools?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: What responsibilities are taken for maintenance? Is there any federal responsibility there?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a current operating grant of 50 per cent at the post-secondary level for the high schools. Our grant is on a per-capita basis and I think last year it amounted to some \$800,000 or \$900,000. I made representations—I thought that they were fairly strong representations—that the federal government should assume in this programme 1, 50 per cent of the excess. Now the resolution from the Ministers just said all the excess—I suggested 50 per cent of the excess of the cost of vocational over academic training, which might have cost, roughly, \$100 per student. To date, we have had no reaction to this request.

Mr. Nixon: I will not pursue this much farther, but I would say that if the arrangement is definite into 1967, this is not an unreasonable planning date.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is really very short, Mr. Chairman, when you realize that by the time you initiate a programme, plans and construction—we are talking now of less than two years so it is still really a relatively short period of time. I think we have to have an indication from Ottawa fairly soon, in order to do our planning intelligently for 1967 and 1968. You see, we could be caught in the middle of a building situation.

Mr. Nixon: It is almost like what the universities had to put up with here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, they had guarantees of minimum.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister the status of the new Western Ontario institute of technology in the Windsor area. I would like to know if tenders have been let, when construction can be expected to start and when the completion and the actual use of the school can be expected.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the last two questions. I can tell the hon. member that the property has been acquired and the architect has been retained and is currently preparing to get the plans. The moment we have these we will be very pleased to communicate the information to the hon. member, but it has proceeded this far and we think we are making very substantial progress.

Mr. Newman: What is the progress that has been made to date? Can we expect the

institution to be in full operation by September of 1966?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I would think, Mr. Chairman, being very practical about it, that no matter how rapidly the architect and the contractor were to move, we should consider September, 1967, as the date for occupancy. This was our target date for it and whether this can be accomplished, I do not know, but it will not be by September, 1966. This is going to be a fairly large building.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, that is putting it off another year; we understood it would be ready for occupancy by September, 1966. We will probably find next year when we come in this House, it will be put off another year after that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: I would like at this time to commend the hon. Minister's department on one thing, and that is programme 5 in my own community. One year ago I asked that courses be set up for sewing because of the new General Motors plant that was coming in. They immediately set up a programme for sewing and it has been extremely successful. The General Motors plan is not yet in operation but they anticipated the need and they have fairly well met the need.

Likewise, there was a great demand for home care, and home care courses have been set up and are in operation and the individuals taking the course will have no difficulty in obtaining employment.

Vote 509 agreed to.

On vote 510:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the youth branch, I feel that the hon. Minister should give us some fuller explanation of what this branch is doing. It may be that they are waiting for the full report of the youth committee, but specifically I would like him to give his views on the possibility of some sort of employment service that might be set up in this branch that would co-ordinate the efforts of the government of Ontario to provide jobs for our young students and at the same time, give them an opportunity to accept some responsibility for community services.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I made very careful note of the hon. member's suggestion during The Department of University Affairs debate and I think, quite frankly, that this would be a very difficult

problem to solve at the secondary level. We are presently exploring whether we might do something, say, at the university level for this group of students. It is a pretty complex and complicated situation and for secondary students, it may be impossible, but we are giving the matter some study.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that while we are interested—and I think the report of the youth committee will be very helpful to the youth branch, nonetheless, we are proceeding as I outlined in my introductory remarks. Mr. Thomas has now been appointed the director. We are seeking specialists in the fields of sociology, economics and education. Dr. F. A. Nizami has been employed as a research officer in the field of education. We have 15 or so applicants for the other two positions; they have now been screened to five and Mr. Thomas is now interviewing these people. This, as the hon. members know, is primarily a broad general research section for the problems of these young people who left the school system at too early an age. We have had, I think, very excellent results from Dr. Koerber's initial year's work. I think that he has established certain ground rules that will be very helpful to this new branch and I would be in a position, I would hope, next session, to be more explicit as to their accomplishments.

They have instituted a number of studies; there are no results from these yet. The only thing I can observe from my own observation, is that the more you dig into the problem of young people in this area, the more complicated and complex it becomes. I could go on with this subject for some time, because I think it is going to become one of the major concerns. Whether it is the responsibility of The Department of Education, I am not prepared to assess, but I think it is someone's responsibility and this is why we have entered the field.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister mentioned in his introductory remarks—which I thought were amazingly brief on this important topic—the fact that the branch has been set up 18 months now and has been in operation about a year. The operation has been somewhat disappointing. It may be that there has been nothing said about it, but here is a branch dealing with youth specifically. I do not know what they are doing except hiring three more research people. Nothing has been said, for example, about the 9,000 young people who drop out of our school system before the legal leaving age, and I think that is quite a significant

statistic, that the youth committee brought to our attention, that this many people leave the system before they become 16. I do not know what the youth branch is doing. We are offering them only \$75,000—perhaps it should be more—the branch does not seem to warrant its inclusion at this high level, at this time, unless there are some results.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the branch has been in operation for a year. I have looked at what is happening in most other jurisdictions and this is not being done, as we understand it, by departments of education elsewhere. It is a programme that we are establishing here because we are very concerned that we do not have the answers. Obviously, if we had the answers, we would have the programme.

This is primarily research in an effort to relate the activities of many voluntary agencies that are presently in the field. There are many groups doing quite commendable work at the present time and we are hoping to relate their activities so that there will be no useless duplication. We have had meetings with the social planning council here in Toronto—their committee on unreached youth—and I think that out of this will come, I hope some form of programme of policy, but I do emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very broad area. It is one that is extremely difficult to come to grips with and there is no point in my minimizing it.

Mr. Nixon: What about the drop-outs under age 16? How do they get out of school in such large numbers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, some of them leave to go to employment; some of them are in the rural areas and as the hon. member knows, they leave on letters of permission to go to work on the farm and I cannot tell you specifically why they all leave. This is really what we are attempting to find out.

Mr. Nixon: So this is specifically something we should know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes, this is one of the areas that we are attempting to delineate, as every other jurisdiction is attempting to delineate it at the present time. Why do young people leave? Obviously if they are having difficulty academically, this is one reason; but we think that there are social problems involved that go beyond the academic difficulties.

Mr. Nixon: We will look for a full report of the branch next year.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Vote 510 agreed to.

On vote 511:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, this is the vote where the province should be co-operating with the federal authorities in setting up a little more of its fitness programme than they have in the past. In the 1962-63 budget as set out by the federal authorities, Ontario's allocation was \$38,898, and in that year Ontario spent only \$12,510. In the following year, 1963-64, Ontario's allocation was \$233,000, yet Ontario took advantage of only \$86,000 of this. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, why has Ontario been so backward in taking advantage of the funds allocated to it by the federal authorities? It certainly should have been able to use them to some advantage, and I will suggest to the hon. Minister several advantages to which they could be put. Just yesterday the original group that composed the Ontario physical fitness study committee met with the select committee on youth and one of the recommendations that they did make to promote closer liaison with the national advisory council on fitness and amateur sport was that Ontario set up a similar advisory body to take full advantage of the federal moneys available. Were this done, I assume that a lot of the organizations that are asking for grants under miscellaneous grants probably could have received these grants by this authority rather than from vote 515.

I would like at the same time to suggest to the hon. Minister that under this fitness programme that he promote a provincial type of Olympic competition, just as we would have national championships. He could promote a sort of provincial Olympic competition, a full-scale one, so that the youngsters in our schools and beyond school age would have the advantage of knowing what big-time competition is like, and likewise, under this, provide funds for provincial coaching clinics.

I know the hon. Minister will say he does have certain types of clinics, but last year I had to press the case most vigorously to convince him that the clinic as conducted in the city of Windsor was one that was worthy of financial assistance. I think one like that should have been able to come under this vote, and the hon. Minister, looking into it, would have had no hesitancy at all in giving these clinics some type of financial aid.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into this at great length. Actually,

while the federal government may set aside certain funds, they pay 60 per cent of what we spend. In other words, we have to make the expenditure. It is not quite as generous as one might think. It is not a case of the federal government saying, "We have \$100,000 for you, you spend it." We have to spend a certain percentage before we are reimbursed, and our approach has been—and I think it is a valid approach, Mr. Chairman—that we want to spend the money in order to develop a situation of participation in a broad way as far as fitness is concerned rather than in specialized athletes. There are some who will argue, and I had difficulty accepting this myself, whether we should be using funds just to develop Olympic athletes. I think we should be using funds to develop a community programme for recreation, and, of course, we are using these funds now to help finance the courses at Guelph for recreation instructors.

This is part of the funds that we are using, and as the hon. member knows, we have been using funds for coaches' clinics that relate to the broad aspect of a sport, rather than for particular individual situations to assist individual athletes. There may be some debate as to this approach but I think if we are interested in the general physical fitness of the population, not in specific individuals who wish to perform, say, in the Olympics or in the Pan-Am games, or what have you, that this is the proper approach. Maybe there should be some provision.

I notice that on occasion the Minister of National Health and Welfare has indicated that maybe we should be taking some interest as a nation in Olympic participation, and I do not think it would be proper for me to comment on whether this is wise or unwise. But I think as a province, where our concern must be for the great bulk of the people, that the approach we are taking is perhaps a sound one. One might argue that we should be doing more of it, Mr. Chairman, there is no question about this, but I do hesitate on a question of providing funds for specific individuals who might become, as I say, Olympic or Pan-Am performers.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to promote any type of individual sport, but I think the higher the pinnacle you have, the greater the base you will have of athletes interested in eventually reaching that pinnacle.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have an item that conceivably should have come

under another estimate, but it has some association with physical fitness. There is in Ontario an organization called the Ontario arenas association that was founded in 1947. In 1962 it presented a brief to the hon. Minister and since the select committee on municipal affairs was in operation this was used once again by the government as an excuse for not coming to grips with the representations.

In brief, what the association is seeking is an upgrading of the standards and of the skills of its personnel. Indeed, rather briefly, again in 1963 it presented something to this department in which it listed its requests as fourfold: (1) That the training programme carried on for arena personnel in the field at Ontario agricultural college be recognized by The Department of Education; (2) That the existing OAC certificate be approved by the department; (3) That the present programme be carried on for a time to be agreed upon, and the training kept up to date until the present personnel had had a proper opportunity to qualify; (4) That a grant system, similar in operation to that used for municipal recreation committees be set up for the community centres, boards, or arena commissions, properly set up by councils or municipalities.

The last time this association was in touch with the hon. Minister was in September, 1964, when once again the hon. Minister said that this was under consideration by the select committee and that he was awaiting its report. He now has its report. Can the hon. Minister give us some idea of when the department might be able to come to grips with these proposals, because they seem to me to be worthy ones?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the hon. member that while the last official representation was made in September, the president of this association happens to be a constituent of mine so that I have it brought to my attention rather regularly. We hope to have some resolution through this that will be, we think, satisfactory or close to it, some time during the summer or the early fall.

Vote 511 agreed to.

Vote 512 agreed to.

On vote 513:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a comment about scholarship and scholarships and what I have to say does not even call for an answer from the hon. Minister. I am not going to ask him

any questions, I am going to express my own opinions on the state of scholarship and scholarships in this country.

I might say *en passant* that it is pleasurable to watch these estimates and see some of the significant differences in the presentation of these estimates from others. One marks especially the total absence of the device, the well-known and well-used device, that when the Minister of a department gets into trouble all he has to do is say, "We are acting for all of the people of Ontario," and everybody bangs their desks and that bails him out. One notes an absence of this in the presentation of these estimates.

What I have to say, as I said, will not call for an answer from the hon. Minister, but I have the comfort of knowing that he will be one of the very few people on the Treasury benches who will appreciate the significance of what I have to say in this regard.

My point of departure is the announcement by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) of the appointment of the members of the Ontario advisory council.

I think, sir, there were some ten or a dozen people appointed to that very august body and in respect of two of them he informed the House that they were Rhodes scholars. Of course, one notes that that announcement was intended to impress; we were supposed to be impressed by the standard of achievement of Rhodes scholarship of two of these people and the prestige that surrounded that attainment. I was one of the few people who were not impressed by that. I would have been equally impressed had the hon. Prime Minister said that each of the two individuals was president of the local numismatic society or that they were chairmen of the United Appeal fund. I object to the prestige given to Rhodes scholarships and the absence of a similar prestige for purely Canadian scholarship on two grounds.

One, and perhaps the more important, is that a Rhodes scholarship in my view is not to be any longer surrounded by prestige, because of the fact that it is not Canadian. It is foreign. I would much prefer to see some evidence in this department that the administrators of The Department of Education were willing to proclaim to all Canadians and indeed to all the world that we have established through blood, sweat and tears, the high standard of scholarship within our own country, and indeed within our own province.

The second ground, and I am going to develop that a little later—each of them—the

second ground on which I object to the giving of high prestige, and really it is the highest prestige given to any type of scholar, is that the Rhodes scholarship is associated with an age that has passed. It is true of every age in the history of mankind that it leaves legacies that other ages strive, during the lifetimes of the individuals that live in any particular interstice between the two eternities, to erase.

That is true of the age of Cecil Rhodes. Cecil Rhodes was an empire builder, and as such, in the days when empires are either passed or are passing, Cecil Rhodes and his legacy is no longer identified with the current thoughts of mankind. Indeed, Cecil Rhodes as an empire builder in Africa left a trail of misery; the establishment of an empire in Africa left a trail of misery that those at present living are striving very likely to erase and to correct.

I would rather that, in accordance with the current opinions of mankind, we associated scholastic achievement and intellectual intelligence with those people that the hon. Minister of Education himself calls the agents of progress. That is his phrase: the agents of progress. And in our own history one seldom hears much about the great men in many fields who very aptly and very roundly suit that phrase—the agents of progress.

For example, one does not hear of scholarships in Canada that are associated with Sir William Osler. There may be scholarships associated with his name but if a man were to win a scholarship named after Sir William Osler, and commemorative of the great legacy that he left to mankind, it would not receive the prestige that was inherent in the Prime Minister's words when he announced that two of his advisory council were Rhodes scholars.

One does not hear in the field of medicine of any scholarships associated with the famous Sir Alexander Fleming. There may be scholarships associated with Sir Frederick Banting, and with Best. Certainly we commemorate them, but we Canadians are always inclined to denigrate and to play down the achievements that we have reached in this country.

I know that our standards of education are very high—how do I know it? All I have to do is to look south of the border in order to see the willingness with which our American friends, many of whom are from Missouri, accept the graduates of our institutions; they take them with open arms. So our standards of education in this country must be very high if the Americans do not require a special passport to admit people of intellectual

achievement and who have accumulated a great store of knowledge.

One has only to think of some of the names of people who have found their mark in American life, the long-time president of Stamford University was a Canadian. The long-time dean of Yale theological seminary was a Canadian. In more contemporary terms, when several hundred engineers were laid off at the Avro plant in the Minister of Education's own riding, they got ready acceptance in the state of California. They did not have to pass any special examination in order to be welcomed into plants in California.

In that way we Canadians, of course, have been subsidizing American education for maybe a decade. Our taxes go to pay for the education of people in the arts, the crafts, the sciences, in the realm of technology, in order to be swept into the giant American economy.

In the same sense the most important product or citizen of London in the bush is not John Parmenter Roberts. He has not yet, attained, though he may some day attain, the achievement of contribution to society that the other citizen Charles Edward Saunders has achieved.

Now there may be some—the odd one or two—that would ask who is Charles Edward Saunders? Well, Charles Edward Saunders grew up in London in the bush and went on to become a very excellent agronomist and the hon. Minister of Education knows he was the inventor, the creator or the developer of the Marquis wheat which—in its rust-free characteristic—enabled our prairie to become one of the greatest bread baskets of the world.

So my complaint is that we have a government here that never seems to have any tendency to stimulate our people along the way of putting aside some of their inferiority complex, so that we Canadians may become a little more extrovert; so that we are willing to stand up on occasion and exclaim about our achievements and we do not have to fortify ourselves with C2H5OH before standing up and bragging a bit about some of the things that we have created in this country.

Having set up that, hastily I go on to say that I am not postulating a straw man because I have the contrast of the activity of the government in establishing a trust to preserve the grave of Sir John Graves Simcoe. I looked at that statute, maybe it is a worthy project, but it made me laugh for two reasons. The people who are the initiators of that, and it has educational features, it seems to me are directed toward the preservation of old bones and dry guts, rather than a healthy and

salutary development that more nearly reflects the current opinion of our people and particularly our young people.

Again I say in passing, with respect to Sir John Graves Simcoe, I wonder how many will vote for the bill if they happen to own William Renwick Riddell's "Life of Sir John Graves Simcoe" and not owning it, how many have read it? There may be some that would not even know what century he lived in.

But that is my complaint and in saying those things in respect of our educational achievements there is an opportunity for me to express opinions on the floor of this Legislature that are in accordance with the trend of popular thought. It just does not get expressed, or does not get expressed enough.

I would like to see the creation of the very epitome of intellectual effort in the form of a Canada scholar. That is a good term: a Canada scholar, whereby we would offer to people from other provinces the opportunity to study in some of the fields of human thought and research in which we in Ontario are the leaders.

What are some of the things in which we are the leaders? Well, I was surveying the resources from my own memory in respect to that, but I am told that we are the leaders in the development of the electron microscope. Indeed the developer of that aid to scientific research, is from the home town of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Gordon).

We have here, not too far away, down the street, what I am told is one of the leading hospitals in the world for pediatrics. I am told that people come from all over the world to the Toronto hospital for sick children, to study the methods that we have developed in the treatment of diseases of children.

I would like to see some scholarships established for people from other provinces, and for some of our own people in Ontario; indeed scholarships for people from other lands, to come and make use of some of the benefits of our own creation. That again is in the sense of declaiming those things which are Canadian.

I am told that at the University of Toronto, next door to us, that we are among the leaders of research among the nations of the world in the field of sub-zero physics. Certainly in the field of cardiovascular surgery, one hears that the techniques that have been developed in this very city are among the most progressive yet achieved by the medical profession. Dr. Selye down in Montreal, has done original work on the effects of stress and strain on the cardiovascular system.

Not only in the field of medicine, but in other fields we find achievements of things Canadian. Recently we have seen emerge a very fine coterie of scholarly historians. Until the last 10 or 15 years we did not have a historian in this country really worthy of note. We had historians who were writing textbooks suitable for the elementary schools and perhaps the secondary schools, but in the last 10 or 15 years a band of historians have emerged who are unparalleled in their excellence, writing about things Canadian, about Canadian history.

An hon. member: What are their names?

Mr. Sopha: Careless and Creighton, of the University of Toronto, Morton of the University of Manitoba, Thompson of the University of British Columbia. And yet, in spite of all those achievements, and the availability of men of learning to teach our young people, we have the hon. Prime Minister of the province get up and as one of the visas to win the acceptance of people on the Ontario advisory council, he still goes to a foreign land. He says "These people are Rhodes scholars." I am not impressed any longer. That might have been suitable for the last years of the 19th century—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I contend that this is completely in accordance with vote 513 and I do not particularly enjoy the Chairman looking at me as if I am out of order.

Mr. Chairman: Wait a minute now, I want to say a word. We have allowed a great deal of latitude this morning and I think the member is going far afield as far as this particular vote is concerned.

Mr. Sopha: It just seems to me that lately I am accused of going far afield. This vote is concerned with scholarships and bursaries and we are voting \$2,300,000 for scholarships. My point is that it is high time in this country that we gave some scholarships to our own people for study in this country, in order to proclaim the achievements that we have made in the field of human knowledge.

I have lost my train of thought but I had a book that I wanted to refer to, Mr. Chairman, in respect of the—and I will leave this point of the Rhodes scholarship, the prestige of which I object to. I hope that it will soon disappear just as the memory of Rhodes himself has receded into antiquity. It is interesting to note that one of the last great trouble spots of Africa, Southern Rhodesia, is the state established by Cecil Rhodes. He

left there a legacy which the British government, indeed all mankind, is very anxiously trying to correct.

But let me put in the record in respect of the colonials—you see how much that is out of date, when the hon. Prime Minister says "So-and-so is a Rhodes scholar"—in respect of the colonials, here were the stipulations of Cecil Rhodes:

I consider that the education of young colonists—

I suppose that is us:

—at one of the universities in the United Kingdom—

Mr. MacDonald: Do not be so self-conscious.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Let me start it again:

I consider that the education of young colonists at one of the universities in the United Kingdom is of great advantage to them for giving breadth to their views, for their instruction in life and manners and for instilling into their minds the advantage to the colonies as well as to the United Kingdom of the retention of the unity of the Empire.

Now, could anything be more out of joint in 1965 than that concept, when indeed, the Empire itself has disappeared and has been replaced by an association of equal nations which joined together on principles of dignity and honour?

In my view and in accordance with my plea for the establishment of scholarship and intellectual achievement in connection with things we have established and created here in Canada, those things purely Canadian in the field of intellectual endeavour, I say that the only legitimate aristocracy, the only really legitimate aristocracy is the aristocracy of intellect. I am sure the hon. Minister of Education would agree with that, it is the only worthy one, based purely upon ability and intellectual achievement. The Rhodes scholarship, I show, by way of contrast, provides an aristocracy in virtue of the fact of having won it.

When a person has won a Rhodes scholarship, as long as the hon. Prime Minister comes in here and blandly announces it in the way he did, it provides a false aristocracy that is something far short of proof of achievement in the field of intellect.

So this Friday morning, Mr. Chairman, I will not be too prolix in my remarks, I would like to see The Department of Education in this—

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hills): I said it is a frosty Friday.

Mr. Sopha: Oh. Well, I always enjoy the interpolations of the hon. member for Forest Hill, they are usually intelligent and he is a man worth listening to, if his comments are helpful.

My plea in short to the hon. Minister of Education—and I say again he does not even have to reply—is that I would like to see some development in this department for the granting of marks of achievement to Canadians in respect of things Canadian, where we in some respects are ahead of the rest of mankind. In doing that we do a great deal toward the development of a national consciousness, which is particularly important as we approach this our centennial year.

Let me say in closing, that one of the most significant things about our Centennial year will be in this realm—I hope in that year of national orgy of celebration, 1967, I hope that it is not just a case of a landscape being filled with politicians, who will be proclaiming the glories of the past and the expectation of future greatness of this country, but that we Canadians during that year, whether through our exposition or otherwise, will be demonstrating to the world those things in which we are different. I do not think that can be emphasized too much. It ought to be a year when we put aside some of this national inferiority complex and stand up and dig our heels into the rug and look the rest of mankind, and particularly our friends in the United States, in the eye, and we say to them, "In the 100 years of our nationhood these are some of the things that we have done in the northern half of this continent. Here are some of the things that we have achieved. Here are some of the reasons that we ought to be allowed to join the great company of mankind that may properly, in the words of the Minister of Education, be described as being agents of progress."

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am constantly fascinated with the capacity of some Liberal spokesmen to fight the battles that have been won and to miss the battles that need to be fought. I am not impressed with the fact that the hon. member for Sudbury is not impressed with the Rhodes scholarship.

Mr. Sopha: Well, who cares?

Mr. MacDonald: I agree, I agree.

Mr. Sopha: Am I supposed to hide in a corner because the hon. member is not impressed?

Mr. MacDonald: I invite the hon. member to engage in a crusade to free this nation of all Guggenheim fellowships, all contributions from the Rockefeller fund, all contributions from the Carnegie fund, because undoubtedly they are symbols attached to the bygone age.

However, let us get down to the graduate scholarships of today.

I have a question I would like to put to the hon. Minister. This is a new and a very commendable move that the government made and it was designed primarily to cope with the desperate need for teachers at the university level. It has been represented to me by people who are involved in this post-graduate work that the limits that have been fixed are going to work crippling effects on those who are seeking to complete their work in the short time that the hon. Minister had in mind, so that we may find the proper university teachers required in our current expansion programme.

For example, the limits are \$1,500 during the year and \$500 for the summer period; a maximum of \$4,500 during the three-year period. Now if you expect the person to spend all his time in this post-graduate work—which is really what happens, because in the summertime they have to pursue courses and theses and sometimes field work and in the winter time their teaching load is restricted to three hours a week because this has been laid down by the school of graduate studies in order that they must focus their attention almost completely on their studies—there is very little opportunity to earn any other money. So in effect, the hon. Minister is demanding that they have resources beyond this amount. It results in heavy borrowing, and things of that nature.

I wonder if the hon. Minister might comment on whether or not, in the operation of the scholarships, insofar as he has been able to assess it at this point, this ceiling is working the kind of difficulty that has been at least put to me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this was discussed very briefly; it comes under The Department of University Affairs. This does not include the graduate fellowships that comes under university; but I would reply in any event, because it is an area in which we are interested.

I think it is too early to tell. There is some concern that it may work some hardship. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned about getting students with their MA so that they can move into the university teaching community as rapidly as possible. We have had some discussions with

the dean of the graduate school at the University of Toronto some three or four months ago to arrange an evaluation to see just whether this will impose any real hardship. It may be, particularly in the area of the PhD work, that we may have some difficulty; we are going to be having further discussions with the universities on this subject over the summer.

We think the programme has been very effective from a number of standpoints to date, but as I explained during The Department of University Affairs estimates, we cannot tell yet what percentage of the students will remain at the universities. That is, of course, the prime purpose of the exercise and we do not know at this point whether we will accomplish this or not, but we are keeping an eye on this problem, Mr. Chairman.

As I say, it really relates to The Department of University Affairs, but I thought the hon. member would be interested in this information.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, if one recovers from the curmudgeonly attitude of the hon. member for York South, based upon the articulated major premise that only what he says is important, may I ask the hon. Minister—

Mr. Bryden: You are working hard to prove that premise right now.

Mr. Sopha: No; having brawled with your hon. leader, I do not want to get into an argument with the juniors.

May I ask the hon. Minister, in respect of the letter I wrote him a year or so ago about the boy, the young man, who had achieved a remarkable standing, especially in the sciences, and had been granted an Ontario scholarship. The department deducted from the bursaries he got from the universities, the amount over \$1,000? Is the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is the policy. It is one that is of course under review at all times, but I have to be very frank that we think there should be a limitation on the amount of money that one student receives from the provincial or the federal-provincial bursaries and scholarships. This limitation has been a policy. It does not take away from his academic achievements, it just means that the funds are spread, we hope, over perhaps a broader base.

Mr. Sopha: If the hon. Minister will permit me as I delineate a little more clearly, the boy was—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say this, Mr. Chairman, I would want to add this: I believe we raised the limit, I am not sure if it is \$100 or \$200, so that they can go up to, I believe it is, \$1,200 now instead of \$1,000. I am not sure of this figure, but it has been raised.

Mr. Sopha: Well, this boy, I am happy to say a resident of my own community, had achieved amazingly high standards, particularly in the sciences in his grade 13 examinations. If my memory serves me correctly, I think he had got an average of 87 per cent in nine papers, and accordingly he was automatically an Ontario scholar.

He came from a very poor family, in fact his mother was a charwoman. She worked very hard to provide the necessities for the family and keep this boy in school. He received offers from three or four universities to come and study with them, three or four universities in Ontario. I did not know this before but apparently universities, and I do not see why they should not, want to attract people of exceptional abilities so that at some later time they will be able to say that so-and-so graduated from our university.

I think the rule was at that time, and I thought it was very oppressive, that any grants over \$1,000 that he got from the university which he selected, which was eventually Queen's, would be deducted. Any amount in excess of \$1,000 would be deducted from the \$500 that he was to get.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Now the hon. Minister tells me it has been raised to \$700 or \$800?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes. I cannot tell the hon. member whether it was \$700, but it has been raised.

Mr. Sopha: I am happy to hear that but I think—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question concerning the control that the province has over the availability of federal backing for student loans.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, we are the agents for the federal government with respect to the Canada student loans.

Mr. Nixon: Would the hon. Minister like me to ask the question first?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sorry; yes.

Mr. Nixon: Specifically, are these available only when the student is attending university or government-sponsored trade schools, or would they perhaps be available to a student who wanted to go to a privately owned institution that had a full year course? Specifically, some of the business schools, privately owned business schools, have brought this to the hon. Minister's attention and to our attention. I was wondering if it would be possible to have a programme that would permit these people to borrow or to get a loan backed by the government for this purpose.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I think this matter has been resolved and I think the private schools can anticipate the loans will be extended. It causes us problems, quite frankly, in that we do not really inspect or supervise these private trade schools to any substantial degree. But the Canada student loans—and I expect we will be announcing this fairly shortly, it is just in the final stages of negotiation—will probably be extended to the private trade schools.

Mr. Nixon: It is interesting that the hon. Minister mentioned that the province does not inspect these schools. I understand that when one of the trade schools under the direction of the hon. Minister wanted a secretary for their office they phoned up the Shaw school and asked them if they had anybody available.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They operate a very good school.

Vote 513 agreed to.

On vote 514:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is necessary to agree to this one immediately since it involves about \$350 million.

I am not going to talk at any great length about it. I will say that I have for some substantial time been puzzling over the foundation tax plan. I think I even understand it, and if that is true I think I probably qualify now to take a crack at Einstein's theory. It also appears to me to be a good plan. There obviously has been an extremely good effort to apply principles of equity to an extremely complex situation.

There is, however, one phase on which I would like to seek a little further information and that relates to the corporation tax adjustment grant. Now essentially, as I understand it, that is a piece of symbolism. It does not, for most school boards, make any significant difference in the amount of money they get,

because if there were not the corporation tax adjustment grant they would get the money through the foundation plan anyway.

I think that is essentially true, but as far as I can see it is not entirely true. It is not true if the corporation tax adjustment grant is larger than what a board would, in any case, have got under the equalization grant in the absence of the corporation tax adjustment grant. If that is so, it seems to me that this creates an element of—I was going to say discrimination, but I will put it this way: It favours the wealthier boards and I am wondering what analysis shows on this.

For example, the Metropolitan Toronto separate school board: How does it come off under the total programme as compared to some of the other school boards? I have heard it said that although it did not used to be considered to be in a preferred position, it is getting to be, relatively speaking, one of the wealthy school boards, especially as compared with other separate school boards in the province. Now, I am not suggesting that any school board grant should be reduced. I think that all boards can all make good use of any money they get, but on the other hand, I think it would be unfortunate if, through a piece of symbolism, the government, in fact, was giving a larger benefit to those who needed it least. It is my impression that that may be an effect of this corporation tax adjustment grant. I do not know if the hon. Minister has any comments to make on that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that there is no intent, of course, to do this, and we doubt that this is, in fact, happening. There may be some areas where there is a high percentage of corporation tax, where they are benefiting from this facet of the grant plan and in the lower assessed areas they get these grants under the regular foundation scheme. I think one could say, generally, that the urban separate school boards have received a higher percentage increase in grants than the rural separate school boards, but, as the hon. member I am sure realizes, the rural separate school boards were not having the same difficulty under the prior grant situation as the urban boards were experiencing.

Now we cannot give you specific evaluations yet. We may be able to in the next three or four months, but we think, generally speaking, it has been an equitable way of distributing the money to both the public and separate school systems. I do not think that symbolism—as the hon. member calls it—really is giving more than it should to the

urban boards and we do not think that these rural separate school boards, which really were not in bad shape prior to the plan, have been adversely affected in any way. This is the reaction we have had to date. We were concerned about this aspect and I would be very pleased to have the hon. member discuss this as length with Mr. Rideout or Dr. Jackson who were very helpful in the development of this plan, but I think the figures will show this to be the case.

Mr. Bryden: There is one thing I want to make clear, Mr. Chairman. I certainly am not implying that any board is getting more than it should. But I am concerned that some boards may not be getting as much as they should.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister expect to take any action on the recommendations in the auditor's report this year, on page 19, calling for a special study of simplification of the grant system?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the auditor, we would like to simplify—and I think he was referring, perhaps, to internal procedures which we are always anxious to simplify. After discussions with Dr. Jackson and his officials, we questioned just how we can accommodate the auditor. It is not easy to simplify the grant situation.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does he not challenge him to it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was going to suggest this, but I do not think he will.

Mr. Nixon: I do not know whether it is just the internal business of the department or not, but is the object of such a study to determine, if possible, a more simplified grant system so as to permit a ready comprehension by school boards and other interested persons like the provincial auditor of the procedures and calculations involved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It would be highly desirable, but very hard to achieve.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of items related to boards that I assume might be dealt with through grants and, indeed, I do not know how one is going to cope with this situation if the government does not use its control of grants to correct the situation in the municipalities.

The first one is with respect to a situation that I have raised with the hon. Minister privately. I received a memo from his office

today. This concerns the local difficulties with regard to the proposed new senior public school in Kenora. I am not going into the details; what I would like to ask the hon. Minister is this: Is the department absolutely helpless in influencing a local board when there appears to be conclusive evidence of widespread local opposition to what they are going to do? In this instance, I continue to get letters from different people—it may be an organized campaign, I do not know; but they are not objecting to senior public schools—

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are objecting to locations.

Mr. MacDonald: They are objecting to the location—a school that is being put on the outskirts of the city. They make a case, that I find it difficult to assess, emphasizing added transportation costs; they raise the question that if you are going to build a new school, why do you not tear down the 1897 central school in the centre of the city and build one that would be big enough to meet both of these purposes and would be most centrally located, and all of this seems to me to have validity, and my question is this: Even though it is true—as the note I have from the hon. Minister's department is that the decision regarding school boundaries and school construction are matters to be determined by the local school board. Presumably you are taking refuge here in the old local autonomy argument. Is your control over grants not sufficient, and is it not a legitimate exercise of that control over grants, to come to some conclusion as to what are the merits of the two sides of the case? I have had it argued in one letter that a significant number of people on the board are not planning to run again, and they are really "lame duck" members of the board of education. If they do run again they are all going to be beaten. Now this may be wrong, but they have had petitions with 971 names signed to them in a town the size of Kenora—which looks like pretty widespread opposition. Can the government not do something? Have you assessed the merits of the case?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just speaking generally—without getting into too much detail as far as Kenora itself is concerned—legally the boards have the right to go ahead and build a school. We have never withheld grants and it is doubtful whether we could withhold grants. We have never done so; it is not in our policy, because we feel that the assessment of the actual physical location of the school plant within a community is

one of the prime functions and responsibilities of the local board. I could say that there may be two sides to the Kenora story, but not dealing with that specifically, I would say that, generally, I think it is a principle that we should be very careful not to abandon; and that is, having the local school boards with the responsibility to accept where these buildings should be. I think this is really the debate in Kenora. They are not debating—as I understand their correspondence—the principle of the senior public school. They feel it should be in *x* location and the board feels it should be in *y*.

As far as the department is concerned, we support the idea of the senior public school. We feel that the board has been elected in a democratic way to handle the decision as to where the school should be located and our inspectors—I have to say this—have approved the site that has been recommended by the board.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, do I unfairly conclude that when the hon. Minister says there may be two sides to the issue in Kenora, he is not certain his inspectors are right?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no, I am just saying that it is the people who are upset—perhaps the board's position should be assessed as well.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I will leave it. I hope some time soon to be in Kenora and I will have a first-hand view of it. In the same category, again without getting into details, Mr. Chairman, last January a parent and ratepayer in Beckwith township, RR2 Carleton Place, Mrs. N. Manzon, wrote a letter to the Carleton Place *Canadian* with regard to conditions in Tennyson School S.S. No. 5. From the letter that I received recently, apparently representations have been made to all and sundry, including local members in that area, and the department, with regard to conditions in this school.

Now, what puzzles me is that it is alleged in this letter—and I would judge without going into all the detail of it that it is really a very old-fashioned little red school house with temperatures last winter in December 4 to 16, inclusive, in the school days there, ranging 54, 50, 70, 60, 50, 57, 52, 56 and 48 degrees in the school for the morning. Then by afternoon it got so hot—this reminds me of the little red school house in my first year of teaching.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Like my office.

Mr. MacDonald: Like your office, is it? Then the physical conditions, the toilet facilities and things of that nature, are out of date. Now it is alleged that over the past year medical office inspectors have requested certain improvements but to date nothing has been done. My question to the hon. Minister is, either through grants or through other directives, surely the department has the power—if medical officers and inspectors request improvements in a school that is obviously out of date, and with conditions as indefensible as are spelled out in that letter, and I assume they are correct—to do something to make certain that the recommendations are followed through?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this situation in Beckwith received some publicity a month or so ago. It is related to a desire, I think, on the part of this person and several others in the township to establish a central school because of the provision now for one board in the township. As far as the department is concerned we support the idea of establishing a central school. I think we have to look in these instances to the local MOH if they do not conform to health regulations. Of course, the MOH, as I understand the law, is in a position to do something of a concrete nature.

Our problem is, do we withhold grants and in this way perhaps prejudice the education of the children because of the physical nature of the building, or do you hope that reason is going to prevail and they will move either to rectify the situation or perhaps to move into a central situation?

This has come about, I think, primarily because of the change in legislation and it is a problem we hope will see itself resolved over the next few months. But we are faced with this view to withhold grants and perhaps put the board in the position where it says, "We will no longer maintain the school situation." We have not done this. We have on occasion held up grants until certain improvements were made. As far as this situation is concerned we are going to look at it in the fall and see whether they are moving into a central situation, or if they are not, what improvements have to be made if they are going to continue.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let us pursue this briefly, Mr. Chairman. As far as the local MOH is concerned, if there is action under the law that they may take, the hon. Minister, I think, may be on sound ground in saying, "Let him take the action," or "Let the local authorities insist that he should take the

action." But I understand that recommendations have come from your inspectors. Presumably you have some sort of power, in withholding grants. Is there any other legal power beyond the withholding of grants or the delaying of grants, in order to make certain that recommendations are lived up to?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, this would be our only power. It is a subtle sort of power, to withhold grants until the changes were made.

Mr. MacDonald: And you might be considering that this fall if things do not—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If things do not improve.

Mr. MacDonald: If things do not improve. After four months of struggle and no action, that might be a ray of hope to those who are carrying on the battle.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just briefly speak on a point that may not be raised again in this estimate with the hon. Minister. Father Francis-Xavier Johnson, of the Jesuit Order, from Regis college, Willowdale, had a letter in the paper recently with regard to a new physics school text. This is a text which has been worked out by a group of university and secondary school teachers. He is not objecting to the fact that this was obviously originally an American text, which clearly it was, but since it was printed in Canada, he raises the question, which strikes me as being very valid, as to why you could not, particularly in a physics text, at least remove those symbolismisms which are clearly American.

For example, in his letter to the *Globe and Mail* of March 24, he draws attention to page 23 to, "The founding fathers of our own American republic very much steeped in the climate of opinion," etc. On page 248, for instance, we notice an American flag as it ripples in the breeze from the top of a flagpole. On page 376 is, "Think of the 4th of July rocket which explodes while moving along through the air." In other words, if you are adopting an American text, which in physics would seem to me to be a defensible proposition when it has been examined as being the best by an Ontario committee, is it not possible at least to have the Canadian flag rippling in the breeze and to have Canada Day rather than the 4th of July rockets?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I think I have made my point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have no lengthy comment, Mr. Chairman. I am not familiar with

the text. I think I know what happened. We are moving into the new physics course this September and I assume it is for the grade 13 programme. The text is obviously of American origin because they have had this programme in their schools for the last two years. I gather that there may be a copyright situation involved here. I will look into it, but I would think this is probably the problem that exists.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we could let this vote go by without my addressing a few remarks to the hon. Minister in connection with libraries. We did have a fair discussion about libraries at the time of the estimates of The Department of University Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We had a very fair discussion last night after the hon. member left.

Mr. Singer: I understand that and I was advised that the hon. Minister told the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) that he did not really understand what was going on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I did not tell the hon. member for Yorkview any such thing. Mr. Chairman, I endeavoured to bring the hon. member for Yorkview up to date on what had happened. I think that is the sum and substance of my remarks.

Mr. Singer: I think I indicated to the hon. Minister at the time that he brought in his estimates under The Department of University Affairs that I was not as enthused as he was with his proposed plans for improving the library system.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The supply of librarians was discussed; it had nothing to do with the system. The system is what we discussed last night, the supply of librarians is what we discussed under University Affairs.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I repeat again the same criticism that I have addressed over several years. I do not think that we have a proper appreciation or understanding of a library system in this province, and as the hon. Minister has moved ahead in many fields I should think that he would have paid much more attention to improving our system of libraries and in addition the training of librarians.

It seems to me that the complaints that are made annually by the association of librarians insofar as their pay is concerned still apply and there is no adequate answer. It seems to me again that the system of grants insofar as libraries are concerned is

still inadequate. I note that the vote in these estimates is some \$400,000 over what it was last year, but you are still nibbling away. I do not know whether you still do this formula business, where you give a percentage of what you set out in your programme, and each year determine differently what percentage of 100 per cent of the amount accepted for grants is going to be given. This is a system that I could never understand at all, but it has been carried on almost since we first started to pay grants. I cannot see why grants for libraries should not be on the same sort of basis that grants are made for schools.

I think another thing that the hon. Minister should pay some very substantial attention to, which has perhaps not been discussed at any great length, is an effort of co-ordinating school libraries and public libraries. I know that boards of education are going to rise in great anger and concern about this sort of suggestion, but it seems to me that as we build each one of our new schools we set aside an awful lot of valuable space for a school library. These schools, after all, are public buildings and it would seem to me that there could and should be a fairly simple method of making libraries available in the schools and outside the schools—making school libraries available to the public and public libraries available to greater extent to the schools. There is naturally a very substantial overlapping, Mr. Chairman.

It seems to me that no one dares step over somebody else's authoritative boundary. But I would think the library system needs the same sort of care and attention that the hon. Minister tells us he is bringing to various other phases of our education system. My remarks are going to be no more involved than this, Mr. Chairman. I went through the hon. Minister's speech carefully and I have not heard any really ambitious programme for the improvement of our library system and I am very disappointed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I obviously do not want to take too much time on this myself. I would point out to the hon. member I do not often refer to my riding, but I participated at an opening some three weeks ago of a new library facility that was built jointly by the Toronto township board of education and the Toronto township library board, where they have just the type of facility that has been mentioned by the hon. member. This is, I think, a situation that will increase across the province.

I traced one point with the hon. member for Yorkview last night. As I say, I hope it

was informative; it was intended to be. This comes from the library association itself. We had a meeting in my office, the members brought in their initial recommendation, they asked for this further study; Mr. St. John, who is from the Brooklyn library system in New York, I believe, is presently engaged in a very thorough evaluation and is to make a report to the association and then to me. He is here in Toronto at the present time. We hope to have the report in July. There are many problems; we want to see them solved as much, I am sure, as the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just cannot let this opportunity go by. We get so many studies, so many new investigations going on—I think the government reached a new height yesterday when one of the deputy Ministers said he was studying plans to commence a study. I think that the government should get around now to doing something instead of studying plans to commence studies or starting studies that are eventually going to result in reports. Let us have a little action for a change.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is at the suggestion of the association.

Vote 514 agreed to.

On vote 515:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister just one question on this?

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Chairman, I will certainly be very brief this morning. I am referring to item 515. It seems to me that this item in the estimates, with the inclusion of the Ontario council for the arts, and including a large item called "miscellaneous," might be a place for a particular grant for which I would like to propose to find a home.

What I propose, Mr. Chairman, is that a research grant be provided by the province of Ontario to support the preparation and publication of a history of the province of Ontario covering the years since 1867. I suggest that specifically a sum in the neighbourhood of \$15,000 a year be provided in each of the next two and a half years to such person or persons as may be selected by an appropriate committee on the basis of competitive proposals for the execution of this undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, I further suggest that the primary object of the undertaking would be the early publication of a political history of Ontario, of that readable, colourful and

entertaining style, as has already been mentioned this morning, that we have been able to develop in Canada amongst a number of our historians. A secondary object of the undertaking could well, sir, be the gathering of material for a full and complete general history of Ontario of a much wider scope, a history in depth, to be published over a longer period of time and more academic in nature than the political history that I speak of.

The task I believe, sir, could in fact be completed within the two and a half years remaining before the end of our Confederation centennial year without requiring undue haste or in any way jeopardizing the quality of the project. A special concentration on politics would be most appropriate because although the whole of Canada and Ontario have accomplished great things since 1867, Confederation itself was a political event—a great political achievement by partisan party politicians of this and the other three provinces who joined.

Briefly, my reasons are these, Mr. Chairman, for putting forward this proposal: First, sir, in the same way in which the practice of politics tends to increase one's interest in the other people, so I have found, and I am sure most hon. members of this House have found, that the practice of Ontario politics and membership in this Legislature tremendously increase a person's interest in what I have proposed, the field of the history of politics itself. And I believe that not only is the interest here but as more and more over the years our activities both in government, and in this House, impinge upon the people, the citizens of our province themselves will find a deeper interest in provincial politics resulting.

The second reason for this proposal is that the project would fill what appears to me to be an absolute void, an almost complete vacuum which presently exists. Where can anyone with any degree of ease find out today which leaders of which parties stood for which policies or effected which particular achievements when? On which issues have what elections been fought and who won and why? What were the truly important and exciting debates? What were the great scandals? What part did the press play?

By way of example, a few days ago, I heard the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) sternly caution the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) against building too many roads, when, as he suggested, the future may well lie in attention being paid to other forms of transportation. Dimly at

that time I recalled that some time in the 20s the Conservatives, while in Opposition, had furiously attacked the Drury government for its good roads policy. The Conservatives were then dedicated to electric trains, and I believe streetcars running to Barrie and all over the province.

Mr. Nixon: Radial.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Radial electrical transportation, I believe is what the Conservatives were pressing for, and attacking the Drury government for not introducing. But where could anyone—and certainly where could I—check the accuracy of that rather foggy memory? And again, how was it that the Tory Party were the first to nationalize an industry when we nationalized, in a provincial sense, Hydro, in 1906? And where can one quickly find out why Ontario has achieved and held world leadership in the field of workmen's compensation?

Finally, sir, my third reason for raising this proposal for this grant is that in this very House it is my feeling that the stuff of history can be found among many of the hon. members themselves and among those who serve in this building indeed, as well: the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), Mr. Malcolm McIntyre, Mr. Roderick Lewis, Mr. L. R. MacTavish, and also material to be obtained from handed-down memories of others in this Legislature and from ex-Premiers and ex-members, still very much alive, such as E. C. Drury, Mr. George Drew, Mr. Leslie Frost, the hon. Earl Rowe, Senator Arthur Roebuck, Senator David Croll and Colonel T. Ashmore Kidd.

The last Liberal regime deserves a book of its own and I say this kindly, sir, and I mean it in an academic and non-partisan sense. Who of my generation—and there are many of this generation in the House—can resist the Story of Mitch Hepburn or on the other side, the stories about Mitch Hepburn? And again, taking an earlier time, what kind of a "bird" in fact was Oliver Mowat?

A good political history, sir, I think, will interest itself in our politicians as persons, because, Mr. Chairman, I believe that democratic politics might well be defined as the cult of the personalities. Our democracy in Ontario has been vigorous during the past 100 years and I believe our politicians and personalities have been interesting and colourful. This story should be told and told without delay.

I would ask the hon. Minister to allocate a small portion of the funds being requested

in this particular vote, for setting this project under way.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just for a moment I would like to go on record as supporting the suggestion that has just been put to the House. I feel it is really a better one than has been put previously, for simply a continuation of official history. The way the hon. member has described it, I would look forward very much to an amendment, perhaps, to these very estimates that would include the \$15,000 that he feels would be required.

Vote 515 agreed to.

Vote 516 agreed to.

Vote 517 agreed to.

On vote 518:

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, in vote 518, there is a considerable departure with which I feel the hon. Minister should deal at some length. I realize that we do not have too much time available, but it appears that the actuarial difficulties of the superannuation fund for teachers is going to be dramatically improved by the voting of practically \$15 million to the fund. I would assume that the fund itself would probably take this money and reinvest it in this great province, but nevertheless the fact that the government sees fit to allocate this large sum of money to support the teachers' superannuation fund draws to our attention once again the very serious difficulties that are being experienced by the superannuated women teachers.

It is not necessary to recount the story in full again. It is enough to say that this group of people who have served the community well through two world wars and a depression have been living now for many years on full superannuation of \$600 a year, \$50 a month. It is their plea to the government that \$1 million be found outside the regular fund to give them a pension that would allow them to live out their days in dignity and some comfort. I feel that the arguments in support of this are very strong indeed. There have been resolutions by the education committee put to the government and it has been discussed fully. As all hon. members know, time is taking its toll of those who would be assisted by the money that might be made available, and I would beseech the government and the hon. Minister once again to make some provision for this dwindling group of people in recognition of their need and of their great service to the community.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Brant was trying, I think, to be as

brief as possible in view of the time situation in dealing with the item that he raised, but I do not really see any justification for passing over this quickly. He said he was not going to recount the previous history of the matter and I do not think it is necessary to recount the whole of it in great detail, but I think it should be recounted to a certain degree.

As a matter of fact, there are two groups of people whom we might consider here. There is first the group to whom the hon. member for Brant referred, certain elderly women teachers who still find themselves caught in a completely antiquated phase of the superannuation plan with pension of \$600 a year. At the time they were paying in that was considered to be quite an adequate pension, but there have been all sorts of adjustments in the plan since then to keep it up to date with modern conditions, adjustments which result in some people getting pensions of \$7,000, \$8,000, \$9,000 a year. I am not objecting to those pensions. I think that if we want people of the type that we consider desirable to make teaching a career, we are going to have to be prepared to pay them attractive pensions at the end of their periods of service; but let us not forget the people who were under the plan in the old days, who made their contributions and are now left with totally inadequate pensions. That is one group.

The other group, which is even smaller, is a certain group of widows of retired teachers. I am not quite sure what their current situation is, but the last I heard of it, which was a few years ago, they were getting \$25 a month. That seems to me to be about as low a pension as one could get and still say it is a pension.

Now this matter, as the hon. member for Brant said and as we all know, was before committees of this House on several occasions. On every occasion, the committee unanimously recommended, including Conservative, Liberal, CCF or NDP members, that something should be done about these people.

As a matter of fact I have a few notes from a meeting. I think it was held in 1961 or 1962, and on that occasion the committee reiterated a position it had previously taken that the government should do something about these people whose pensions are obviously totally inadequate. A further motion was passed at that time—I moved it and the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) seconded it—I am sorry he does not happen to be here this morning—by which we requested the then Minister of Education, who is the

present hon. Prime Minister, to look into this matter. We requested further a meeting of the Minister with the committee before the estimates of The Department of Education came down. That meeting was never held. I even have a suspicion that the current Minister was the chairman of that committee, I am not sure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, he was not.

Mr. Bryden: Well, anyway, he was well aware of what was going on. The committee felt that the government should get down to business and not just keep saying that it agreed in principle but could not do anything. The committee asked for this meeting, it never was held, unfortunately.

There never has been an adequate explanation of why the very modest requests of these people cannot be met. As far as the superannuated teachers affected are concerned, meeting the total of their demands back in 1961 and 1962 would have cost \$1 million a year. Now, I am sure, it will cost less, because some of them undoubtedly have dropped off since then. They were quite an elderly group.

I do not know how much it would have cost to have met the requirements of the teachers' widows, but let us say it was another \$500,000 at that time. The whole sum is probably down to something like \$1.25 million now. It is a sum that will decline year by year until ultimately there will be no obligation.

Mr. Chairman, in a budget of nearly \$1.5 billion, surely we can afford an expenditure of somewhere between \$1 million and \$1.5 million per year for a few years, declining year by year, and only for a few years, to meet a serious human need.

All that these ladies have ever been asking for is that all pensions below \$1,000 a year—a miserable \$1,000 a year—should be raised to \$1,200 a year; and that those whose pensions are between \$1,000 and \$3,000 a year should receive an increase of \$200 a year.

I am amazed, as a matter of fact, at the modesty of their proposal. A minimum pension of \$1,200 a year surely is something that we can readily recognize, and we certainly should not contemplate anything less than that.

I have never really heard any explanation that amounted to anything from the government as to why this cannot be done. The most I heard consisted of some dark references to the fact that if we did this for these superannuated teachers and widows, then

there are other people living in similar poverty for whom something should be done. The other people have never been specified, but if there are other people dependent on pensions directly or indirectly from this government who are living in similar circumstances, then I say we should look after them. I do not know how much it would cost to do so, but I say that if there are people here getting pensions of less than \$1,200 a year we should do something about them even if it costs another million or two per year.

I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister of Education the fact that earlier in this session the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), after years of inaction, brought in legislation to rectify to some degree out-of-date pensions under The Workmen's Compensation Act.

For years and years, Mr. Chairman, it was alleged that we could not do this because there was no way of collecting the money. Finally, after many years of pressure, the hon. Minister of Labour brought in a recommendation that will bring up to some sort of minimum the completely antiquated pensions that until now were being paid to a small group of people under The Workmen's Compensation Act.

If we were ready to give justice to those people, and I am sure everybody in the House was, why are we not ready to give justice to these superannuated teachers and to any other small groups that may be in a similar situation? I think that we are entitled to a much more adequate explanation from the government than we have had to date. I hate to think we are now coming to the closing phase of another session of the Legislature with no indication at all from the government that it is going to do something about these people. I think that this is a disgraceful situation.

All of us should be ashamed. Here we are in a position to give at least a modicum of justice to people who gave fine service to this province, yet now have to live on a pension of \$600 a year, plus, admittedly, the federal old-age security. We are asking them to live under those penurious circumstances and yet we are not contemplating doing something to change the situation. This matter has been before this House about every year for the last ten years, I think. Surely the government can act this year on the subject, and not slough it off until another year with some vague suggestion that there are other people being shabbily treated to whom we also have to provide justice if we provide justice to this group.

I ask the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister to look at this matter urgently and do something about it. If it requires action by the Legislature, then for heaven's sake, let us have action before this session of the Legislature terminates. I really think, Mr. Chairman, that the government ought to be prepared to say something instead of just sitting and looking at us.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to bring the hon. member up to date, a Cabinet committee was appointed to look into this and we had a meeting with both groups, roughly a week or ten days ago. I cannot report any more to the House at this time, but this is the state of the situation at the moment.

Vote 518 agreed to.

Vote 519 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Education.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee of supply rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will sit at 2 o'clock and have a night session on Monday night. I would like to go to second reading of government bills on the order paper. Then there are certain bills I would like to deal with in the committee stage and following that the estimates of The Department of Health. I will make the motion on Monday that we will sit at 10.30 a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of next week. There will be night sessions on Tuesday and Thursday nights, as well as on Monday night.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.10 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 7, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, June 7, 1965

Introducing Mr. Christian De Laet, secretary-general of the Canadian council of Resource Ministers, Mr. Spooner	3729
Powers of expropriation granted to universities, bill to make uniform, reported	3734
Public Service Works on Highways Act, bill to amend, reported	3735
Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported	3735
Energy Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	3735
Gas and Oil Leases Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	3735
Planning Act, bill to amend, reported	3735
Schools Administration Act, bill to amend, reported	3735
Public Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	3735
Separate Schools Act, bill to amend, reported	3736
Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act, bill to amend, reported	3736
Foundation for the preservation of the burial place of John Graves Simcoe and his wife, bill to establish, reported	3736
Loan and Trust Corporations Act, bill to amend, reported	3736
General Sessions Act, bill to amend, reported	3737
Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	3737
Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	3737
Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	3737
Mental Hospitals Act, bill to amend, reported	3737
Ophthalmic Dispensers Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	3737
Pharmacy Act, bill to amend, reported	3738
Ontario Municipal Board Act, bill to amend, reported	3745
Registry Act, bill to amend, reported	3745
Land Titles Act, bill to amend, reported	3745
Partnerships Registration Act, bill to amend, reported	3745
Limited Partnerships Act, bill to amend, reported	3745
Establishment and operation of the centennial centre of science and technology, bill to provide for, reported	3745
Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, reported	3745
Power Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	3746
Fire Marshals Act, bill to amend, reported	3746
Justices of the Peace Act, bill to amend, reported	3746
Child Welfare Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported	3746
Recess, 6 o'clock	3761

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, members of the Woodstock-Oxford Circle, Woodstock; and in the east gallery, students from St. Peter's elementary school, Peterborough.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the next order of business, I would ask your indulgence, sir, if I may have the opportunity of presenting to you and to the House a very important visitor to our province in the person of the secretary-general of the Canadian council of Resource Ministers, Mr. Christian De Laet, who is sitting at your left.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that in addition to the present hours of sitting this House will sit from 10.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays for the balance of the present session.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries, I would like to make a brief comment. I think this government has made considerable progress this year in terms of handling the business of the province in the fashion that will make it possible for both those of us in this House and outside to do justice to that business. I am very sorry that in the final stages of the session we are reverting to that old familiar pattern of working on a basis on which it is not possible to do justice to the business of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I think the main reason for this is something that we have raised many times in this House and we do not seem to be

able to make the degree of progress to which I think the Legislature is entitled; and that is that the main load of government business should be brought down something other than in the final week of the Legislature. We are now faced with the prospect of clearing, in a week or, conceivably two weeks or perhaps ten days, the estimates of three departments and a very significant load of the government business which was brought down as late as the past week or two.

I for one have said, and I repeat it here, the proposition of starting sessions at two o'clock in the afternoon earlier in the session to give us the extra hours would remove the necessity of this war of attrition in the final days. This is something that I think we should entertain. It has not been done this year, and it has not been done because the government caucus was meeting up until a very short time ago to deal with business which I submit, in any planned approach to legislation, could have come down many months ago, at least many weeks ago.

I regret once again, I want to say on behalf of our group, that we have once again fallen into this familiar pattern. It is going to be impossible, not only for us but for a lot of people who are intensely interested in some legislation that has been brought down only in the last few days, to even have a chance to get the bill and to study it, let alone to have an opportunity to make representations to the standing committee or to members of the Legislature.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I feel that I should make a comment following the hon. member. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, we have gone through this argument once a year for the 14 years that I have been in the House, but it does seem to me that in the natural development of business, when the mornings are no longer needed for committee work, to be only proper and natural that the time could be used, particularly when a great deal of work on the order paper has reached the committee stage of the whole House.

In other words, the debates have been held on second readings where the principles have been debated and so on; I feel a very broad

and a very complete effort has been given for a thorough examination of this business. Frankly, it is a problem for many of the hon. members, particularly those from out of town, at this stage of the session when the committees are not meeting in the morning. What are they to do? Just sit around all morning and do nothing? The alternative is to come in here and deal with matters which are on the order paper, as I say in the committee stage. They will receive thorough scrutiny and there will be opportunity for all this work on the order paper to receive full attention, as it has in the past.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would say that from our side we do not have any objection to a morning sitting when committees are not meeting; but one of our concerns, and I am making the judgment before this actually takes place, one of our concerns would be that if we had late night sittings, then we would feel that really this is trying to press things too steadily. We have had situations where we have gone on until twelve or so, and I think, sir, that we have all seen that on the whole the debate deteriorates. We are all human and we get somewhat tired at the late hours. I would hope that the hon. Prime Minister will see to it that we do not have long night sittings plus morning sittings.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say in this regard that we would not exceed the night sittings we have had. Sometimes we have continued later than 11.30 till 12.00—I believe after that on one occasion. But in each case it has been in order to complete one debate that was taking place. It is not my intent to add to it, because some of us have to do a certain amount of administration as well as being in the House to deal with just this aspect of government work. It is not my intent that we should start sitting hours that are going to make it very difficult for all of us to do the task that we are here to do.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in this discussion, if I may call it that rather than a debate. I certainly cannot let pass without comment, the question—I think that is the way he put it—of the hon. Prime Minister as to whether or not the hon. members will just sit around every morning when there are no committees meeting and when the House is not in session.

The hon. Prime Minister no doubt can speak for his own supporters, but I can assure

the House, Mr. Speaker, that as far as people over here are concerned, we do not sit around in the mornings merely because there are no meetings of either the House or committees. With the amount of important legislation that has been piled on us in the last couple of weeks, along with major estimates—three of the most important departments still to be dealt with—I submit that one does not have to be clairvoyant to understand what Opposition members will be doing in the morning. They want to study this legislation.

But the government's arrangement makes it practically impossible to give it the study that is merited. Under the regime that is now proposed, we will start at 10.30 in the morning; we will presumably not complete our sessions until 10.30 in the evening, and perhaps even later in some cases. What time does that leave for mature consideration of the highly important legislation that is now before us, with only limited notice?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the business of the House should be so ordered that all members—those on the Opposition side as well as on the government side—have adequate opportunity to consider important matters placed before us.

In fact, I would say that it is in many ways more important that the needs of the members of the Opposition should be considered in this connection. The function of the Opposition is to scrutinize the proposals the government places before the House. Those proposals have already been before government members in caucus. We will still scrutinize; the hon. members of the government do not need to think that we are going to fail to do our job just because work has been piled on us in this inhuman way, but I believe, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Question!

Mr. Bryden: This is it! These people always want to cut off discussion. They want nothing dealt with on its merits. They want to railroad measures through.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: You have had weeks of argument on the liquor legislation in your own caucus.

Mr. Bryden: One of the reasons—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please complete his remarks and never mind the interjections. I will look after the interjectionists.

Mr. Bryden: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the reasons why we did not start at 2 o'clock much earlier in the session was that the government was still having its legislation considered in Cabinet and caucus up till about a week ago; five months after the start of this session. This is the difficulty we are up against. The government does not plan its programme so that it can bring in legislation reasonably early.

There was no need for this liquor legislation to wait until the last minute; it could have been before the House in February. But no, it is in now and this fact is used, among other things, as an excuse for now meeting at 10.30 in the morning. I, like every member in this House, do not enjoy meeting in this House in the summer-time, but I believe that we should meet here if it is necessary for deliberate consideration of the business.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not start our sessions until the winter is half over, then we can regard it as inevitable that we are going to have to meet in the summer. If we started a bit earlier perhaps we could avoid meeting well into the month of June.

We have no option but to accept this decree that the government is now putting before us; but I would hope, once again, Mr. Speaker, that in future the government will plan its programme of activity for a session in such a way that it is not necessary for the House to be in session for 12 and more hours per day.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I think there is a word or two yet to add. In this speeding up of the proceedings we are going to lose the opportunity to discuss in committee several important bills that are still before the standing committee of the House. Such bills as the Medicare bill, I would think, should have been an important part of the legislative process; that bill would have been introduced to the standing committee on health, presented there and the public given an opportunity to present their arguments to that committee.

The same thing should apply insofar as the educational research bill is concerned. There are all sorts of persons in this province who would have been interested in appearing before the standing committee on education; had it been sitting. There is the community colleges bill, which has been a topic of very substantial discussion among leading educators in this province, but the public has been

denied the opportunity to discuss this before the standing committee on education.

My friend, the hon. member for York South, mentioned the liquor legislation. There are all sorts of groups and institutions and organizations that would have been interested in coming before the committee on legal bills to discuss those matters in a public way, as has been their right and has been an established procedure in this House.

There is the OMERS bill, which was introduced just at the end of last week. I have had several inquiries over the weekend from persons who are interested in the changes that are being introduced into the Ontario municipal system, and they are concerned as to how it is going to affect them. All I could tell them—as I had these inquiries over the weekend—was: "I do not know how you are going to present any objections that you might have, I do not even know how you are going to see a copy of the bill before it becomes law because it looks, with the speed-up that we are going to have, that we are going to be out of here by Friday. If you find something in that bill that you do not like, it is just tough luck."

The same sort of things prevails insofar as the EMO bill is concerned. Then, Mr. Speaker, I deplore very seriously the fact that only in the last few days of the sitting are we going to be given—and at irregular times and without any pattern—an opportunity to discuss private members' public bills; for instance, the bill standing in my name on the ombudsman, on which we got ten minutes of debate on Thursday afternoon. It will come back sometime soon again, but nobody is quite sure when or, at least, nobody has been able to tell me.

There is the resolution of the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) on divorce—a matter that has aroused great public interest here. We do not know when it is going to be called or how much time will be allowed for debate on it, and that sort of thing. There are a dozen different private members' bills standing on the order paper and a dozen different resolutions, and they are all going to be jammed into a hodge-podge at the end of the session because the government's business is not properly organized.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that we must object very strenuously to the way the government carries on the business of this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order. Committee of the whole House.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have put on the order paper notice of motion of the following to be given as instruction to the committee; namely, that it has power to consider and make recommendations to amend Bill 136 as stipulated in the notice of motion that I provided, and I should wish to speak to that now.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member to put his motion.

Mr. S. Lewis moves that:

Upon the calling of the order for committee of the whole House, that the following instruction be given to the committee, namely, that it has power to consider and make recommendations to amend Bill 136 to provide:

1. That a fund be established into which shall be paid all money necessary to provide fully comprehensive medical insurance contracts to persons designated in sections 6 and 7 of the bill and in this motion, and that the said contracts be issued and the said fund administered by the hospital services commission of Ontario.

2. That government support according to an appropriate sliding scale be made available to provide comprehensive contracts to those whose taxable income does not exceed \$3,000 per year.

3. That all residents of the province, whether or not referred to in paragraph 2, be entitled to receive comprehensive contracts from the commission upon voluntary payment by them into the fund of appropriate contributions as determined by the commission, and that issuance of such contracts and payment of such contributions be required in respect of those for whom coverage is mandatory under The Hospital Services Commission Act and regulations.

4. That provision be made to cover prescribed drugs at least for pensioners, persons for whom continuing drug therapy is required after discharge from hospital, and persons for whom long-term drug therapy is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: I wish to inform the member for Scarborough West that I have taken note of the notice of motion of this instruction to the committee of the whole House, which he has just moved.

I wish to advise the member, and the House, that in reading page 536 and the following pages in May's 17th edition respecting procedure for instructions to a commit-

tee, including the committee of the whole House, I have no doubt that such a procedure, though rare, is a recognized procedure of Parliament.

However, agreeing with the procedure, I find that the precedents make it quite clear that the proposed instruction is out of order.

Under the heading, "Inadmissible instructions," at pages 539 and 540 of May, it states that such an instruction is out of order, and I quote:

—if its objects are inconsistent with the decision of the House taken on second reading, or seek to traverse that decision by an alternative scheme or postponement.

Cases in support of this principle are cited on page 540.

From the debate on second reading, it is my understanding that one of the main principles of Bill 136 is its voluntary feature, and I have no doubt in my mind that the provision in the proposed instruction, that contracts and payments of contribution, be required in respect of those for whom coverage is mandatory under The Hospital Services Commission Act and regulations, is in direct conflict with the decision of the House taken on second reading.

In fact, it appears obvious to me that the whole purport of the proposed instruction is to propose an alternative scheme which is expressly out of order.

I therefore must declare the proposed instruction out of order.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, this—

Mr. Speaker: I would advise the member that the Speaker's ruling is not debatable, but if the member for Scarborough West wishes to appeal my ruling, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we went to great trouble to provide you with a memo on this. I would have thought—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, will the member please be seated. There is no point of order. I have rendered a decision and taken note of the notice of instruction, and the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) read it to the House at the time that it was made. The notice of instruction has been moved today and read again with the motion of the member for Scarborough West; I have read it in the meantime and I have made a decision, and the Speaker's decision—if we are going to

abide by the rules of the House—is not debatable. Therefore the member is out of order. The member for Scarborough West has the liberty to appeal my decision if he wishes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Can I have liberty, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the decision for a moment on the basis of the motion?

Mr. Speaker: No, you are not at liberty to comment on the Speaker's decision.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Speaker, we have no alternative but to appeal your ruling, and I want to give you my reasons. The government has gone to very great pains to state that it was establishing, in this plan, a plan duplicating the successful principles of hospital insurance.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): We did nothing of the sort.

Mr. Speaker: The member—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief—

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me, I am sorry. The member can appeal my ruling but, in doing so, he is not at liberty to go into a long dissertation of the reasons why he is appealing my ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you mean one cannot give the reasons as to why?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. MacDonald: It would not take long; not more than two or three minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I would say that you simply have to appeal the ruling I made without going into a speech as to why you are appealing it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a second point of order. This surely is extraordinary, that one is denied the opportunity to explain why he is appealing the Speaker's ruling?

Mr. Speaker: I must say that I have never seen the practice except on one occasion when I allowed the member to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this: We supplied you with all the reasons why this was done; we did it as a courtesy, but we did not get in return the courtesy of an explanation from you until now. Secondly, if I had the opportunity I would explain that this is precisely in the terms of the plan that the government

professes to be duplicating. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, your explanation that it does not conform with the decision in second reading is, in our view, simply not valid. We have drawn this up so that it is exclusively within the framework of the second reading that has been adopted by this House. We accept the will of the House and therefore we have no alternative but to appeal your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the Speaker's ruling, will please say "aye." All those opposed, please say "nay." In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

YEAS

NAYS

Allan
Bales
Boyer
Brown
Bukator
Carruthers
Cecile
Connell
Cowling
Downer
Dunlop
Dymond
Eagleson
Edwards
Ewen
Gaunt
Gomme
Grossman
Harris
Henderson
Johnston
(Carleton)

Bryden
Davison
Freeman
Gisborn
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
MacDonald
Young—7.

Knox
Lawrence
(Russell)
Lawrence
(St. George)
Lewis
(Humber)
MacNaughton
McKeough
Newman
Nixon
Noden
Olde
Paterson
Peck
Pittock
Racine
Randall
Reaume
Reilly
Robarts
Rollins
Rowe

YEAS

Simonett
Singer
Spooner
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson
Trotter
Troy
Walker
Wardrope
Welch
Wells
White
Wishart
Worton
Yaremko—57.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the “yeas” are 57, the “nays” 7.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the Speaker’s ruling upheld.

House in committee; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

POWERS OF EXPROPRIATION GRANTED TO UNIVERSITIES

House in committee on Bill No. 44, An Act to make uniform the powers of expropriation granted to universities.

On section 1:

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves that subsection 1 of section 1 be amended by striking out the word “and” at the end of clause m, by relettering clause n and clause t and by adding thereto the following clauses:

(n) University of Ottawa;

(o) Waterloo Lutheran University.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The effect, Mr. Chairman, is to add to the list of universities under section 1, two other universities, the University of Ottawa and Waterloo Lutheran University.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, with these amendments all the universities in Ontario are now covered. Am I correct in that assumption?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: All universities which receive public funds. I believe these are all, actually.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the concern of many of us, about this section as originally worded, was that it did not cover all uni-

versities. This amendment brings in the two that are covered. Would it not be simpler if clause 1, subsection 1 of section 1, said “all Ontario universities which are in receipt of public funds” so that there could be no doubt that the intention of the government is not to discriminate between any future universities? Would not that seem much more logical rather than listing them?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: As amended, the section will include those named in the section, with the addition of Ottawa University and Waterloo Lutheran University. The last clause of the section provides such other universities designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. There are some universities that possibly are not receiving full public funds and do not qualify. The Act would enable those universities to be added as they qualify.

Mr. Singer: But, Mr. Chairman, the very thing that gives us cause to consider this very carefully is the fact that in the first draft two important universities were left out. It would seem to me that if the government wants this type of legislation to apply—and the legislation in principle is good—it should make it abundantly clear that it applies without fear or favour to all universities. I am just wondering why—because we had a warning signal that apparently it was intended to discriminate as the bill was originally drafted—why subsection 1 of section 1 does not say “all Ontario universities,” or “all Ontario universities that are in receipt of money from the province of Ontario.”

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, there is no intention to discriminate at all. There were certain qualifications to be met by universities to be in receipt of public funds. My hon. friend knows that if any universities are left out I would be glad to hear him state one.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that by nature I am suspicious. The hon. Attorney General says there is no intention to discriminate and I just cannot think of any other explanation in the bill as it was originally drafted, but that there was a deliberate intention to discriminate because the University of Ottawa and Waterloo Lutheran University were definitely left out. I am saying that if there is now no intention to discriminate—and I carefully draw the distinction because there was then an intention to discriminate—why not say in simple language “all Ontario universities”?

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves that subsection 1 of section 2 be amended by striking out the words "real property" in the fifth line and inserting in lieu thereof the words "land as defined in The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962 and 1963"; and that subsections 2 and 3 be amended by striking out the words "real property" in the second line of each subsection and inserting in lieu thereof in each case the word "land."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The effect of the proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, is simply to give the definition of land as it now is in The Expropriation Procedures Act.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

Bill No. 44 reported.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE WORKS ON HIGHWAYS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Public Service Works on Highways Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 66 reported.

THE PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AND SECURITY GUARDS ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 73, The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 33, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 34:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on section 34, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would consider putting another sub-clause in there, governing the use of firearms, or the carrying of firearms; or does he feel that it is dealt with adequately enough by the criminal code? That is the regulation section.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There are provisions in the criminal code for the registration, use and control of firearms and we carry out those certain things under our registration through our police force. I do not think there is any urgency indicated in this.

Mr. Singer: Does the hon. Attorney General think, Mr. Chairman, that where an investigation agency or security agency believes it looks impressive to have open-holstered

revolvers, it is a good thing? The hon. Attorney General takes on himself in this amendment the power to issue regulations to govern uniform badges and insignia; should he not take upon himself as well, the power to issue regulations governing the carrying of firearms? It seems to me to make sense and in keeping with the amendment that the committee inserted—amendment "h" in the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I would rely upon the last subsection (k) if that appeared to be necessary.

Sections 34 to 38, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 73 reported.

THE ENERGY ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 83 reported.

THE GAS AND OIL LEASES ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Gas and Oil Leases Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 84 reported.

THE PLANNING ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 85 reported.

THE SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Sections 1 to 20, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 87 reported.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 5:

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that clause (a) of subsection 11 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(a) Where,

(i) the number of trustees is fewer than five or more than nine or,

(ii) the municipality or part thereof in a county school area is entitled under subsection 1 or 2 of subsection 55 to one half or fewer of the trustees of the county school area, and the assessment for public school purposes in the municipality or part as adjusted by the application of the latest equalization factor provided by The Department of Municipal Affairs is more than three-quarters of the total assessment for public school purposes in the county school area is adjusted by the application of the latest equalization factors provided by such department, the council of a county may as recommended by the computative committee request the Minister to determine the number of trustees to be elected to the board. The municipality or municipalities to be represented by each trustee and their term of office.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The purpose of the amendment is to authorize the Minister, when requested by a county council as recommended by computative committee, to determine the number of trustees on the board of a county school area in circumstances where one municipality that has three-quarters of the assessment in the county school area is entitled to only one-half or fewer of the trustees under the normal procedure for determining representation.

Mr. Singer: Which is simpler, the amendment or the explanation?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, it is simply to provide, where it is three-quarters of the assessment, the Minister—under certain circumstances—with power to give that municipality more representation on the board.

Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 6 to 22, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 88 reported.

THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Sections 1 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 89 reported.

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Sections 1 to 19, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 90 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make arrangements for supplying the money necessary to fulfill the requirements of any guarantee under The John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation Act, 1965, and to advance the amount necessary for that purpose out of the public funds of the province,

as provided by Bill No. 94, An Act to establish a foundation for the preservation of the burial place of John Graves Simcoe and his wife.

Resolution concurred in.

PRESERVATION OF THE BURIAL PLACE OF JOHN GRAVES SIMCOE AND HIS WIFE

House in committee on Bill No. 94, An Act to establish a foundation for the preservation of the burial place of John Graves Simcoe and his wife.

Sections 1 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 12:

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that section 12 as written be struck and the following substituted therefor:

This Act comes into force on a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor by his proclamation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As a word of explanation, there are some legal difficulties that have arisen—I believe having to do with title on this property in England—and until they are straightened out we believe it would be better if the Act were not enforced yet.

Section 12, as amended, agreed to.

Section 13 agreed to.

Bill No. 94 reported.

THE LOAN AND TRUST CORPORATIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

On section 1:

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I move that section 1 be struck out and that the following sections be renumbered accordingly.

By way of explanation, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the provision in section 1 is something which may very well be done by the shareholders of the companies themselves. There has been considerable representation as to limiting the age of a director for appointment or election, and since it is something the companies may well do themselves, we have decided to leave it out of the legislation.

Mr. Singer: Will the hon. Attorney General tell us why it was there in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I might say that there was considerable representation to put it in. There were certain people wishing that the Legislature would take this task on for them.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is the hon. Attorney General certain that these are his sober second thoughts?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 1, formerly section 2, agreed to.

Sections 2 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Section 10, formerly section 11, agreed to.

Bill No. 95 reported.

THE GENERAL SESSIONS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The General Sessions Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 100 reported.

THE ONTARIO HOUSING CORPORATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): I move that section 2 of the bill be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Notwithstanding subsection 3 of section 2 of The Ontario Housing Corporation Act,

1964, the fiscal year of the corporation that commenced on the first day of April 1965 shall end on the 31st day of December, 1965.

This is just a change in the year end.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 101 reported.

THE SHERIDAN PARK CORPORATION ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 102 reported.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 104 reported.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 106 reported.

THE OPHTHALMIC DISPENSERS ACT, 1960-1961

House in committee on Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Ophthalmic Dispensers Act, 1960-1961.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I was just trying to dig out my copy of this bill.

There are one or two matters to which I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) with regard to it. Actually, the whole of the bill, for all practical purposes, is incorporated in section 1. When the hon. Minister brought the bill before the House for first and second readings he indicated, as seemed reasonable, that all the proposed amendments would make the disciplinary powers of the council under The Ophthalmic Dispensers Act the same as that in other professional Acts. This seemed

perfectly reasonable, but since the bill received second reading there have been a number of other matters that have come to light, Mr. Chairman. I think they throw a somewhat different complexion on the whole question, and I raise these matters now to put them before the hon. Minister for his comments, and perhaps, if he was not already aware of them, for his consideration.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, it is the next Act I am talking about.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 107 reported.

THE PHARMACY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Mr. Bryden: My hon. friend from Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborn) was trying valiantly to let me know that I was one bill ahead when I started my previous remarks. I had been working on something else and had not noticed that we had not yet come to The Pharmacy Act. However, it is better to be one bill early than one bill late.

As I was saying, the proposed amendment gives the council powers that are more or less in line with those given to councils of other professional associations under other Acts. However, it is to be noted, I think, Mr. Chairman, that recently the council of the college of pharmacy has been considering certain matters, which, I would say, come very nearly into the realm of price-fixing. I admit that they are very careful about it because they know that if they openly attempt price-fixing practices they will be in trouble with the restrictive trade practices commission in Ottawa. However, they have had a special committee on the subject of advertising and professional fees. This committee reported to the council of the college in February and March of this year. On April 22 the council circularized members of the college of pharmacy in regard to the report of the special committee on advertising and professional fees. A copy of this circular came to my attention some time after that date.

I will not go through the whole of the report of the special committee, but there are one or two sections of it that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister.

At the second meeting, after very full discussion of advertising and also of the professional fees concept it was decided to recommend to council—

that is the council of the college of pharmacy:

—that any reference to these services in any media be confined to: Age, name and identification, name and degree, pharmaceutical chemist, pharmacist, pharmacy drugs, druggist, drug store, apothecary.

(b) In the store, descriptive information to be confined to certain narrow limitations.

(c) Telephone listings to be restricted to standard or bold-face type and no display advertising permitted.

(d) Professional advertising in newspapers, circulars, letters, cards, and so on, shall not appear as part of an advertisement of merchandise, or on the same page as an advertisement of merchandise. Radio, television and other media shall be similarly restricted.

And then the next item in this report:

That this council do hereby go on record as publicly and immediately renouncing any and all methods of estimating professional dispensing fees and/or pricing guides, which it may have previously caused to be published, and that, effective June 1, 1965—

the date has already passed:

—the professional-fee method of pricing prescriptions be the only method approved by this council.

And that the suggested minimum for professional services be \$2 for each prescription dispensed, it being understood that there is no compulsion on any member of the profession to adopt this exact fee—

and so on. That last clause is put in for the benefit of the restricted trade practices commission, that no member of the college of pharmacy is required to accept the precise dispensing fee of \$2—but this is the one that is recommended.

Now, if one takes all that together, Mr. Chairman, what it adds up to is this: that, under the report of the special committee which has been approved by the council, it will be considered unethical conduct for a pharmacist to advertise the prices of products that he sells, or at any rate to advertise and associate his name with the advertisement. What the college is trying to accomplish here is that there will be no advertising and that there will be a so-called fee for professional service in pricing plus the cost of the goods. I have no objection to fees for professional service but I would point out to the hon. Minister that what is involved here is only

partly and to a minor degree, a fee for professional service.

There is also a commodity being sold, namely, a drug prescribed by a doctor. We know that the college of pharmacy is unhappy because certain pharmacists are selling prescription drugs at reduced prices and are advertising the fact they are doing so. There is very little point in having price competition if one cannot let the world know that one is competing on prices.

The college of pharmacy for some substantial time has been after certain pharmaceutical enterprises—notably the pharmacy connected with Honest Ed's and the Vanguard pharmacy in Toronto; and no doubt some others, there are several of them—which have been trying to introduce a certain degree of price competition into this highly monopolistic industry.

As a matter of fact, having served for two years on the select committee on the price of drugs, I am quite satisfied that about the only place where there is any real competition in this industry is at the retail level. The big fellows have pretty well knocked it out, by a variety of means that we do not have to go into here, at the manufacturers' level. The one place where there is a chance of price competition is at the retail level. Certain pharmacists, either by specializing in volume or sometimes by specializing in certain types of service—for example, Vanguard pharmacy specializes in providing drugs in quantity to those afflicted by long-term illness who need them in quantity—by doing this sort of thing a number of pharmacists have been able to cut the price and still make a profit.

The college of pharmacy does not like that. It does not like the operation of the free enterprise principle in the so-called free enterprise system. It has been pushing away and trying in various ways to stop these people from doing that. Now it has come up with a further idea; it is going to have a professional fee method it says, and this is the only method it will recognize.

Then in addition, and what is critical, it will regard as unethical any attempt by a pharmacist to indicate, not that he is providing his professional services at a reduced price, but that he is selling goods at a reduced price. If they have their way, he will not be permitted to advertise that fact.

So the net effect, if they can make this stick, will be to eliminate such price competition as continues to exist in this industry.

It has always been a fact that businessmen believe in competition for the other guys but

never for themselves. This is human nature, and nobody would criticize them for it. But we, the public representatives, should make sure they do not use public statutes to protect themselves against price competition. When one takes the amendment now before us in Bill 108 in the context of the circular that has gone out from the college of pharmacy, I think there is a danger, Mr. Chairman, that the real purpose of the amendment will be to serve as a weapon to reduce price competition.

You see, if a pharmacist should make it known that he is selling certain products at a certain price, he will be accused of unethical conduct by the college of pharmacy. They will be able to badger him with this much stricter and tougher section 29(a), and say to him, in effect: "Now look, fellow, you are getting out of line; you stop this nefarious practice of advertising the prices at which you are willing to sell goods or we are going to bring section 29(a) down on you like a ton of bricks; we can haul you up before the college of pharmacy, force you to give evidence," and so on, "We can put the blocks to you."

It may be that they could not get away with it. It may be that a court would not uphold what is clearly the attempt of the college of pharmacy to provide that the advertising of goods is unethical conduct, I do not know. But the point is that with this much tougher enforcement section it is quite possible that the college of pharmacy could simply intimidate people into accepting their attempt to restrict a normal and legitimate business practice, and indeed one that I would say is absolutely essential in the interests of the public; a practice whereby people who are willing to sell goods at less than the going price are able to advise the public that they are doing that.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should take another look at this bill in the light of this recent development, a development which took place after the hon. Minister introduced the bill in the House, and I believe after it was given second reading in this House. Certainly the development did not come to my attention until after the bill had received second reading.

I do not think this is the appropriate time to proceed any further with the bill. Let us find out exactly what the college of pharmacy had in mind in seeking this amendment. Let us see how they explain it in relation to the circular that they sent out a month or so ago. I think this House is entitled to an explanation of such matters before it proceeds any further with the bill.

After all, the college has been carrying on for a great many years with the enforcement procedures, the disciplinary procedures, that are already in The Pharmacy Act. I know they have been unhappy about them, because people whom they look down upon have been able to get away with price competition, and they would like to stop that. I am afraid that this tighter section, although I am sure when the hon. Minister introduced it he accepted it at face value as I did, is part of the overall plan to try to eliminate what little remnants of price competition there are in the pharmaceutical industry.

As I say, it may be the hon. Minister has an explanation of these matters. I thought at least they should be brought to his attention for his comment. I would suggest to him that unless he has an adequate explanation we should simply let the bill stand for this year until the situation clarifies itself.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I have to say to you, sir, that I have no knowledge of this committee's report. I could expect and accept that this could be a professional committee of the council set up to investigate some phase that is of interest to the profession, and that it has submitted its report. As far as I know, the report has not been accepted by council or adopted by council.

Mr. Bryden: Oh yes. I am sorry, it has.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It has?

Mr. Bryden: I probably did not make that clear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This might well be, but there is no indication in council's request to us that this enters into the matter of the amendment in any way, shape or form. For some time now, the profession has been trying to exercise some control over the price of drugs by having their members adopt and stand by a professional fee for their services, rather than running the business by pricing the drugs according to a mark-up or a scale of profits. This, I believe, might well be behind the thinking of the council when they set up this committee.

There is nothing that I can see involving this amendment that would give any solid ground to the suspicion of the hon. member. After all, there is an appeal to the courts from any ruling of the college or the disciplinary committee of the college. If the member charged is convicted by the disciplinary committee and disagrees with their finding, he has recourse to the courts.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): May I ask a further question of the hon. Minister in this respect? Evidently the whole purpose of this disciplinary committee is to try to get some stability in the price structure. I think of a friend of mine—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, excuse me for interrupting. That is not the function. The sole function of the disciplinary committee is to oversee and keep watch over the professional conduct of pharmacists.

Mr. Young: How far then will professional conduct go? I think of a friend of mine who has to take drugs all the time in order to live, and those drugs are very high priced. He is not a wealthy man and he was paying too high a price. I talked to his druggist, who felt that it would be unethical to lower the price; but talking to another friend of mine who is a druggist, he made some arrangement whereby the patient could get his drugs at a much lower price, near the wholesale level. Now, this was an unethical practice according to the first druggist, and he was irritated that the business left him and went to the other person. In a situation like this, would this kind of undercutting of prices be thought of as unethical, and could this bill conceivably give the druggists power to discipline the second druggist?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I should point out that, in all sincerity, this is not the business of the college. I think that the first druggist was irritated because he lost some business—a very human trait. But I am quite certain that, if he took that formal charge to the college, it would not even be looked at. The business of the college is to look after and maintain educational and professional standards, not to concern itself with pricing or charges of price-cutting. They try to maintain and constantly elevate their group to the status of a profession, where they belong, and this is the only place where they become involved in matters of advertising and things of that kind. All the professions, as you know, have fairly rigid standards relative to professional advertising, and the college of pharmacy is trying to maintain theirs. To the best of my knowledge, sir, they are not involved officially in the matter of price control.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Perth.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the thoughts of the hon. member for Woodbine. I have

been a practising druggist for 38 years, having graduated 40 years ago. My drugstore has been going for 102 or 103 years, and in that time—I have had some very honest predecessors—we have served the people well in that area; we did not overcharge. There has been a lot mentioned about pricing and fair profit, and we all know you cannot live unless you make a profit. I believe that a fair profit should be paid to everybody who works and also the man who retails. He cannot give something away and not make it up somewhere else, let us not kid ourselves.

We are talking about the cost of drugs. Over the past years I did not have the privilege of serving on the drug committee for reasons not my own, yet there was undue criticism made of the druggists at that time, and of the profits they were taking as a result of being in that type of business. This was entirely untrue. It has been mentioned, and I think it should be mentioned again, that often a druggist buys 100 pills because that is what he has to buy to fill a prescription of 30. We can blame this on the manufacturers, possibly, yet when a doctor prescribes, it is the duty of the druggist to fill just what he asks for, no substitutions. I make a practice of that. If necessary I will phone Toronto and have things delivered that night. That is what you call service.

Someone mentioned somebody who had to take drugs over a long period of time. Any customer for vitamin E, for instance, in my area, can buy it in my drugstore at a 20 per cent discount. That is a common practice among druggists in this province.

With regard to dispensing charges, they are for the birds as far as I am concerned, because in the area where I live, the people do not make the kind of money that they can afford \$2.50 for a prescription on top of the price of drugs. I think one has to use his judgment as a doctor does. The man who has money pays and the man who does not have money has a right to service even if he cannot pay for it. I think we have to take that for granted.

In connection with these cut-rate stores which the hon. member mentioned: Possibly, if you ride along Danforth Avenue you will find about 15 good druggists who had to go out of business as a result of the price competition from these discount houses. As the hon. Minister of Health has said, there is no setting of prices; there never has been, and by the same token, there is nobody who tells the manufacturer where to sell his goods; manufacturers do not care where they sell them as long as they sell them. That is

creating half the problems of the retail drug stores.

We all know that there are locations in this city, where, if a man did not have a drug-and-sundry business he would not have a business, because the doctors send their prescriptions to certain stores, or the customers take them to the stores that have the leadership. Beyond that they cannot tell them where to take them.

So you see, there are difficulties. But I would like to have it on the record that some of the criticism of drugstores is not merited at all, and I would also like to say that as far as I am concerned, and I am fairly active in the different groups, I can see no objection to giving the council a little further disciplinary powers with regard to—it is not unfair competition, it is unethical practice, that is actually what it is.

I would even go a little farther. You have heard me mention dispensing. In some of our communities the doctors hand out drugs, but there is not a graduate druggist to do it when he is not there. I just wish the hon. Minister of Health could take that into account and some day ensure that dispensing is done where there are only qualified people to do it. The doctors are qualified but they are not always in their offices in the country.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would not disagree with anything the hon. member has said. But that is not really the point that I was trying to make. I am not trying to criticize the retail pharmacist—that is not the matter at issue—but I am concerned about what the college of pharmacy may have in mind.

The hon. member for Perth stated that as a practising pharmacist he thinks the professional-fee method is for the birds. I think those were his words essentially. Under this report of the committee, which was approved by the council of the college on Monday, April 12—

Mr. MacDonald: We are heading for trouble.

Mr. Bryden: —“effective June 1, 1965, professional-fee method of pricing prescriptions be the only method approved by this council.” Now that has been approved by the council of the college of pharmacy and is now in effect as far as they are concerned. I take it that what they mean is that if a druggist, such as my hon. friend from Perth, does not use that method they will consider that he is guilty of unprofessional conduct and conceivably take disciplinary action

against him. I admire the position of the hon. Minister of Health that one should not normally look behind a bill for the motive of those sponsoring it. I think that is a reasonably sound proposition in the main, but let it be borne in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the council of the college of pharmacy has been indirectly trying to engage in price-fixing without contravening the federal restrictive trade practices legislation.

For a great many years it has badgered and harried people who have been selling drugs at less than the price at which the college would like to see them sell; it cannot lay down rules that that is unprofessional conduct, but it sits over them and watches them for the slightest slip so that it can haul them up before the discipline committee. It has certainly done that in the past, and when there is an organization with a record like that, I think we have to take a somewhat more critical look at what it is doing than the hon. Minister is taking in this case, and than would be legitimate in most cases.

When an organization with a record like the council of the college of pharmacy asks for a tightening of its disciplinary powers—at the same time that it is trying to make unethical the advertising of prices that pharmacists are going to charge for products, not for professional services, but for products—then I think we should take a hard look at it. As I said to the hon. Minister, I think perhaps he should in this case develop a somewhat more suspicious attitude than is in his nature, because the facts here merit it. I fully accept his explanation that when the proposed amendment was brought to him, it was in terms merely of bringing the Act into line with certain other professional Acts. But in view of the record of this organization, and in view of its recent attempts, as indicated by the document I have read, to clearly restrict price competition and to use our legislation for that purpose—I think the whole matter should stand until we have had a good, hard look at it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, to bring this to a head, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister directly if it is his intention that the existing powers or the enlarged disciplinary powers as they are spelled out in this Act, are not to be used for price regulations, in advertising or otherwise?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It would certainly be my belief, sir, that this government should not give any professional body powers that

will give them the right to regulate prices. I do not believe that this is inherent in this amendment at all. It certainly is not from the government's standpoint.

I am still of the opinion that this is a recommendation of council, not an order of council. To the best of my knowledge, council does not involve itself in checking price-cutting. I believe this is the association; is it not the association, Mr. Chairman, that keeps a constant eye on this competition, rather than the college?

The college, again, according to the legislation we have provided for it, is to maintain educational standards and to look after professional conduct. It has really nothing to do with the average advertisement a druggist will publish in the newspapers.

Mr. Bryden: I agree with the hon. Minister that this is what the college of pharmacy is supposed to be doing. The council maintains that inspectors—and these inspectors have certainly been used in the past in a way designed to intimidate people in the industry—qualified pharmacists, registered pharmacists—from engaging in price competition.

They cannot do that directly, because, as I said, they will be in trouble with the federal authorities; but they certainly have tried to do it indirectly. My fear is that, under this legislation, their hand may be strengthened in trying to do indirectly, something that they certainly cannot lawfully do directly.

However, Mr. Chairman, I was happy to hear at least the hon. Minister's assurance that there is no intention on the government's part to put legislation on the statute books that would in any way give an association a power to fix prices. If it should turn out in the jurisprudence of this matter, that that has happened, or that in practice they are able to use this section for that purpose, then I have no doubt that, under the circumstances, the government will take another look at the section.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I will go even further and give you an undertaking that I will call the council into conference and tell them very specifically that this is a fear of hon. members of this House, and it is not the intention of this legislation to give them this power.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I just get one further point of clarification? Then I think we will have complete satisfaction here. When you say that you do not intend that they should have the power of price fixing, do you interpret the power of price fixing to

include the power to forbid advertising prices of products—not professional fees, the products?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would have to think about that before giving a snap answer, sir, because there is a great deal more to this than is apparent on the surface.

My hon. friend from Woodbine says that I should develop a suspicious nature. I am steadily doing this through listening to the points that they raise, but I do not want to become overly suspicious, nor do I want to give any snap judgment on a question which could have the ramifications that his have.

I do not believe that is the type of advertising at which they are aiming. The advertising that the college is seeking to control, I believe, concerns the professional side of pharmacy. I do not know how many of these discount houses advertise prices for prescription drugs, and these are the drugs about which the college is concerned. It is the pharmacists' plight with which the college is concerned, not the alarm clocks and the hot water bottles and cosmetics and all the other stuff that the druggist sells in his store. I do not think that the college would seek to control or hamper that advertising in any way. But they might very well have certain regulations and responsibilities with respect to the advertising of prescription drugs.

The recommendation that the pharmacist use the professional fee system is to elevate him to where he ought to be and to where he was always expected to have been, as a dispenser of drugs, rather than a retailer or pill peddler; as he has been commonly called, and wrongly called.

I think this is the intention. I think having some knowledge of the price of drugs could redound to the benefit of the consumer in a great many cases, particularly in these days of the sophisticated and somewhat exotic drugs that we have to use in the treatment of the ill.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the elimination of legitimate competition will redound to the benefit of the consumer. It may be a little paradoxical that I, a socialist, should be trying to put that elementary point across to people who profess to believe in private enterprise; but I do not think it is inconsistent with either of our philosophies, and I do not think that the elimination of competition is going to redound to the benefit of the consumer.

I do not want—obviously it would be pointless to try to push the hon. Minister into

making what he thinks would be a snap judgment. When I heard his reservation I was motivated to get up again because his reservation relates to what is the whole point at issue. That point is that under the policy statement of the college it will be unprofessional conduct, I take it, for a pharmacist to associate his name with an advertisement relating to the price of goods. That is the way I understand it. It is not a matter of advertising the price of his professional services, which I think all professions frown upon, but it is a matter of advertising the price of goods.

I think, Mr. Chairman—and we have to face facts—that we cannot draw an exact analogy between pharmacy and such professions as medicine and law. Doctors and lawyers are selling, almost exclusively, their services. There may be some other small items for which they charge, but mainly they are charging fees for professional services. This is not true, and in the nature of things cannot be true, in pharmacy.

The main item, in most cases, is going to be the products sold. I submit to this House that it is illegitimate to accept the line of argument coming from the college of pharmacy that they should be put on the same basis as the other professions; they cannot, in the nature of things. They are essentially selling a product, and in addition they are providing a professional service which in most cases is the smaller part of the total cost.

For whatever reason, there are some pharmacists, qualified men, just as qualified as the others, who have found that they can sell those products at a lower price than some of the others are doing. Of course the college of pharmacy cannot stop them from doing that without getting into trouble with the restrictive trade practices commission; so what it is now trying to do is to say that these people who can sell at lower prices will not be permitted, without running the risk of being charged with unprofessional conduct, to tell anybody that they are willing to sell at less than an accepted price.

As far as I know, there is no large-scale advertising of prescription drugs, but there is some advertising. I know of one organization, for example, which specializes in drugs for long-term treatment, that will send circulars to various associations, associations of old age pensioners and that sort of thing, telling them that certain products that those people frequently use, and some have to use over long periods of time, are available at certain prices for certain quantities.

It may be that the hon. member for Perth makes them available at exactly the same price, I do not know. The point is that unless the old age pensioner or other persons on long-term treatment knows that he can get them at this lower price, what is the value of having them available?

This is the point; I hope the hon. Minister will take another look at this, not make a snap decision but take another look and face the fact. We are dealing with a product, and a product that is very expensive in many cases. We cannot treat it as if it was nothing but a professional fee. I would say that there should be all reasonable opportunity for competition in the sale of these products. I hope the hon. Minister will consider the matter further.

However, sir, if he considers that it is unprofessional conduct for a pharmacist to advertise a certain product he has for sale at a certain price, then I am afraid that exactly the danger I am afraid of will take place; that it will be no time at all until the college of pharmacy will have its inspectors down the necks of anybody who dares to sell at a price lower than it, in its wisdom, considers appropriate—using its disciplinary powers to badger and harry them until they give up the practice; a practice, I may say, that has been beneficial to the public up to now and will continue to be beneficial if it continues to exist.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): What would you do about Honest Ed's?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I just want to bring up that very matter now because I do not know whether the hon. Minister is aware of it or not—there is a good possibility of using this Act before the House and getting around a legal test case that took place about 1959 or 1960. The college of pharmacy, by using its disciplinary authority, tried to stop a druggist from going into the business of what is now known as Honest Ed's pharmacy—alleging that all kinds of things would take place; that the public would not be properly served.

Now, experience has proved that this has been a very good pharmacy; it bases its whole business on volume, not on service. It does not supply the service that the local druggist supplies, which I go to. But if you have the time, and if you are buying expensive drugs, they do supply this service. This annoys many of the members of the college of pharmacy and I say that if they are given the power of controlling prices—and I am glad to hear that the hon. Minister has said that they cannot control prices, I wish it was spelled

out—I hope if a case ever comes before the courts that *Hansard* is allowed to be read in court by the judge in order to cope with what the hon. Minister has had to say.

Even stopping advertising is another way of controlling prices, simply because an outfit like Honest Ed's, or any discount house, bases its sales on volume. Instead of getting 40 per cent profit on the volume, they get only 25 per cent. It is a perfectly legitimate business transaction they carry on. They supply a perfectly good product. Despite all the efforts on the part of the college of pharmacy to stop Honest Ed's, the pharmacy college did not succeed in that case because the individual who wanted to make a change in the selling of drugs had the determination and the financial backing to face this situation in the courts. It was a very expensive litigation, and it was not based on the fact that the man had done anything illegally, but on the fact that he was said to be unethical. Now what does the term "unethical" mean?

I wonder if, by passing this legislation, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to at some future date put some businessman—let us face it, sir, a druggist is also a businessman—to a great deal of expense in order to carry on a perfectly legitimate operation. There is no doubt that these discount drug houses have supplied to many citizens in this province high-grade drugs, trade-name drugs if you will—not just generic drugs but trade-name drugs—at a much lower price. For those people who do not have the money and who do have the time to go down to these various discount centres where you can get these drugs, we are putting the consumer at a real disadvantage.

I do not think—if this bill was never passed—you would harm the local druggist whom we all know so well, because the local druggist makes his living because of his contact in the community; because of the service he gives. But again, this is a deliberate aim at those people who sell the discount drugs. Again I say, these drugs are from the standard manufacturers—the trade-name manufacturers—and it is the matter of selling drugs that the college of pharmacy is trying to attack. I wish that the hon. Minister would take this bill back and reconsider the effects it has, or put into it certain provisions to say that the individual druggist or discount house is allowed to sell at the price that it deems wise and that it be allowed to advertise. After all, all you have to do is look at Honest Ed's ads; and obviously they do advertise. I think that this bill could stop that and this is what the college of pharmacy is trying to do; to get around the law as determined in our courts in about 1959.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member has completely drifted away from this bill altogether. This amendment is asking to give the college the right to subpoena witnesses who can then be forced to appear before the disciplinary committee and give evidence. It gives them the right to take testimony under oath, and it also gives them a legal basis by which to apportion costs against those found charged and convicted before the disciplinary committee. But there is nothing in this amendment at all that has any reference to price control, price setting or price cutting. This report of a committee set up by the council is a recommendation. I do not know if it is a recommendation of the committee to council, or if it is a recommendation of the council.

Mr. Bryden: The recommendation was adopted.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The recommendation was adopted by the council, but I have no knowledge of it being made into a law of the council or a ruling principle of the council to its members. There is nothing in this amendment that gives the college any right to set or control or forbid price cutting.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 108 reported.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 109 reported.

THE REGISTRY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 110 reported.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 111 reported.

THE PARTNERSHIPS REGISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 112 reported.

THE LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 113 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the real and personal property, business and income of the centennial centre of science and technology is exempt from all assessment and taxation made, imposed or levied by or under the authority of any Act of the Legislature,

as provided by Bill No. 114, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of the centennial centre of science and technology.

Resolution concurred in.

CENTENNIAL CENTRE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 114, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of the centennial centre of science and technology.

Sections 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 114 reported.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Sections 1 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 115 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is authorized to make arrangements for supplying the money necessary to fulfil the requirements of any guarantee under The

Power Commission Act and to advance the amount necessary for that purpose out of the public funds of the province,

as provided in Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 116 reported.

THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 117 reported.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 118, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 118 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the moneys required for the purposes of The Child Welfare Act, 1965, in addition to the moneys referred to in subsection 1 of section 91 of The Child Welfare Act, 1965, shall, until March 31, 1966, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 119, The Child Welfare Act, 1965.

Resolution concurred in.

THE CHILD WELFARE ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 119, The Child Welfare Act.

Section 1 agreed to.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed to the detailed consideration of this lengthy and highly important bill, I would like to make one or two comments—generally with regard to the bill. I am not—before you raise your gavel, Mr. Chairman—going to try

to discuss the bill in principle at this stage; it has already been well discussed in principle. But I would like to call the attention of the House to the number of symbols indicating changes made in the bill in the standing committee. I think it is a tribute to the standing committee that considered this bill, and also to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) that he was prepared to enter the standing committee with an open mind, and to accept changes where he was convinced on the basis of argument that they were in order.

But I would say of the committee that it demonstrated the value of this type of standing committee with this type of legislation. Interested parties from the welfare professions testified before the committee. They made representations to it from time to time, both orally and in writing; members of the committee made many representations to the hon. Minister. I will say that the hon. Minister approached all these matters with an open mind, prepared to be convinced where arguments were sound.

He was not convinced in all cases where we thought he should have been, but, as you can see, he did accept a substantial number of proposals for change in the bill both in the committee and in discussions with the representatives of the profession. He is to be commended for that. I think the bill is now considerably improved as a result, over what it was when it was brought before us at the second reading stage. There are still some further improvements that we in this group would like to see made but we will deal with those when we come to the appropriate sections, Mr. Chairman.

Sections 2 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, excuse me—I have been handed a further amended copy of this bill. Is that subsequent to the last copy we have in the book?

Mr. Bryden: Amended by the committee.

Mr. S. Lewis: On this section, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister will anticipate the point which I am about to raise. It is a fairly simple point: A good part of the intent of this bill—and I agree with my hon. colleague from Woodbine that it has been admirably amended by the hon. Minister—a good part of the admirable intention will be defeated by maintaining the present structure of organization and administration through the province, of child welfare.

The hon. Minister now has before the House, the second reading of a bill in which this government, for the first time in its history, will finance the administration of larger units for welfare matters in the province of Ontario. That is a fairly major step forward. I suppose it relates rather strongly to the public assistance programme being contemplated by the federal government. But if, in fact, in the field of general welfare the government is prepared to move, then I strongly suggest that it should also be prepared to move in child welfare. Whether this move is in the direction of the county unit or in the direction of regional welfare units, or for that matter in any of the alternatives held out by the original advisory committee to the Minister on child welfare—whatever the mechanism—some alternative must be found. The overlapping of children's aid societies, the inequality of municipal resources, the inability of units in this province to function adequately where children are concerned, should not be permitted.

It should not be permitted, particularly when the hon. Minister prides himself on a bill of this quite meaningful substance. And no one can deny its important content. So I urge strongly on the hon. Minister that he consider amending this section in the very near future. I appreciate that it will take a major amendment and I hope it will be perhaps coincident with his bringing down those ever-mysterious, ever-unreachable regulations.

Section 7 agreed to.

Sections 8 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 12:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, you are moving along rather rapidly here and—

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, on section 12, I would like to move an amendment deleting section 1(a), which reads "40 per cent of the part of the approved estimates referable to operating costs other than operating costs referred to in clause (b)." I would like to remove that section (a) so that section 1 would read:

100 per cent of the part of the approved estimates referable to operating costs for the care and maintenance of the children of unmarried mothers.

Mr. Chairman: I would have to rule that amendment out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Are you sure?

Mr. Chairman: Rule 49: "No motion or amendment, the subject matter of which has been decided upon, can be again proposed during the same session."

Mr. Bryden: The idea is a good one.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The idea was good.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, before we pass by this section I would once again like to protest as much as I can that this is one of the essential weaknesses in this bill—this particular section—because, when you call upon the municipalities to provide sixty per cent of the moneys—and let us bear in mind that the municipalities have a far narrower tax base than we have here in the province as a whole—you are asking municipalities who can ill afford it to initiate the changes that are most important.

The fact is that the changes that are desired in this bill are simply not going to be brought about at the rate at which they are needed because the municipalities do not have the funds. We in this province are far better equipped to administer and to plan here in the provincial headquarters at Queen's Park the necessary changes that are needed; because, looking at the situation as a whole, the province not only has the funds and the means of obtaining the funds to institute such a programme and such changes as are contemplated under this Act, but they have certainly more personnel than most of the children's aid societies throughout the province and most of the municipalities, Mr. Chairman.

There are exceptions. It is true that the larger centres in Ontario are in some cases well equipped. But, looking at the province as a whole, the funds should come from the province of Ontario and in conclusion I would like to say once again 100 per cent of the responsibility to carry out this Act in financial matters should rest with the province of Ontario. In this way a great deal of the financial burden is taken off the municipalities and also there is a much more efficient administration of The Child Welfare Act.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out to the House, though it is probably evident to them already, that this section 12, as it presently stands, contradicts every representation that was made to the hon. Minister in respect of this Act, and contradicts every other facet of policy

presently operative within his own department. For the members of the House, let me briefly summarize: When the advisory committee presented its report to the Minister, it recommended that the province of Ontario should pay a minimum of 50 per cent of the total cost: an absolute minimum. Failing that, the advisory committee went one step further. It said that even if the province could not pay a minimum of 50 per cent it should take into account the varying financial resources of the municipalities right across the province. It should not foolishly assume that there was the same absolute ability to pay in northern Ontario as in Metropolitan Toronto, and that some emphasis should be given to the variation of financial resources, geography, and understanding of child welfare through past experience.

Mr. Chairman, when the Ontario welfare council came to the hon. Minister after his advisory committee had reported, before the bill was drafted, they said that the municipal contribution should be a nominal one—and they used that word. By “nominal” they implied that it should not be more than 20 per cent of the total cost. They used an analogy, if memory serves me, with general welfare assistance, where indeed the municipal contribution is only 20 per cent.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that there is not another single piece of legislation in the hon. Minister's entire department, from the homes for the aged to The Children's Institutions Act, to mother's allowance, to any piece of legislation one can recall, where as heavy an onus as this is placed on the municipality—not one! The highest it ever reaches is 50 per cent. Yet, in the area of child welfare the hon. Minister in his wisdom and the Treasury board in theirs have decided to place the maximum responsibility on municipalities—municipalities which have shown for the last decade that they are unable to fulfill such an obligation.

I say to the hon. Minister, that what troubles me therefore, about section 12, is not only the patent injustice in the burden that it puts on the municipalities and because of the inability of some of them to respond, not only the patent injustice of the province refusing to take all or a large measure of the responsibility for child welfare, but because it negates all the recommendations made to the hon. Minister and all the conduct of legislation in his own department. That is a feat of inconsistency not given to many Ministers of the Crown and I heartily hope that he will therefore consider an amendment in the future.

Mr. Chairman: Was the member for Woodbine speaking on section 12?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it is the same section that I wish to discuss. I can hardly argue with your ruling that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ottawa East, when moved by a private member, is out of order.

Nevertheless, it was a very good idea, and my only regret is that the hon. Minister has not seen fit to bring in such an amendment since from him, in his exalted status, it would have been in order.

The purpose of the amendment, as I heard it when the hon. member for Ottawa East read it, was simply to make the costs of the administration of this Act entirely a provincial responsibility.

Mr. Chairman: That would be out of order anyway.

Mr. Bryden: It would not be out of order, I think, if moved by a Minister; however, we do not need to discuss the matter because it does not look as if the hon. Minister is anxious to get on his feet in order to move such an amendment.

Mr. S. Lewis: Suppose the hon. Minister does?

Mr. Bryden: We would be prepared to accept it as being in order if the hon. Minister would do so, Mr. Chairman. I suspect the trouble may be with his Treasury board colleagues who so often adopt a penny wise and pound foolish attitude.

The total expenditure here, or the total charge on the provincial Treasury, if the government took over the entire cost of providing for children covered by the Act, would no doubt be significant, but it certainly would not break the government. Yet the method that the government insists on maintaining, and antiquated method, is going to militate seriously against effective administration of what is otherwise, in most respects, an excellent Act.

We have talked a great deal in this House, and its committees, and when I say “we” I mean just about everybody, about local autonomy. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the more I see of the legislation the government places before us, the more I am convinced that it does not give a hoot about local autonomy. It talks about local autonomy and tortures and destroys it at almost every turn.

Just consider what it is doing here. It has before us legislation which gives the municipalities no discretion of any kind whatever.

They cannot do a solitary thing under this Act to change policy in the slightest degree. I am not saying they should be able to, but that is the effect of the bill. This legislation is simply not a matter on which the municipalities have any discretion, and yet they are soaked for 60 per cent of the costs.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is a fundamental principle of democratic government that a government body should pay for those matters on which it legislates and should not have to pay for matters on which it does not legislate. But we, in this House, in our wisdom, are being asked to pass a bill that imposes obligations on the municipalities, financial obligations, and we give them no say at all in the matter. They cannot affect the policy, that is determined by other people. They just have to pay up when the time comes.

I suggest that this is not only unsound as a principle of government, Mr. Chairman, it also is calculated to create resistance on the part of the municipalities. They would be more than human if they did not resent a financial obligation imposed upon them without any exercise of discretion on their part. What is the likely result of their resentment? They will, as far as possible, use every effort to avoid having to pay the money; or at any rate they will use every method—and after all there are methods available in the Act as there have to be—they will use every possible method to restrict the amount of money they have to pay. Why should they be expected to develop a constructive attitude toward a matter for which they have no policy responsibility? Therefore, they will try to save money. What else? They are worried about the mill rate just as every level of government is worried about the tax rate, especially as the day approaches when the wrath of the electorate must once again be faced. The municipalities will fight like anything to hold down costs under this Act because they are not given the opportunity, much less the encouragement to develop a positive policy attitude towards it.

We do not have to rely on speculation to arrive at that conclusion. One just has to look at the past year's record of the Metropolitan Toronto council with regard to matters of children's welfare to realize that even the council of the largest municipality in Ontario—and, indeed, the largest in Canada—takes a penny-pinching attitude when it comes to children's welfare. The council cut down the appropriation for the family court because the family court wanted to provide what I think the council regarded as frills, namely, services for the benefit of children,

to prevent children from getting into court in the first place. This is the negative attitude which municipalities take, even the largest municipality. This is just a charge on their mill rate! And yet we continue with this principle in the legislation which is now before us.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that by doing so he will greatly reduce the effectiveness of a very good Act. As the hon. member for Scarborough West has pointed out, everybody who appeared before the committee—and indeed, I suspect, even possibly a majority of the members of the committee—thought that the government should take over, if not the entire cost at this stage, at least the lion's share of it. For some reason or other the hon. Minister was not willing to give any consideration to this proposal at all. I think he said that it was simply a matter of government policy and he was not prepared to consider it any further. So I suppose that, if it is a firm decision by the government that they are going to load most of the costs that accrue under this bill, on to the municipalities, there is nothing much we can do about it.

I would hope, however, that the hon. Minister would really go to work on his hon. colleagues and convince them of the folly of the position they have now taken in the interests of economy. They are destroying economy, they are militating against the best operation of a good piece of legislation that would save this province millions of dollars in the long run, if it operated properly. It would save money in terms of avoiding situations where people have to go to penal institutions or mental institutions. If we can get a proper child welfare policy operating, we can avoid much of that necessity in the future and thereby save ourselves a great deal of money. But the government apparently looks at the few nickels it can save today without considering the dollars it is going to have to pay tomorrow. It once again takes its penny-pinching attitude of throwing costs on the municipalities, which do not legitimately belong there.

The whole history of this country in the last 100 years has been to relieve municipalities of responsibilities for welfare, at any rate of those that involve costs. In the 19th century it was considered that if any level of government had any responsibility in this field at all, it was the municipal level. It was really considered that no level of government had much responsibility, but, if any level had, it was the municipal level—that was the 19th century view. Gradually we have seen over the years that that is an

impossible view. Slowly the higher levels of government, both federal and provincial, have been taking over costs relating to welfare. But, here, in this otherwise forward-looking Act, we still cling to an ancient, antiquated 19th century conception. It is a pity that the bill is marred in this way. I am afraid that the defect in section 12 is not just a minor defect, it will have unfortunate consequences in the total effectiveness of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 12 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister. I do not get on my feet very often of late, I am under the doctor's care with three different kinds of pills for which I have to pay. I find with all the coverage I have I do not have coverage I need for pills.

However, I have been in municipal affairs, as you know, Mr. Chairman, for 12 years. There must be good reason for the government taking this stand. I was wondering whether the hon. Minister would care to explain section 12 at this time and tell us why they insist on the board paying 60 per cent?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I was going to comment on this, I am sure that the government is not taking an entirely negative position.

Before, as you will appreciate, the municipalities paid 60 per cent of all costs of protection and prevention services, except that we would pay \$100 for each employee they had for that purpose. Now we participate in the whole picture, not only the fact of our giving \$100 per employee for prevention and protection services. On top of this we are bearing the entire cost for children of unmarried mothers, which is also quite a large factor. I can assure you that to be very honest with myself, I could not say I am completely satisfied with the way it is now or that this is the way we intend it to be in the future. We on this side would like to be progressive, and I am sure that we will be progressive in this particular matter. But, after all, I think we have made quite a large step forward helping the municipalities in this particular matter. I hope, and I would like to say this now, that this will not—although some people might think so—make the fact that the children's aid society or its work will be a forgotten thing by all united appeals. I hope it still will

be considered to be held in this respect, and that this particular legislation will not be a means to duck out of any responsibility.

I make this statement in all sincerity. I appreciate the words that were expressed by the hon. members and I can see their point, but at the same time, as I say, you must go along with what you are able to do at the present time; and this has been established as the percentages that were possible at this time. On top of this I would not like the idea—if it should ever get to there—of having the 100 per cent feature in it for the simple reason that, when that happens, I am sure the children's aid societies would disappear. I would not like this to happen because they have served this province for many long years, over 70 years, and have done so well; and we hope to have them with us for a long time to come. I would like to also participate in the responsibilities that there were before and that there will be under this Act.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to leave the impression that we have lagged behind as badly as would seem to be by the hon. members opposite who have spoken. We have made a large step; a step which will represent anywhere in the neighbourhood of between \$2 million to \$4 million more than before, and \$2 million to \$4 million less to the others. But that doesn't mean to say that we have to look to the experience that lies ahead. I am sure that I can assure this House, and the hon. members here, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I am concerned we will be very glad to look at the progress of this Act, and I can assure them that this is not the last word.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, early in the hon. Minister's comments he mentioned that they would, I think, "duck out" of the responsibilities and that he did not want that to happen. But I am sure the hon. Minister did not mean it quite the way he said it in making reference to the children's aid societies. As I know them, they do an excellent job together with the united appeal. As the hon. Minister and everybody in the House knows, the personnel who make up the organization are excellent people. The united appeal does a good job too, and I am sure the hon. Minister must admit that it is that way rather than the statement that he would "duck out" of the responsibilities. These are civic-minded people who do this. I am just trying to protect the hon. Minister because I thought he might be in for a rough time a little later on in the day. I was just putting a little oil on the troubled waters. The children's aid society, as everyone knows, does an excellent job,

and by asking it to contribute the 60 per cent the united appeal also get behind it and then they know of the activity and where the responsibility lies and what is necessary for the people. That is the reason for leaving this in, as I gather.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I understood my friend very well. Before this Act the 60 per cent was paid by the children's aid society, who collected from the municipalities and also had part of that share, I suppose, from the united appeal. Now, the united appeal is not asked to contribute anything as far as this legislation goes. It will be shared 40 per cent by the province on the whole programme—not only on part, but on the whole programme—plus taking over all the responsibilities of children of unmarried mothers; then the 60 per cent balance is to be paid by the municipality. But what I meant to say a moment ago is that, because of the fact of these percentages being arrived at, I hope the united appeal will not opt out—if I may use that expression—on the fact of helping the society in its work. I am quite sure that it will be very useful, and I daresay it is a very good piece of advertising for them also. I hope they will stay with the programme as they have in the past.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the hon. Minister say that he hopes that more progressive legislation on this might come at a later time, because this seems to be not as progressive as it certainly ought to be. Now, in legislation of this kind—and this bill is a good bill by and large, I think there is real progress being made here—the child and his needs ought to be at the very forefront of our thinking. But just as soon as we put a dollar toll gate between the child and the needs of that child, then we are running into real difficulty.

In most municipalities budgets are set early in the year, and it might well be that many municipalities will be inclined to say, well, over this year of 1965 we will need \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$15,000 for this kind of welfare work, and so we put it in the budget. But my guess is, and my experience with municipal government would lead me to believe, that most municipalities will set aside a minimum budget of this nature. Then, as cases may flow in at larger numbers later in the year, there will be real trouble in meeting the budget. And this means that there may be war brewing between the children's aid society and the municipality, because the children's aid society will see a child who needs special care and it will have one eye toward the municipal treasurer and the other

eye to the child's needs. So that child may just not become the ward of a children's aid society; it may not get the proper care it needs because of the impossibility of that children's aid society to collect its 60 per cent of the expenses. And here is real trouble building up for this legislation and for the children.

In most of our welfare activities the province has been accustomed to paying 80 per cent and the municipality 20 per cent. The municipalities are used to this fact, and I see no reason why at least the same standard should not be set for these needy children as for the other welfare cases within the municipality. I would urge the hon. Minister, in looking at this legislation, that this figure of 80 per cent should be the absolute minimum as far as the province is concerned; in other words, double the 40 per cent that is being envisaged here. In this way most municipalities will be able to handle the situation. When I look at almost a thousand municipalities in this prosperous province and see the financial weakness of so many of them, I realize that they are just not going to be able to handle this 60 per cent that they are required to do. So if the province would raise this to 80, I think we could see a practical solution to this problem and a solution which would again put the needs of that child in the centre of a legislation where it ought to be.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, following the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkview, I have had considerable experience in children's aid society work. For instance, I know that in the Ottawa area the money for preventive services has been supplied by the Ottawa community chest and later on by the united fund. The children's aid society of Ottawa and Carleton county, I think, had some \$150,000 coming from those sources and a small subsidy from the municipalities. Just to give you an idea of the subsidies of municipalities for preventive services: The city of Ottawa gave a grant of \$12,000, the county of Carleton gave \$2,000, and the city of Eastview gave \$1,000 for preventive services.

Some of the hon. members would say: "That was peanuts. There should have been available to the children's aid society of Ottawa some \$350,000 or \$400,000 for preventive services." According to this new Act, possibly the children's aid society of Ottawa will put in its budget this sum of \$350,000 or \$400,000. This will be quite a hardship on some of the municipalities because from a small grant, which they paid on a voluntary basis in the past, they will be compelled by the legislation to provide a considerable

amount of money. Because, mind you, of the moneys spent, more than \$110,000 came from the Ottawa community chest, which left the municipality with approximately one-tenth of what was needed for preventive services.

I would like to ask one question of the hon. Minister. Have any municipalities protested about this division? Have there been any letters from various municipalities through the province asking that they be relieved of this part of the cost of the children's aid society in their municipality?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, the answer, a very short one, is, no.

Mr. Racine: No? No municipality has made any representation?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Racine: I am very surprised.

Mr. Bryden: They do not know about this section. Wait till they find out.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 12 stand as part of the bill?

Sections 12 to 31, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 32:

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves that subsection 1 of section 32 of the bill be amended by striking out the words "the local director of" in the sixth and seventh lines.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I make the same motion with respect to section 33, Mr. Chairman. The amendments give the society the responsibility for exercising the powers and duties and obligations of guardianship in respect of wards. The society may delegate any of these to "the local director of" the section 4.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to follow. I wonder if the hon. Minister would explain just what he has in mind in this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The Act, as you will note, Mr. Chairman, reads—if I may just use the last two lines:

Section 32. (1) The Crown has and shall assume all the rights and responsibilities of a legal guardian of its wards for the purpose of their care, custody and control; and the powers, duties and obligations of the Crown in respect of the wards of the Crown, other than those assigned to the director by this Act, may be exercised and discharged by the local director of the

children's aid society having the care of the ward.

The objection to that was that it gave too wide powers to the local director, who should really be getting the powers from the society itself. That is provided for in section 4, that is why it was struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 32, as amended, agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves that the words "local director of" in the first line of subsection 1 of section 33, be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 33, as amended, agreed to.

Section 34 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves that section 35 of the bill be deleted.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The explanation, Mr. Chairman, is that the section is not necessary in view of the estimate system of financing the operations of children's aid societies.

Motion agreed to; section 35 deleted.

Sections 35, formerly 36, to section 38, now 37, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on this section 38 now section 37, I would like to make a few remarks. I am glad to see that there has been some improvement in the legislation pertaining to the adoption of children, having to do with their religious faith. But because this bill has had a number of amendments, and all of them have been improvements, I would like to suggest one more amendment.

I think this bill should be more definite as to the problem of a child's religion—not only the child's religion but that having to do with the adopting parents.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I might point out to my hon. friend that this section is not the adopting section, it is foster care.

Mr. Trotter: Foster care? Very well, foster parents, as you will, is all right. I would like to make one suggestion as regard to this. For example, in subsection 6, it says: "Where a children's aid society, (a) is unable to place a child in a suitable foster home within a reasonable time—" We do not know what a reasonable time is and I think that there should be no doubt left in the mind of the public or in the mind of the children's aid society that this problem of religion or lack of religion should not interfere with putting a child out to a foster home.

We have had instances just recently when people who have been attempting to become citizens of Canada, have been questioned as to their being agnostics. There are many people who would probably make very good parents and foster parents, and make very good citizens but who have no prescribed religious faith. They say they are agnostics. We may all prefer that somebody have a definite prescribed religious faith, but in this day and age there are a great many people who may not even use the term "agnostic" but who are not identified with any particular religious faith. They are good citizens, they could make very good parents.

I would like to see added to this section, subsection 6(c), to read:

In no case shall a child be denied a good home because of the religion or non-religion of the foster parents.

I would therefore submit that this be added. That would be in the new section 37, subsection 6(c).

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved that section 38 be amended by adding:

Subsection 6(c). In no case shall a child be denied a good home because of the religion or non-religion of the foster parents.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I presume that if this amendment carries, as I think it should, the legislative counsel will clear up any little problems in drafting that may arise.

I do not quite see where a clause (c) can go in, but the principle is, I think, a sound principle. I believe from the discussion in the committee, that it is already envisaged in the bill as it now stands that this principle will apply. There are certain provisions attributing certain religious beliefs to children under certain circumstances—if their father is of one faith, the child will normally assume the same faith, and so on. All that is in there, but then section 38—or section 37, as it now stands—is intended to provide that where a child cannot be placed in a foster home of the same religious faith as that attributed to him, he can be placed anywhere he will find a good home. I believe that is the intention.

I do not think, however, that it hurts a bit to spell it right out, as the hon. member for Parkdale proposes, that there can be placements of an interfaith nature. I think it is rather sound to make it quite clear that the question of religious faith attributed to the child must not prevent him from getting a good home. I think this is quite desirable,

although the hon. Minister could conceivably argue that the amendment is redundant.

I have difficulty following the thinking that says a six-day-old baby has a certain religious faith. I do not know how that is possible, but perhaps that is merely because of my lack of training in theology. I think that what is basically important is the welfare of the child, not the welfare of religious organizations. I regret seeing religious organizations fighting over children as they have done for all too long in this country and in other countries. I would be very happy to support the principle of the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Parkdale.

I hope, indeed, that the hon. Minister will accept it because I think he intended that the section, as re-enacted, will actually recognize the principle incorporated in the hon. member's amendment. Therefore there is no harm in having that principle spelled.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: My hon. friend stated a moment ago that I would use the word "redundant," well, I suppose I could use that, but at the same time I see no reason why it would enhance or better the bill at all by using that section. The court is given complete and entire discretion to deal with it, if nobody else can agree in dealing with it, regardless of the children's aid society or the people in the foster home.

After all, placement to a foster home is made by the children's aid society. I do not like to defeat the purpose of the section as such, because it clearly states there that one children's aid society will place a certain child having a certain religious faith in a particular foster home and vice versa.

Now, if I use this, am I not defeating the whole purpose of that section? Furthermore, it seems to me that the words "reasonable time" are used. Generally speaking, I am quite sure a "reasonable time" can be decided upon by the society itself. If anybody thinks that they are not reasonable and are temporizing, it can be brought up by anyone before a court of justice or a court of law.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not want to encourage any religious discussion here in the House, but there is definitely, as far as I am concerned, a definite demarcation as between faiths. I think this is why this has been brought about, and I am sure that we want to recognize everyone in this particular respect.

The general principle is the same, but the way of acting in dealing with this is possibly difficult for one side to understand; but on the other side it is not so difficult. I can

assure you that all are very concerned with this—whether of the Jewish faith or the Protestant faith or the Catholic faith. These denominations are very set in their views and I do not see why we, as a Legislature, should disarrange that at all. I think the words “reasonable time” are quite proper. I would not like to see anything brought into this section to defeat the main idea as it is stated in section 37, which was formerly section 38.

Mr. Chairman: As I see it, the amendment is in order, although I do not see where it is necessary at all.

All those in favour of the amendment, say aye.

All those contrary?

In my opinion the nays have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of the amendment, please stand.

All opposed to the amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the ayes are 22, the nays 45.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Sections 37 to 69, inclusive, formerly sections 38 to 70, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 71:

Mr. S. Lewis: On section 71: whereas I am in concurrence with the chair and the hon. Minister that in one sense—although not sufficient to vote against it—the government was right in feeling that the previous amendment was redundant with respect to the religion of the adopting foster parents in sections 38 and 39. I think that the amendment which I propose to move will not in fact be redundant of any part of this bill. In fact, it will be, I hope, an important addition to this bill.

The amendment, which will relate to no order being denied on grounds of religion, Mr. Chairman, will be, as those of us who are on the standing committee on education, health and welfare know, parallel to that moved in the committee by the Conservative hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eagleson).

I want to take a moment, Mr. Chairman, and give credit where credit is due to that hon. member for Lakeshore. He has fought a bold and good fight in this Legislature, and he has fought it honourably.

In the inexplicable manoeuvring behind the scenes, unfortunately, for whatever

reason, this particular amendment is not forthcoming from the government. But I think that to do justice to the speeches and the work that has been done in this Legislature by the hon. member for Lakeshore, I shall ultimately move my amendment in the express wording that he used.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to this House that if that amendment had not been withdrawn—accidentally withdrawn, unsuspectingly withdrawn—in the standing committee on education, health and welfare, it would have passed. I offer my personal feelings on that, but I suspect it would have passed and I honestly suspect, Mr. Chairman, that it would have passed with the majority of the Conservative members in that standing committee voting in favour of it. It was a good amendment, truly drafted and valid to its point.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I may say that if it behooves the hon. Prime Minister to allow a free vote on this amendment in the Legislature at this time, it is my strong feeling that the amendment would pass and pass with support from all political parties. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is time we spelled out our acceptance of interfaith adoption in the best welfare of the child, with clarity and without reservation. We must reject the bogeys and the vested interests of yesteryear, which have so bedevilled this issue in the public eye, so that it remains, whatever the hon. Minister may suggest, confused and muddled. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to this Legislature, that we have reached the point of maturity where a moral imperative demands that we be unequivocal on the question of no order being denied on religious grounds.

Like the hon. member for Parkdale, I think that the effect of sections 38 and 39 of this Act, working in concert, can result in interfaith adoption. The hon. Minister will correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that that, in effect, parallels the Lamb case. That is in fact what happened. The Lamb case was a judicial expression of sections 38 and 39, acting in concert. It was a judicial expression. I would have wished that the same expression would have come from this government, from the Legislature, indeed from outside interests. There is in the *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, the issue of April, 1964, a fascinating symposium on interfaith adoption in which one Darren Michael makes the following observation:

The fresh breezes of ecumenicity have evidently not achieved a velocity sufficient to permit cross-faith adoption where it is

felt that the best interest of the child would indicate its desirability.

The hon. Minister in committee—and he can again correct me if I am wrong—has argued that the Lamb case prevails—that there is no need for putting in an amending phrase that no order shall be denied on grounds of religion, because the Lamb case is the rule of the land and will ever after prevail.

I want to suggest strongly to the hon. Minister that the Lamb case is a temporary judgment. It can go either way—it could have been appealed or we can have an entirely different judgment in the future. It is not in fact an immutable decision. In truth, Mr. Chairman, the decision by Judge Little in the Lamb case was given precisely because he did not know the intent of the Legislature in respect to interfaith adoption. Thus a judge was put in the position of having to speculate upon that intent.

I hope I do not do my judicial friends damage by the words I use—my training is not as skilled as theirs—but Judge Little suggested that the religious factor spelled out in part 2 of this bill, did not in fact apply to part 4. And he therefore said and I quote from his decision:

This section refers only to the placing of children in foster care and makes no reference to adoption—

that is the section in part 2 of the bill.

One cannot infer that the requirement regarding religion therein set forth should be applied to part 4 of the Act where no reference to religion is made. It is clear that the Legislature did not intend any such limitation in adoptions, otherwise it would have said so.

The question that, therefore, I think, asks of the legal process, Mr. Chairman, is whether Judge Little's observation that the Legislature did not intend any such limitation in adoption, would stand up in future cases. I want to read into the record of this House one or two observations made by other eminent legal authorities on the intent of the Legislature. I recall the observation of Lord Watson in *Solomon vs. Solomon and Company*:

"Intention of the Legislature" is a common but very slippery phrase which, popularly understood, may signify anything from intention embodied in positive enactments to speculative opinion as to what the Legislature probably would have meant, although there has been an omission to enact it. In a court of law or equity, what the Legislature intended to be done

or not to be done can only be legitimately ascertained from that which it has chosen to enact, either in express words or by reasonable and necessary intendment.

And let it be said that Mr. Willis also has spelled out the rule. I can recall it in my brief sojourn in law school, of literal rules and frivolous rules and similar rules which can be given much interpretation. So I think the fundamental fact, Mr. Chairman, is that the legislative intent is not sufficient, and that indeed a subsequent ruling can deem an entirely different legislative intent. What we have to do, therefore, is to spell out unequivocally and with literal clarity precisely what we mean.

Judge Little in his decision said that he was satisfied on all other grounds and he referred to what is in this bill, I believe, section 77, subsection (b): "That the order will be in the best interests of the child." Within that clause there waged the debate over the religious factor and the validity of interfaith adoption.

The hon. Minister has also said, and others said in the standing committee on education, health and welfare, that by putting in a specific provision we would be tying the hands of the judge. My contention is, Mr. Chairman, that Judge Little himself demonstrated manifestly that he now has to pronounce on the intent of the Legislature. We are not in fact tying a judge's hands. What we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that all things being equal, religions should not be a factor in denying an order. Now, surely, there can be nothing with more valid and sensible and simple clarity. It by no means confines a judge, it just states without qualification, the position of this Legislature.

I strongly urge, Mr. Chairman, that the Legislature pass this amendment. I think it is important that the public know and that we know in our own minds, precisely the intent of this Act. We do not know as the Act presently stands.

In another very interesting observation from the Osgoode Hall journal, Mr. Darren Michael said, and I quote:

Having considered the terms of The Child Welfare Act and the jurisprudence of the highest courts in England, Canada and Ontario, how is it possible to say that here in Ontario in the year 1964, the religious affiliation of an infant's parents—father if legitimate, mother if illegitimate—can be a bar to the adoption of that child by any married couple who do not happen to share the same faith?

No doubt the simple answer is that it just is not done, but that is not a satisfactory answer in the absence of any clear-cut statutory directive for laying of decided cases that lay down any other alternative. It will continue to be an unsatisfactory answer until the Legislature determines to resolve the uncertainty and dubious legality of the current practice. Such a solution has indeed been suggested during the current session of the Ontario Legislature by R. A. Eagleson, the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the weight of evidence, the nature of the Act, the feelings of this Legislature, should give free and unqualified expression as to our intent. That intent can only be expressed in precise legislative language and I urge that the moral imperative work. The feeling which I suspect reside in the minds of the hon. members of this House, should be transformed into votes. I therefore move that subsection 2 of section 71 be amended by adding thereto the following:

And no order shall be denied on grounds of religion.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to dwell long on this, because I would only be repeating in principle what I said on section 38. I would like to emphasize again that religion is of the utmost importance in the upbringing of the child in modern society but at the same time we should bear in mind that there are many fine citizens who do not have the strong association with organized religion as many people did in the past. They are often fine citizens and would make good parents; and it is bearing this fact in mind, whether it be the religion or non-religion of the adopting parents, that they should be judged simply as people who would make good parents and would give a child a good home.

I know that the hon. Minister in this government has said that all this is now provided for, but still the government wavers. It weasels out of facing up to the issue. I feel that it should be spelled out in the words of the amendment of the hon. member for Scarborough West, or as I had suggested earlier in dealing with section 38.

So again I would plead, through you, Mr. Chairman, with the government and with the hon. members of this House, that we let the people of this province know exactly where we stand—that we want children who need adopting to be adopted strictly on the grounds of a good home, and not so much on the grounds of religion or lack of religion.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words. I have listened with interest to the presentations of the hon. member for Scarborough West and I regret very much that I, through circumstances that were beyond my control, I was not able to be present at the consideration of this bill before the standing committee.

There is one thing that I think is wrong when the hon. member says that all things being equal, religion should not play a part. It seems to me that all things being equal, the religion of the child should be most important. As one who is a practising member of a certain church, it is my own feeling that the important thing is the welfare of the child and I am sure that many also have that stand. So the important thing, I think, is the welfare of the child, and that is why I agree.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, so that my hon. friend will understand: I did not imply what I think he is suggesting. I said that all things being equal—that is that the adoption be deemed advisable and in the best welfare of the child, by the judge—religion as such, should not be a factor which would deny such adoption.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I think I have stated my position in this respect in my speech in the debate on the Throne Speech, some time ago, and I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that we are making a mountain out of a molehill on this issue, because I believe that we cannot find any statistics of people in this province of people having been denied a home because of their religious beliefs. I think I read into the record, a letter by Mr. Markle of the Catholic children's aid society of Toronto, at that time, and I think this still stands. I do not believe that this is really a problem and I think the hon. Minister will be able to tell us that, if this is not a problem, we are running into considerable problems by trying to put this type of amendment into legislation. I personally do not know how my party feels on the matter as a party, but I feel that this amendment is not necessary at all, that there is enough in the Act at the present time, to protect the religious faith of all children that have to be adopted.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised at the position just enunciated by my friend from Ottawa East.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): He is a wise man.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs says he is a wise man, but the

Liberal group saw fit a few minutes ago to put before this House an amendment, which in my opinion—I think in your opinion, too, Mr. Chairman—was really unnecessary. Certainly it was unnecessary in the hon. Minister's opinion. That amendment proposed, in regard to foster homes, that where a home was not available in one religious faith, it would be available in another. I think that is already provided in the bill quite clearly, and quite specifically. The hon. member for Parkdale nevertheless saw fit to move an amendment to set it forth as a clear and definite principle and we, in this group, agreed with that approach. We saw no harm in making it clear beyond all possible doubt.

But when we come to the question of adoption, Mr. Chairman, the matter is far from clear in the bill. In fact, I am coming to the conclusion that it is being left deliberately obscure. There is no doubt that under this bill, if it becomes law, it will be possible under certain circumstances to place a child in a foster home of a different faith, but it is by no means clear, that where circumstances otherwise make it desirable, it will be possible for a judge to order an adoption of an interfaith nature.

We have heard numerous references to the Lamb case; that the Lamb case established a precedent under which, if the judge considered the other circumstances to be proper, he could order an interfaith adoption. I am not a lawyer, but in talking to lawyers my understanding is that the Lamb case is law in the district of Parry Sound and not anywhere else. It was a decision of the district court of the district of Parry Sound. As I understand it, that decision is not binding on any other court except the district court of Parry Sound and subordinate courts within that jurisdiction, that is all.

There has been no decision at a higher level that, under our statute as it now stands, interfaith adoption is possible. No one knows how the Court of Appeal of Ontario or the Supreme Court of Canada might find in such a matter. Why should we make it necessary to take the question to the court of appeal or to the supreme court? We all know that such a proceeding would take about two years and involve tremendous costs. If we are agreed that interfaith adoption is proper where in the opinion of the presiding judge that is the best way of looking after the needs of the child concerned—not to be entered upon frivolously, but no judge would enter upon it frivolously and would act only in the best interests of the child—if we believe that this is a good principle, then why do we not

put it into legislation so that it will be clear to everybody on the face of the earth and so that there could not be any possible doubt about it?

Why are we holding back, why are we equivocating on the matter? Why are we not willing to come out and say that this is the policy of the province of Ontario?

The hon. member for Scarborough West mentioned that when this matter was before the standing committee on—I have forgotten the exact name of that committee, but education, health and welfare are its three duties—that an amendment in precisely the terms he is now putting forth was moved by the hon. member for Lakeshore, Mr. Chairman. I regret that the hon. member for Lakeshore is not here today, because I know he is most interested in this matter and he was prepared to bring it to a head at the committee meeting. At that time those who were present will recall that the hon. Minister said: "Let this one stand while I have a chance to think about it."

Perhaps the hon. member for Lakeshore and some of the rest of us were, shall we say, beguiled by the innocent nature of the hon. Minister's remarks on previous occasions in that committee. When he had said let a section stand so I can think about it, he himself came back with an amendment incorporating in all essentials the proposal that had been put forward in the committee. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Lakeshore may have thought that he was going to do the same in this case; that what was worrying him was perhaps the nature of the drafting rather than the principle involved and that the hon. Minister himself would bring forth the amendment. I suspect that that is what happened. I am certain that the hon. member for Lakeshore was quite serious about the amendment and wanted to see it carry in the committee. Therefore he would not have withdrawn it or let it stand unless he had thought that the hon. Minister was likely to bring forward such an amendment himself.

Furthermore, I do not think there is any doubt at all, as my hon. friend from Scarborough West suggested, that if that amendment had come to a vote in the standing committee it would have carried. There is no doubt that it represented the consensus of the standing committee. I might say that at the time there were only three Opposition members in the committee, the hon. member for Scarborough West and myself from the New Democratic Party, and the hon. member for Ottawa East representing the Liberal

Party; otherwise all members of the committee present were Conservative members and my guess, and I think it is pretty close to being right from having heard what they were saying and having had some of them make comments to me, is that the Conservative members themselves, apart altogether from the Opposition members present, would have voted two to one in favour of the amendment.

An hon. member: They did not.

Mr. Bryden: They did not because they were led to believe that the hon. Minister was going to give the matter further consideration. I certainly am not suggesting for one minute that the hon. Minister implied that he was going to give it favourable consideration, but I am sure that in view of what had been happening in the committee that is what the other hon. members thought.

They were all ready to vote for it. I will not now talk about conversations that took place outside of the committee meeting, but there is no doubt in the world that at least some of the government members were quite unhappy that the hon. member for Lakeshore saw fit to withdraw his amendment, they would have liked to have voted on it. I do not happen to see any of them present in the House at the moment, but certainly there were a good many of them that made it quite clear that they favoured the amendment. Some of them at least sotto voce, indicated that they would have liked to have had an opportunity to vote on it and bring the thing to a head right in the committee. I regret they did not have the opportunity.

I suggest that the government should adopt the procedure suggested by my hon. friend from Scarborough West. Why not remove the whips and make this a free vote? This is a matter that to a certain degree we can recognize impinges on religious convictions, private convictions of the members, and it is not really a partisan issue. It is an issue, which, I imagine, cuts across political parties generally. I have no doubt that in our party there are some people—not in this House but some active people in the party—who probably would not agree with this amendment. I believe that the hon. members in the House from this group all agree with it, although they can speak for themselves if they do not, but I believe that in the Liberal Party there are people on both sides of the question, I believe that the same is true on the government side. There are undoubtedly some members who conscientiously would oppose this amendment or would consider it inexpedient, but there is no question in the

world that there are hon. members on the government side of the House who are absolutely convinced that an amendment such as proposed by my hon. friend from Scarborough West is necessary and desirable in the interests of children who may subsequently be up for adoption. I would hate to think, Mr. Chairman, that these hon. members will either have to absent themselves from this House or vote against their consciences because party discipline is applied in a case where I think it is quite inappropriate.

Let the matter be settled on the basis of the individual consciences of the people's elected representatives. If the majority in their individual consciences are opposed to the amendment, that is fine, I am prepared to accept their verdict, but I hate to have to accept a verdict that is dictated on the basis of party discipline in a matter of this kind. I urge the hon. Prime Minister to permit a free vote on this matter. It is not appropriate to make this a matter of government policy, in any case, and to impose party discipline. I urge the hon. Prime Minister to permit a free vote, and then I urge hon. members to vote in accordance with their consciences, one way or the other. I have a hunch that, in a free vote, the amendment would carry; but if it does not, I am perfectly prepared to accept the verdict of the House.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. member for Woodbine that this is probably not a partisan question. Certainly I do not approach it from a partisan point of view but from the point of view of good law making and good jurisprudence.

The intent of the section as it is now drafted, and in relation to other sections, Mr. Chairman, is to ensure that the courts have full freedom to make their orders in accordance with the best interests of the child. That and nothing else. Now, if we are to accept the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough West—and I think he suggested that he had some inspiration from some other source—we would be saying that no order can be denied on grounds of religion or non-religion, and that is a pious statement. We may argue about the state of the jurisprudence, but I think it is clear now that no order can be denied on these grounds.

Let us think of other comparable things. Should an order be denied on grounds of race; should an order be denied on grounds of place of origin; many of these qualifying phrases we see so often in the human rights code. I should think we would not want to in any way hamper the discretion of the

courts in these matters. We might say, then, in amending this statute, we would put in all these good things; we might say, to take the matter to its logical extreme of absurdity, that no order shall be denied for any good reason whatsoever. This is in fact a limitation being imposed upon the untrammelled discretion of the courts if we adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa East I should state, sir, that he has had a good deal of experience with children's aid societies and has been in touch with a number of them throughout the province—at this point certainly there had not been an overwhelming number of difficulties from the point of Catholic children being adopted into Catholic homes; there has not been a shortage of Catholic homes for deserted children. Similarly with Protestant homes for Protestant children, and so on. So that in one sense, with this situation with the amendment that is proposed, in the actual application it may appear as though there is not an urgent need for it. On the other hand, from the point of view of the principle which this amendment is part of, if there is not a proper home—I mean by that a good home with loving parents—for a child within the religious denomination of its parents, then that child should be assured of a home, a good home with the love which is in a home, rather than be kept in an institution or something else, and I would say—indeed I am sure—that every hon. member would agree with that principle.

We do not want children to be deprived of the love, affection and security of a home. I am sure there would be no religious leader who would deprive a child of the affection of a home on the basis that it did not fit any one particular religion. It is because of the principle attached to this that we will vote with this amendment. But I want to re-assert again that, from the aspect of the details or the application, there is not a great deal of alarm. A principle is being stated here that the home and the love and the affection of a family should be the right of anyone born in Ontario, and it is for this reason that we support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all the speeches that have been made in this respect, but relating especially to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition,

I would like to point out to him that all through the Act this principle is evident. To add more words to any section in that particular design is simply, in my estimation, giving a direction; it is not an order to a judge in this particular respect. This section has worked beautifully all through the years. We have had no difficulties with it at all. When it was asked to be looked at, and to be decided upon, it was acted upon in a very judicious way.

I appreciate that I am one of those who is a firm believer—and I think this is running through the Act; as a matter of fact we admitted it in that particular respect—of having full faith in the judiciary of this province and giving them full authority and full responsibility in dealing with these questions. Surely we have not reached the point where we should even give the slightest direction to the judiciary of this province of Ontario in this respect. I think we have full confidence in them and I honestly believe, Mr. Chairman—and this is what I put to the hon. members of the House—it is quite all right to speak about amendments and to speak piously about what it is going to do and what it should not do. Let me say this, I would much prefer to live with the section as it is there and give full power to the judge to decide than to create some trouble. I think, Mr. Chairman, we have had no trouble in this province in the religious sense, so let us not please create any.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment say "aye."

Those opposed to the amendment say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment please stand.

All those opposed to the amendment please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" 18; the "nays" 48.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Sections 71 to 81, inclusive, formerly sections 72 to 82, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 82:

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves that section 3 of section 82, formerly 83, be amended by striking out the words "unless the contrary is expressed" in the third line.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In order to explain this, Mr. Chairman, the words are deleted to strengthen the objectives of not making a separate class of adopted children.

Section 82, formerly 83, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 83 to 86, inclusive, formerly sections 84 to 87, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 87:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to section 88, now 87, which relates to the general powers to make regulations—I would like to raise the point that was raised in the standing committee to some extent. To an important extent the effectiveness of this bill will depend upon the regulations issued under it. The power to make regulations in this section are quite broad. For example, they include such matters as prescribing the standard of services that children's aid societies shall provide; prescribing special needs of children for which joint facilities may be established under section 14; governing the construction, alteration, remodelling, extension and equipment of receiving homes; prescribing the amounts that shall be paid by parents for the purposes of subsection 1 of section 26, and so on.

I do not particularly object to the fact that these things are to be done by regulation, I would agree with what no doubt is the thinking of the government that it is almost impossible to regulate such matters by statute. A certain degree of flexibility is desirable. We can all accept that. What I do object to, however, Mr. Chairman, is the growing tendency in this jurisdiction and in most jurisdictions to delegate most of the lawmaking authority to people who are in no way accountable to the elected members or, at any rate, whose accountability is so indirect as to be practically meaningless. I say that the hon. Minister could quite readily have his regulations available in draft form so that at least we would see them before we were called upon to vote on this bill.

When this matter was raised in the House, the hon. Minister said that was not possible, he was still talking to experts about the regulations. That is fine. That may be his situation. But he also indicated that the bill will not, in any case, come into effect until January 1 next year, so why could he not let the bill stand for the present, until he gets his regulations drafted and then let the hon. members of the Legislature take a look at them? The hon. Minister is looking at me in some bewilderment at the moment. I have heard it said that there is going to be a fall

session of this Legislature. If that is so, the bill could stand until that time. Even if it is not in the present plans of the government to call—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that I stated that I would let it stand.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, no. No. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. I may have missed a word along the way. We suggested to him that there was no reason why he could not let the bill stand, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister does not expect it to come into force until January 1 next year, in any case. Unfortunately, the hon. Minister did not agree with that point of view, and we are going ahead without really knowing what is in the regulations.

I make a special point of this, Mr. Chairman, because we have had rather bitter experience in the past, where statutes passed through this House looked fine, and then they were—shall we say—substantially changed as far as their real import was concerned, by the regulations adopted under them. I think we have a right to be particularly uneasy when we see such broad powers given to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, with regard to regulations.

The regulations that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council might pass under clause D for example, could change the whole import and stress of this bill. This is what has happened before, and I think it is time we made sure it does not happen again. I have many times argued in this House that there should be a standing committee of the House—one that is empowered to meet between sessions, as well as during sessions, but a standing committee nevertheless—that would regularly review all regulations issued by the government. Unfortunately, we do not have such a committee. If we had, then I think people such as the hon. members of this group would be quite happy to see this regulation section go through. But failing any sort of review, I must say that we view it with some uneasiness. We hope that the regulations will be in accordance with the spirit of the Act, but we have no guarantee that they will be.

There is only one appeal on this matter that I would make to the hon. Minister. I would ask him to publish his regulations two or three months in advance of their coming into force. I think that is possible in this case. He has said that the Act will not come into force itself until January 1 next year. The regulations cannot come into force before the Act comes into force, so, if he pub-

lishes his regulations in September or October, as early as possible, then we in this House and others will at least have a chance of looking at them before they come into force, even though we will not have any specific opportunity to deal with them in the House.

The hon. Minister has said that he is in close contact with experts in the drafting of these regulations. I think that is a sound practice, but I think we should dispel the notion that experts have now taken over the government of the province. Maybe they have. I do not know, but the theory is still that elected representatives are governing the province, and are responsible for its governments. Experts have a place. But it is not sufficient to say that the elected members do not have to see these regulations because the experts are straightening them out and we can rely on them to look after these matters.

As long as I am a member of this House, although I have the greatest respect for experts—I think their opinions should always be consulted—I am not prepared to give them carte blanche to make laws in my name. This, unfortunately, is what we are

doing when, as no doubt we will, we pass section 88.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member, that as soon as it is possible, the regulations will be published.

Section 87, formerly section 86, agreed to.

Section 88, formerly section 89, agreed to.

On section 90:

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves that section 90 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The moneys required for the purposes of this Act shall, until March 31, 1966, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund and thereafter shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated therefore by the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

Sections 89 to 92 inclusive, formerly sections 90 to 93, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 119 reported.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 7, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, June 7, 1965

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond	3765
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3787

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment, certain bills with amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The eighteenth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): It is said, Mr. Chairman, that hope springs eternal in the human breast; but I noticed you did not respond to the word "carried" so I guess I have to get up and tell you something about my department. I kept waiting.

Before presenting the estimates for the consideration of the House, sir, I would like to touch upon a few of the highlights of the activities of the department over the past year. This will have perforce to be done rather sketchily, but I would like to pay a little more attention to the programmes which we propose, new programmes which we shall undertake and the extension of existing programmes, in order that the hon. members, through you, sir, may have some idea of some of the things we have in mind and some of the things we have been planning and towards which we are aiming.

I need not remind you, sir, that The Department of Health is one of the largest "service departments" of government in that the budget of almost \$99 million is mainly expended for direct services provided by the members and staff of the department. Because there can never be any relaxation of effort in

health matters, and perhaps because much of the work in which we are involved lacks the glamour and fascination inherent in some branches of health care, some of our people may tend to think little is going on.

We only need to look at the great increase in the budgets. In 1958-1959 when I assumed responsibility for the department, the budget was \$59.5 million; this year it is almost \$99 million, about 66 per cent increase in seven years. In 1958-1959 there were approximately 9,600 people employed by the department; the present complement is 14,000, excluding a number of consultants who provide service on a sessional basis as required. These figures which I have just quoted exclude the budgets of the Ontario hospital services commission.

The broad spectrum of services provided, touches almost every facet of life from the programmes for prenatal and perinatal care through the division of maternal and child hygiene to the overseeing of cemeteries under the division of environmental sanitation.

Although the department was established for the main purpose of combating infectious diseases, its interests have broadened and its responsibilities have increased greatly in the 42 years of its existence. Sometimes I fear we tend to become complacent about these early epidemic diseases; because we do not hear of them in our times, we tend to believe they are no longer a threat. This is so only because of the constant vigil kept by the health workers all over our province and nation. The killers of yesteryear are not conquered, they are only controlled. But measures to ensure these controls are still provided by The Department of Health—the provision of biological vaccines, toxoids, anti-sera, and so on, are still our responsibility and with the apparent complacency I have mentioned, the need for vigorous education of our people steadily grows. I find it is difficult to apprise people of dangers they have never seen or experienced, and even when minor epidemics do occur their significance not unusually goes unnoticed.

Involved in these activities—the activities of watching over the general health of our

people and trying to keep in check diseases that can be controlled—are four separate divisions of the department chiefly, although the entire department has some involvement at some time.

The branch chiefly concerned is, of course, the health units branch, involved in the matter of public health.

There are now 38 health units operating in Ontario, of which eight are in territorial districts of northern Ontario; 25 are county health units, including nine city-county units and one two-county unit, and four serve a varying number of municipalities within a county. These health units provide a full-time service to a population of close to 3 million people and I think it is worthy of note that more than 80 per cent of the total population of our province comes within the sphere of influence of some public health facility.

Four new units opened in 1964—Renfrew county, Metro Windsor-Essex county, Carleton county and Wellington-Dufferin counties—the first-named, namely, Renfrew county, giving full-time public health service for the first time in that county. Fifty full-time qualified medical officers, specialists in public health, serve in the health units, as directors.

Of the 38 health units now in existence, 25 have been established for more than 15 years and, as such, have demonstrated to the more than 700 municipalities under their jurisdiction the value to the individual and to the community of full-time public health services. It is hoped that again during the coming year, further areas not now receiving such service will establish this type of worthwhile programme.

Grants paid by the province to these units for their basic programme totalled \$2,598,034 for the calendar year 1964. In addition to these, special grants totalling \$585,000 were provided for programmes over and above basic services such as prenatal classes, vision and hearing testing, secondary school services and additional medical and sanitation activities.

The northern Ontario public health service was established in 1962 to bring public health services to the many isolated communities and territorial districts which do not form part of a health unit. As in the orthodox health units, our programmes are built mainly around general sanitation, immunization, public health nursing and investigation of communicable diseases.

It is our ultimate goal to bring generalized public health services to those unorganized areas that cannot receive service from existing health units. This has been attained in the

field of sanitation, and we trust, in due course as staff becomes available to us, that the goal will be reached in respect to public health nursing.

A health education section has been established within the public health administration branch to give assistance in educational matters to public health personnel when it is requested or indicated. The service of this section is not meant to be a substitute for basic health education responsibilities of health unit and branch directors but, rather, to augment and supplement the work they do.

Maternal and child health branch, 1964, concerns itself with problems affecting the health of the expectant mother and the health of infants, preschool and school age children. Our main objectives are, as one would expect, a reduction in maternal and infant mortality and means to improve the health of mothers and children. Since local health departments and hospitals are autonomous bodies, our branch provides consultation regarding maternal and child health programmes in local health departments, advice concerning nursing problems in the obstetrical and newborn nursery departments of all public general hospitals, liaison between various official and voluntary health agencies, as well as assistance to help co-ordinate research.

In our poison control programme there are 31 poison control centres in the province. A number of other areas have indicated interest in establishing new centres. A physician from our staff visits these centres in order to discuss problems and programmes and offer consultative service. Reports to the central collection agency indicate that household drugs are responsible for nearly 60 per cent of such poisoning accidents—more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of these are due to acetyl salicylic acid or compounds of this substance—commonly known as Aspirin, and about 30 per cent are due to household products, including cleaners, polishes, paint products, pesticides and fertilizers. The age groups at greatest risk are the two-year-olds followed by the one-year-olds and the three-year-olds, which is to be expected.

Phenylketonuria—PKU—is the result of a metabolic defect present at birth in a small proportion of infants. The incidence of cases, as we heard a few days ago, has been quoted as rather a wide range, somewhere between one in 10,000 and one in 40,000 births. If not treated, in most cases, this condition will result in mental retardation. To prevent mental retardation, treatment with a special diet must be started during the first few weeks of life. In 1963, you will

recall, Mr. Chairman, a programme was set up by The Ontario Department of Health to supply at public expense the necessary diet without charge to affected children, on request. This diet is prescribed and distributed at three special centres located at Kingston, London and Toronto. Since few cases are found, and great gaps still remain in our knowledge concerning this condition, a research committee has been set up to study all cases being treated at these three centres.

There has been much interest in this disease, PKU, and many proposals for its control have been advanced. Some jurisdictions have recently made it mandatory that this test be done on every newborn infant, and a bill is presently before this House proposing to make it mandatory that every parent shall cause the test to be done on their newborn children. I have given long and careful thought to this matter, and have discussed it personally with the chief of every pediatric service at all of our medical schools in Ontario. All of us, as I said last week, are agreed the test is of great value, but none agrees that it should be made mandatory. This has never been done in medicine, and since—I must repeat what I have said often—times in the past—government cannot practise medicine, it is not believed government should legislate how medicine should be practised.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Why not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We believe this can and will be done voluntarily—would my hon. friend like the government to tell him how to practise law?

Mr. Sopha: Well, they certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But the lawyers never obey the government.

Mr. Sopha: We certainly do.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We believe this can and will be done voluntarily, and to that end I have written the chairman of each hospital board and the chief of medical staff of every hospital in Ontario, asking that PKU testing be made a routine service in the hospital. These letters went out, I believe, about 2½ weeks ago and I already have a confirmatory response from more than 50 per cent of the hospitals; just over 100 out of the 174 hospitals have undertaken to make this a routine service in their hospital.

Where the hospital laboratory is equipped and staffed to interpret the test, it will be paid for as an insured service under the

Ontario hospital services commission. Where the hospital cannot interpret the test, it will be done free of charge by the central laboratory of The Department of Health.

The chief functions of the epidemiology branch are the provision of advisory and consultative assistance concerning communicable diseases and their control, investigation of disease incidence, collection, compilation and analysis of communicable disease data, the purchase and distribution of biological products used in the provision of immunization and the purchase and distribution of insulin and some other preparations used in the treatment of diseases. I am glad to say to you, sir, that no serious epidemic of communicable disease was reported in the province during the year just ended, although there was a significant increase in the incidence of German measles. Almost twice the number of cases reported in 1963 were reported for 1964, and this is a far cry from only a very few years ago when we had to report these cases in the hundreds.

Two cases of paralytic poliomyelitis were reported in 1964, and these are the first cases reported in the last two years. One patient was severely infected, requiring respirator care, and died of complications about one month after the onset of paralysis. This was the first polio death since 1960, a rather commendable record in our province and one of which we are reasonably proud.

Financial assistance is now available for needy families with children suffering from cystic fibrosis. The Ontario society for crippled children acts as the department's agent in providing prescribed drugs, and equipment, for any needs of cystic fibrotic children who are residents of the province of Ontario. An item to cover this has again been included under the main office vote of the department's estimates. The amount is \$250,000.

This is a disease of infancy and childhood, certainly fatal unless vigorous treatment is begun early. This treatment is so costly as to be beyond the means of most families, hence the involvement of the government in providing some assistance in this matter.

When The Department of Health was first established, a man's environment was not of very great importance except insofar as it might affect the purity of the water he drank. I believe it was because of an idea that burial of the dead might adversely affect the purity of man's water supply that the control, and so on, of cemeteries was first put under The Department of Health.

But in these days of rapid and extensive

industrialization, with the increasing concentration of population in certain areas, our environment is becoming of greater importance from the standpoint of health. Both consultative and inspection services are provided by this branch to local boards of health, to schools, to various departments of government, to summer camps, to milk processing plants and to dairies. The branch is also responsible for the administration of The Cemeteries Act.

Although air pollution control comes under the industrial hygiene division of the department, it is very much related to and very much involved in man's environment. In November, 1964, regulations were passed requiring the submission of plans and prior approval of air pollution control measures for new sources of industrial emissions or for existing sources which are altered or modified.

During 1964, five approvals, covering 27 sources, were issued, and one refusal was made since that date. Preliminary discussions have been held with 17 companies, which plan construction during 1965. Emission surveys were conducted at 57 plants. Twenty-one complaints regarding industrial sources were handled. Operation of air sampling stations in 21 Ontario municipalities was continued to determine the amount of airborne particulate matter and amount of radioactive fallout. The tests for radioactivity are done by the radiation protection laboratory and this activity is being expanded to encompass gaseous constituents. Four municipalities passed air pollution bylaws during 1964, bringing the total to 22.

Applications for financial assistance for the expansion or initiation of municipal air pollution control programmes were received from three municipalities, and approved, and three others are now in the process of having their applications considered. The first training course for municipal air pollution control inspectors was held in January, 1965, with 12 municipalities represented, and you will recall that this programme is provided for community municipalities at no expense to themselves.

Three applications for funds for air pollution research projects were approved, for a total amount of \$50,000.

In June, 1964, the state of California approved two devices which are attached to the exhaust pipe to reduce exhaust emissions. This made its automotive legislation effective for the 1966 model automobile. Since that time one manufacturer has had an engine modification approved, which will result in lower cost to the consumer than the exhaust

device. Other automobile manufacturers have applications pending for similar types of engine modifications.

We have held discussions with the Canadian automotive manufacturers' association. The industrial hygiene branch is keeping in close touch with developments in California, where problems of maintenance of the control devices and of enforcement of the legislation are being encountered. Engine modifications may eventually prove a much more effective measure.

During 1965-66 we intend to expand the air pollution control programme. Legislation implemented last year brought under provincial control new sources of industrial emissions. It is our plan now to develop a programme for the control of existing industrial sources of air pollution.

It is estimated that there are 4,000 industrial operations in the province which contribute significantly to the pollution burden, and, in consequence, these should receive priority. To this purpose, it is necessary to initiate an orderly recruitment of experienced professional personnel and to give them individually specialized training in air pollution control.

Provision has been made in our estimates for six additional personnel and as these staff are acquired and trained, our control programme will be developed as follows:

1. The grouping of sources by industrial classification and rating of each classification according to its air pollution potential.
2. Plants in those classifications having the highest air pollution potential will be surveyed first on a province-wide basis to determine their atmospheric emissions and the degree of control required. This programme of control will be on a voluntary basis with industry's co-operation, until such time as the acquisition of trained personnel makes it possible to implement enforcing regulations.

Looking for a moment at the laboratory branch, I would observe that many of our branches are engaged in routine though important tasks, so much so that there is a tendency to overlook them or to forget their presence. Their functions do not take on the drama or glamour of a television or radio production, and yet in the day-by-day business of watching over the general health of our people, they are of the greatest significance. Little is ever heard, for instance, about the laboratory service provided by The Department of Health and yet it performs practically all of the public health laboratory service and about 30 per cent of all the clinical laboratory work done in the province.

The year 1964 was a notable one, particularly in the history of the laboratory branch for it marked the completion of three-quarters of a century of service. Although The Department of Health was established only some 40 years ago, the laboratory branch had been going for much longer than that; 75 years of service were completed last year. It was hoped to mark this event by the opening of the fine new home situated on Highway 401 in Etobicoke township. However, this will open later in this year.

The first concern of the laboratory service in 1890 was with community hygiene and the diagnosis of infectious illness, and this has been maintained as a primary function. Although the communicable diseases originally dealt with might have been eradicated before now, they continue to present problems. From the original Toronto laboratory, regional laboratories were established as early as 1904 and these today number 17 in assistance to expanding public health practice in a growing province.

During 1964 specimens examined numbered 2,088,369 for an increase of more than ten per cent. These included water specimens, raw milk specimens, medical microbiology, serodiagnosis—blood specimens—and clinical pathology.

We have also maintained for some years, the technician training unit of the central laboratory. Last year it graduated 20 students, completing a total of 234 in the ten years the school has been in existence. The first mobile laboratory spent a useful summer in providing assistance to the Muskoka health unit. A second mobile laboratory was equipped to provide service for the eastern counties of the province, and a new regional laboratory is to be sited with the new hospital school at Palmerston, and building, I understand, is about to begin now.

Looking now at the tuberculosis prevention branch, we are bound to agree with the many that much progress has come about in this field of medicine in a relatively short time.

I had occasion to say last night, attending a dinner which was held to bid farewell to the present director of our service, who had served this province and this government well for more than 20 years, that the men and women who are now in this field of medicine have seen it probably at its worst and have, through their efforts, come to see its incidence at its lowest possible peak. There are at the present time, something of the order of 800 patients in all the tuberculosis sanatoria of the province. It is

a far cry from just six and a half years when I became Minister when there were 6,000 patients in our sanatoria.

Yet, we are also much concerned because of the dangers resulting from a complacency which seems to have attacked all of us, and seems to give a false sense of security arising out of that progress.

While it is gratifying to note that again our province showed the world's lowest mortality rate for tuberculosis, it must be emphasized over and over again that this is no longer a significant statistic. The incidence of tuberculosis last year in Ontario was 26.4 per 100,000 population—a total of 1,702 active cases were recorded on the provincial register. This is the significant figure which we must always keep before us and which should constantly remind us that tuberculosis is not yet conquered and that continuous watchful care, case-seeking and research are still very necessary.

Tuberculosis is now relatively more significant in the older age groups, and apparently this attacks men—although Mr. Chairman, we are still referred to as the stronger sex, but this, I can assure you, is not medically true. In 1963, 64 per cent of the active cases were males, 36 per cent females. To the age of 30, the incidence for both sexes is very much levelled out; beyond that age it attacks much more rapidly so that the male rate begins to climb sharply while the female rate gradually drops.

There are 12 sanatoria in which at November 1, 1964, there were 871 patients, compared with 1,103 at the same date in 1963. Surplus accommodation is being used for other purposes as follows:

General hospital, active treatment beds,
341 beds—Hamilton 224; St. Catharines 25;
Windsor 92;

Chronic hospital, 520 beds—Brantford 30 for children, which might better be classed as mental hospital; Cornwall, 44; Haileybury 86; Hamilton 95; Kitchener 91; St. Catharines 24; Weston 150;

Mental hospital, 709 beds—Gravenhurst 300; London 184; Ottawa 78; Sudbury 37; Windsor 110;

Rehabilitation hospital, Hamilton, 64 beds;

Outpatient mental health clinics, Ottawa and Windsor;

School for laboratory technicians, Hamilton;

School of nursing, Hamilton;

Society for crippled children, Hamilton;

Institute of physical medicine, Hamilton;

Schools for nursing assistants, Kitchener and London.

Since the greater part of treatment is now outside of sanatoria, the importance of assuring adequate follow-up of ambulatory patients on chemotherapy is now being stressed, and as you will recall was within the scope of the programme last year as a programme of benefit that was provided out of The Department of Health.

Chest clinics are conducted by various agencies, principally sanatoria, city boards of health and the department's division of tuberculosis prevention. The department maintains its own clinics in five permanent districts serving 70 centres.

The tuberculosis prevention division conducts mass surveys throughout the province except in two counties, using five bus units and one portable miniature x-ray unit. In 1963, there were 283 community and industrial surveys conducted by the branch, as well as 25 for special groups—371,726 persons. A total of 242 cases of pulmonary tuberculosis—58 active—were reported. Other diseases and abnormalities were discovered in 4,352 cases.

Hospitals are now co-operating fully in the hospital admission chest x-ray programme. More than 340,000 in-patients and out-patients were x-rayed in 1963. In 1963, 111 cases of active tuberculosis were discovered by this means.

Other special programmes conducted by the branch: jail chest x-ray programme, homes for the aged, recipients of public assistance—provincial and municipal—foster parents, bush camp workers, applicants in industry, food handlers, barbers and hairdressers, and school board employees.

While The Department of Health has an overriding interest in and concern for the education and preparation of all health personnel, there is a more particular interest in those whom we need to staff the facilities through which we as a department provide services. The majority of these call for post-graduate training, and for this purpose bursaries are provided in 18 different professional specialties. In 1964, 281 people benefited by such bursaries.

The dental and medical students' bursary plan was initiated during the academic year 1962-63 and is now in its third year of operation. During the present academic year, bursaries under this plan were awarded to 22 dental students and eight medical students, a total of 30. In addition 585 other bursaries were provided for people taking other special

courses. This meant a total of 896 bursaries were provided in the amount of \$965,000. This does not include the three schools of nursing operated by the department for the education and training of registered nurses. In 1964 they had a total enrolment of 92 students and graduated 73 nurses.

Then in all our hospitals there is an on-going programme of in-service training for attendants and ward staff. Last year 606 men and women successfully completed these training courses, and experience has indicated that the failure rate for such staff members is very low.

During this session already, two quite complete statements have been made to the House concerning the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation, so I will not take the time of the House to repeat this material. Alcoholism, however, is a matter in which other departments are involved, directly and indirectly, and as in many other areas, co-ordination is needed in the development of active and effective planning.

When the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation was established, I believe it was in the mind of the founders that it would be the agency through which all the government's activities in this area would be directed, and that, as well, it would act as a guiding and co-ordinating force for all such activity. I have encouraged the foundation in this concept and now, after careful and exhaustive study, an exciting new programme has been proposed, which government has adopted, and which I now propose to this House.

The proposal is as follows:

(1) Ontario's present alcoholic population of 90,000 to 100,000 people will reach 120,000 in 20 years unless, in the meantime, our prevention and treatment activities are substantially expanded.

(2) The government of Ontario is prepared to declare alcoholism a public health problem requiring for its prevention and control a complete programme of education and information, early detection, treatment and rehabilitation, together with continuing research. The alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation will play a leading role in such a programme in co-operation with other government and private organizations and agencies of Ontario, and will thus fulfil the role originally envisaged for it.

(3) Prevention will be achieved mainly by: (a) expanding the present youth education programmes in the schools; (b) expanding the advertising and publicity which will reach adults; (c) developing industrial pro-

grammes with a view to the earliest possible recognition and treatment of pre-alcoholic symptoms; (d) developing and expanding existing community programmes for early detection and treatment of alcoholism.

(4) Treatment of alcoholism should be considered separately for three main groups, and all of this will be undertaken by the foundation:

(a) The employed alcoholic population of about 50,000, for whom industrially oriented staff and facilities are needed for diagnosis and outpatient treatment and referrals where needed to other facilities.

(b) The skid row and chronic drunkenness offender group of 9,000 to 10,000 for whom there is a need for: (i) changes in the law or its administration regarding public drunkenness; (ii) medically staffed detoxication and diagnostic units in major cities; (iii) small half-way house rehabilitation units; (iv) rehabilitation farms for up to 3,000 semi-permanent occupants.

(c) The remaining 40,000 individuals in the alcoholic population who are not employed and for whom there is a need for: (i) home and agency treatment; (ii) outpatient clinic treatment; (iii) day-care and hospital treatment.

(5) While the foundation now has in seven out of Ontario's ten economic regions skeleton programmes of research, education and outpatient treatment, the expanded treatment facilities proposed above call for a fourfold to fivefold increase in the number of professional personnel—physicians, social workers, psychologists, nurses, and so on—having some specialized training in the management of addictions. In order to provide the training required, the foundation will establish as soon as possible small inpatient units in each of the four to five university centres in Ontario where health professional training is now concentrated. These inpatient units would serve both for treatment of patients and for training of professional personnel. A total of approximately 350 to 400 hospital beds throughout the province is envisaged for this programme.

This plan is based on an approach to the problem of alcoholism that is entirely different from that prevailing when most of the existing legislation was written. It is based on the "treatment principle" as opposed to the "punishment principle" of the past. It is our conviction that this is a more realistic view, but even if we were not convinced of this, it can be said the old method has done no good and anything should be better. From the viewpoint of cost alone, this proposal

will, in the overall consideration, be less costly. We project the cost ten years hence to be \$18 million.

The proposal and programme is so great and comprehensive that it cannot be brought about overnight. The programme is shared over the next ten years. I think it not unreasonable that the House will hail this as a bold and imaginative undertaking, and one that will be achieved. I need only remind you that the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, Rev. A. W. Downer, pointed out that we have more than accomplished the tasks we set ourselves five years ago.

Even our hon. friends opposite will pardon us if we proudly note, once again, Ontario leads. No other province has yet taken such a step and, remember, too, we do this alone—although I continue to press the federal government to support us in this programme, as recommended by the Hall commission.

Looking for a few moments at mental health, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that during the Throne debate, I presented to the House a detailed statement concerning the activities of this branch, but certain aspects apparently were not as clear as they might have been.

The hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) wondered, "What was the policy of the department in respect of mental health clinics, and why were they being encouraged to locate in hospitals?" The policy was enunciated in 1959, and with very few changes, we have adhered to it. Then it was hailed as progressive, forward-looking; it is still considered so by those qualified to judge. For years now, we have heard the cries: "Mental illness is no different from any other illness," and "Let's treat the mentally ill like other sick people." And with these statements I agree. Yet, when we do this, we find the cry changes, and even in that now much-quoted reference work, the Hall report, we hear this cry, and yet we read recommendations specifically spelled out that would make the treatment different.

The community-based clinic, for those who cannot seek the services of the privately practising psychiatrist, is the keystone of the treatment services. Backed up by inpatient facilities in the psychiatric unit of the general hospital, or the community psychiatric hospital, or the Ontario hospital, the spectrum of treatment services is complete. I believe, however, the hon. member was concerned that prevention would be less emphasized in a hospital-based service; I take this from his suggestion that we are fast becoming a "department of sickness." I can agree that this

could be a possibility, but I believe history of medicine would deny this belief. When health forces are called on to tackle an epidemic or a problem, certain priorities must first be established. If it is an active disease, treatment for the afflicted must come first. Those who are ill must be relieved, treated, and if possible, cured. In performing this function methods of prevention may become obvious, or may be developed—or research projects essential to the development of means of prevention may suggest themselves. All this has already happened many times over in the various branches of health care, and more and more these programmes are hospital-based.

The mentally disturbed patient may be ill for some other cause; his mental illness may be secondary to something else—all of us have encountered such cases. In the hospital-based clinic there is available to him every facility, every resource, scientific and human, the entire range of diagnostic and consultative services, just as in the case of the so-called physically ill patient.

There is, I submit to you, inestimable benefit to the mentally disturbed patient in his being able to go to the same place for treatment as all other sick people do. Perhaps we may never be able fully to measure this benefit, but I believe it is evident in the fact that of all those who seek help through these clinics, fewer than one-third of the number have had to be admitted to hospital, at least on the first visit. There is evidence that patients do seek help earlier through these facilities. We already have statistical experience to prove to us that patients admitted to the psychiatric units of general hospitals have an average stay of some 28 days. Perhaps the readmission rate is higher, but I cannot become very exercised over this. If, in balance, the total time required for treatment of the patient is shortened, then I think it is all to the good.

Taking the long-range view, I believe I can assure the hon. members that, according to our present knowledge, this is the better approach to the treatment of mental illness, and will lead to better control, and I hope, prevention.

How to prevent mental illness is not quite as simple as some of us may think—and one only has to work with the mentally ill to recognize how true that statement is. Before we can prevent illness, we have to know a very great deal more about it than we now know about mental illness, what it is and what causes it.

Out of this knowledge may well come

methods of control or prevention. But let us remember that society does not always readily accept these measures. There was great resistance to chlorination of water and pasteurization of milk when it was found these would control many diseases, water- and milk-borne. Mental illness is much more complex than typhoid or tuberculosis, and measures found useful in preventing it may have great impact upon our way of life—this, so far, is beyond our knowledge although we are learning things every day.

Some things are already known, and more and more public health people, those to whom we look instinctively for preventive measures, are becoming increasingly involved in mental health programmes, of case-finding, of follow-up, and of after-care. Voluntary organizations, mainly, perhaps, the branches of the Canadian mental health association, are steadily expanding their services in education, follow-up and after-care, and those of us close to this work can see the progress that is being made.

A few months ago I had the privilege of attending a dinner held in honour of the founder of the Canadian mental health association, Dr. Clare Hincks, who died very recently. This man spent the whole of his professional life striving to have the mentally ill given the same consideration and care and treatment as all our ill. Indeed, in this respect I think we in Ontario should be very proud of the fact that the name of Clare Hincks can rightfully rank on a par with names like Schweitzer of Africa, Seagrave of Burma, and many others whom one could mention, for he too had one cause which he espoused with evangelical fervour. On the occasion of that dinner in his honour he spoke of the progress he had seen in the course of one lifetime and he paid glowing tribute to the work that has been done here in Ontario, and the results that had been achieved. Men like Hincks know and can measure the progress—he was a psychiatrist, and often he told me that he saw his dreams coming slowly but surely to reality.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the rightness of our programmes, but I will have no hesitation in changing course quickly or suddenly if experience, or the opinions of those expert in the field, should indicate the need.

When I presented the report on mental health, I spoke also of mental retardation, and particularly of the work of the inter-departmental committee. I want, now, to speak in greater detail about this matter, and to present to the House a "blueprint" for future action.

A little over one year ago, an inter-departmental committee was established com-

prising representatives of The Departments of Education, Public Welfare and Health. Representatives from this committee, the consultant in mental retardation to the mental health branch, and a representative from the Ontario association for retarded children, were then asked last spring to form a study group in mental retardation.

As its first major responsibility, a report entitled "A Spectrum of Mental Retardation Services for Ontario" was prepared for presentation to the first federal-provincial conference on mental retardation, held in Ottawa last October. The Ontario delegation met with me during this four-day conference in Ottawa to review our Ontario programmes to compare them in the light of what we had heard at that time, and to consider how best to improve our services. Following this experience, the study group prepared a number of recommendations.

Several weeks ago, my colleagues, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), met with me to discuss these recommendations. This close interdepartmental collaboration is based upon the recognition that mental retardation is much more than a health problem, and that successful treatment involves specialized education and welfare programmes. All future programmes will be based on this partnership. The government has accepted in principle, in their entirety, the recommendations of this group, and these proposals will now form the basis of mental retardation planning for this province for the next several years.

It will be possible to implement quickly some of the recommendations of this group. Some however, will require more detailed planning and costing, and, therefore, this committee will continue to meet and to formulate in detail the plans that will be implemented over the next several years. It has been agreed that:

1. The Department of Health will accept the responsibility of acting as the co-ordinating department for mental retardation planning for the province.

2. Recent public concern over the needs of the mentally retarded is a most encouraging development, since this enlightened interest is essential to the success of our programmes. I am pleased to announce the establishment of an advisory committee comprising persons representative of both lay and professional groups. I am particularly pleased to announce that Mr. Harold Lawson has agreed to act as chairman. Mr. Lawson, president, National Life Insurance Co., has a long and interesting record of service in a

variety of voluntary organizations mainly related to health, and social and welfare matters. He was recently chairman of the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto and has long been active in his support of programmes for the mentally retarded. His acceptance of our request that he serve in this capacity is much appreciated by government, and I know will be most satisfying to many now in this field of service.

This committee will have broad terms of reference, but its primary objective will be to advise me on matters relating to mental retardation. At the same time, I also propose to establish a separate advisory committee at each of the hospital schools, and so enable the interest, enthusiasm and goodwill of the people in the community to be made available to the staff and patients of these hospitals, and permit of the active involvement of people outside of government in our planning and programming.

3. An interdepartmental committee of deputy Ministers and their professional advisers from the The Departments of Education, Public Welfare, and Health, will be established to facilitate the planning, co-ordination and integration of all government services for the retarded.

4. Within the mental health branch of The Department of Health, a mental retardation services division is to be established. The director and his staff of this division will be responsible for the administration of, and the programme development in, the Ontario hospital schools in Orillia, Smiths Falls and Cedar Springs, the Ontario hospitals at Cobourg and Aurora, the new school at Palmerston, as well as the children's psychiatric research institute in London. He will be responsible, also, for co-ordinating those services for the retarded that exist in other departmental facilities, and the development of new resources within the province. His staff will provide the secretariat and the technical services to both the deputy Ministers and the advisory committee on mental retardation.

5. The hon. Minister of Education and I are now able to announce that The Department of Education will assume full responsibility for all educational services provided for the patients in our Ontario hospital schools and other Department of Health facilities. The first step will be a survey of current needs to get this programme under way. Some preliminary studies have already been made.

This study group to which I made reference earlier proposed a number of recommendations affecting The Department of

Public Welfare's role in mental retardation. One of the most significant of these was the recommendation to undertake the establishment of a programme of community residential care. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare is now able to support the establishment of residential care facilities for children. The two Acts of The Department of Public Welfare immediately concerned are, first, The Children's Institutions Act and, secondly, The Homes for Retarded Children Act.

These Acts, as hon. members will recall, have been revised so as to encourage local organizations to develop suitable residences to care for those children who can benefit from group care in their own communities. The amended Act before the House at present provides that capital construction grants up to 100 per cent of cost, not exceeding \$5,000 per place, be provided, and maintenance of 75 per cent of the cost also be provided. I now understand that these are realistic supports and will be utilized by the groups and organizations interested in this area.

Other recommendations made by the study group dealing with support to preschool, home care and workshop programmes, will be put before the advisory and interdepartmental committees immediately for further study. It is recognized that these programmes are basic to the provision of the continuum of care ideal for the retarded.

In The Department of Health, I have already mentioned the establishment within the mental health branch of a mental retardation services division. This division will be staffed by a director, assistant director, two programme co-ordinators, a co-ordinator of in-service staff training, as well as an administrative executive officer. Recommendations were made about the establishment of diagnostic clinics in the community, and I spoke of these in the House on February 15.

Hon. members will recall that such a facility is being planned at the Chedoke general and children's hospital, in conjunction with the centennial project of the Ontario branch of the Canadian association for retarded children in the Hamilton and Niagara district. I mentioned briefly, at the same time, the enlargement of the diagnostic and assessment programme in Toronto, and I am now able to state that the present Toronto psychiatric hospital building will be utilized for the establishment of a two-team diagnostic and assessment clinic, and that there will be about 70 beds available for investigation and short-term active treatment in this facility. This building will become available

to us for this purpose about January 1, 1966, when the hospital moves to the new Clarke institute on the university campus. It will become the focal point for our programme in this region for the next three to five years. During this year, we will provide budget to support additional staff to the existing mental retardation clinic so that there will be minimal delay in the development of this new facility.

The study group advocated the establishment of a number of beds for the profoundly mentally retarded and physically handicapped child. Arrangements are now completed with the board of the Fort William sanatorium for its development of 80 beds in the Lakehead area. We have added an additional ten beds to the Ontario homes for the mentally retarded infants at Plainsfield. Discussions are still under way—in fact, construction alterations are now being proposed and studied—for alterations to the sanatorium at Kingston. Discussions are also under way for the establishment of additional beds for this purpose in the Metropolitan Toronto area as well.

When these developments are completed, they will relieve the pressures on our hospital schools at Orillia, Smiths Falls and Cedar Springs, but they will not solve all our problems. To expect this would be too optimistic. These large institutions, about which so much has been said over the past many months, were built in an era when they were fashionable, but now, because of changing concepts, new ideas and methods, different administrative patterns must be developed, and for this reason, a unit system will be introduced. The hospital school will be divided into four semi-autonomous units. There will be: A medical nursing unit, with hospital and infirmary divisions and diagnostic outpatient facilities; a unit with activities for the more seriously handicapped; an educational unit, in which the school programme will be under the direction of the school principal who is responsible to The Department of Education, but who shall ensure that the school programme is conducted in close liaison with the other activities and staff of the education unit; an adult rehabilitation unit.

Each of these units will be supervised by programme directors responsible to the superintendent of the institution. All of these programmes will be co-ordinated through The Department of Health.

I have been much encouraged by the imaginative enthusiasm of the Ontario association for retarded children and its local organizations, which have undertaken the

development of the centennial projects in mental retardation. These projects envisage the establishment of a model community programme in the Hamilton and Niagara area, and an adult services programme in the metropolitan area.

I have already advised the House that we are to provide funds to assist the diagnostic and counselling clinic for the model community. At least two other areas in the province are showing great interest in facilities of this kind, and several groups have already begun discussing with us community residential accommodation, which we believe will be possible through the amended Acts placed before the House by the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

These programmes require additional funds and personnel. During this current year, we plan to establish 35 additional positions for professional staff of various clinical disciplines. New professional and ward staff will, of course, be supported by this branch in the establishment of the new facilities in Edgar and Palmerston, which should come into operation within ensuing weeks, and further examination will be undertaken in regard to the complement of patient care staff in the light of these new facilities and programmes.

This, Mr. Chairman, in very brief outline, is the programme for the mentally retarded quite like that put forward six years ago for the mentally ill. If this is as productive as that was, Ontario will continue to provide, as Dr. Frank of Smiths Falls told the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) a few weeks ago, "far better than, and more than, any jurisdiction in Canada and in most of the states."

Several changes took place within the hospital care insurance plan in 1964. Some of the most significant are as follows:

New hospital construction and a growing amount of hospital renovation increased the number of rated beds in 1964 by 2,130 to a total of 45,263 at December 31, 1964, or an increase of 4.6 per cent over the number available at December 31, 1963. All of this increase took place in public hospitals. The estimated ratio of beds per 1,000 of population is now:

Type of beds	Estimated No. of rated beds as at Dec. 31 1964	No. of beds per 1,000 population
Active treatment	36,124	5.4
Convalescent	1,351	.2
Chronic care	7,756	1.2
Total	45,231	6.8

I am quite certain that most hon. members will already have noted that the Hall commission gives the desirable bed ratio for 1966 as 6.8 per 1,000 population.

One entirely new hospital was built, while four other new hospitals replaced outmoded facilities. Quite a number of renovation projects were completed in 1964, while many others are in stages of construction or planning.

The number of insured persons under the plan reached an estimated total of 6,572,871 at December 31, 1964, representing 99.2 per cent of the estimated eligible population of Ontario based on data from the Dominion bureau of statistics.

New outpatient benefits made available under the hospital insurance plan effective July 1, 1964, were as follows:

(a) Follow-up visits in accident cases: under the new regulation, follow-up visits became insured even though the original admission was as an inpatient. Formerly these were excluded and only outpatients were included in this benefit.

(b) Radiotherapy services: Formerly limited to inpatients, these were extended to patients with cancer who became outpatients and their services in the outpatients department were then insured benefits. The service would be insured in clinics operated by the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation and in those hospitals now equipped to provide radiotherapy for cancer, whether this was by deep or superficial x-ray or by radium. Radioactive isotopes, when used for the treatment of cancer, were considered to be radiotherapy services.

(c) Occupational therapy, physiotherapy and speech therapy: These services were accepted as insured outpatient benefits when given in hospitals which had organized outpatient departments providing the specific service. In the case of speech therapy, the regulation states that the outpatient benefits include "the use of speech therapy facility, where available, for the treatment of an organic illness, or injury, when prescribed by a physician."

(d) Private physiotherapists: Effective September 14, 1964, the outpatient benefits were extended to cover physiotherapy services given in approved private institutions and practices. These treatments are available to all residents of the province and are financed by federal and provincial health grants.

The total OHSC expenditure on emergency outpatient care and additional outpatient

services available in 1963 was \$4,979,997. It is anticipated that the total expenditure in 1964 will be approximately \$6,724,000 and in 1965 will, with the full impact of the recently extended benefits, reach \$9,024,000, Mr. Chairman.

The final estimate of provincial grant contributions in 1964-1965 is \$12,265,432. The estimate for 1965-1966 is \$15,583,603. The latter figure, sir, includes \$1,931,250, which has already been allocated for the special accelerated programme of grants for proposed expansion and renovations of schools of nursing. These figures do not include special grants to be paid to university teaching hospitals and university affiliated hospitals.

The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) recently asked if we had enough money in our budget to meet the increased grants to hospitals. I had forgotten when I undertook to answer that question that these grants were increased in 1963 and provision had been made in last year's estimates.

As a result of our extensive hospital building programme in Ontario, the fixed sum allocated each year by the federal government has proven to be inadequate, with the result that payment of claims has had to either be delayed or carried over into the next fiscal year; that is, payment of federal claims.

It is estimated that claims from public hospitals for federal grants amounting to \$5 million will be carried forward into 1965-1966.

No improvement in this situation, sir, is foreseen during the coming year. The shortage mentioned above does not include a backlog of approximately \$7 million for those mental hospitals constructed in recent years, grants on which we have been unable to collect since 1957.

The following is a summary of the grant formula:

Grants for new construction are payable at the following rates for projects commenced after August 15, 1963:

Type of Accommodation	Provincial per bed	Federal per bed
Active treatment beds	\$3,200	\$2,000
Chronic beds	3,000	2,000
Convalescent beds	3,000	2,000
Nurses beds	3,200	750
Interns beds	2,000	750
	per bass.	per bass.
Nursery bassinets	1,066⅔	666⅔

Auxiliary Services	Provincial	Federal
(a) Dispensary, Physiotherapy, x-ray, Laboratory, Occupational therapy, Autopsy, Emergency department, Outpatient department, Community health services, Hospital training facilities	\$10.66⅔ per square foot of floor area	\$6.66⅔ per square foot of floor area
(b) Dietary department, Operating suite, Delivery suite, Central supply and treatment and examination rooms and laundry service	\$10.66⅔ per square foot of floor area	nil

Type of Accommodation	Provincial per bed	Federal per bed
Psychiatric beds	\$8,500	\$2,000
Detention beds	8,500	2,000

The provincial grants will be paid on all new beds provided, however, that the grant is not more than 50 per cent of the cost of construction. Federal grants are limited to 33⅓ per cent of the cost of construction, or the noted grant whichever is the lesser.

If the cost of providing beds in the psychiatric and detention bed classifications should be less than \$10,500 the provincial grant is reduced to the difference between the federal grant of \$2,000 and the actual cost.

In the case of renovation grants each level of government pays on the basis of one-third of the cost of renovating any area eligible for grant assistance if it were provided in new construction. The provincial grant is limited to \$2,000 per bed and/or \$3,200 per bed unit for any area renovated. Federal grants are limited to \$2,000 per bed and/or \$2,000 per bed unit.

Other changes in the capital grant regulations became effective on July 1, 1964.

(a) Renovating grants for psychiatric units are now payable on the basis of ⅔ of the cost by the province, ⅓ of the cost by the federal government.

(b) Renovations of auxiliary service areas which are sometimes quite costly are payable on the basis of ⅓ of the cost as before, but the limitation is raised from \$2,000 to \$3,200 for every 300 square feet improved.

(c) Hospitals may now apply for advances on grants as each eighth of the work is completed.

A new regulation was also approved as you will recall which provided for loans to public hospitals to assist in constructing new facilities. These loans may be made in amounts up to \$5,000 per bed at an interest rate of 3 per cent per annum. Repayment must amount to at least three-eighths of differential income incurring from the new beds.

It is estimated that the amount of these loans for 1964-1965 will be \$5 million; for 1965-1966 \$8 million; and it will level off again in 1966-1967 to \$5.9 million. As of December 31, 1964, the commission had approved \$3,276,000 in loans under this programme.

Turning to grants for teaching areas; in keeping with the Prime Minister's announcement October 29, 1964 of special grants to teaching hospitals, provision has been made for such grants to five group A hospitals for the purpose of new construction and for the renovation of existing hospital property, to provide hospital training facilities and teaching areas. The commission will determine the schedule of payments by instalments according to the progress of the renovation or new construction. As announced when supplementary estimates were before the House, grants amounting to \$3 million have been provided already for these special teaching areas in six hospitals.

A special capital grant of \$75 per bed was again made to all public hospitals in 1964 for a total amount of \$2,823,450.

Standard ward costs to the insurance plan for care in public hospitals in 1963 was \$251,877,052. In 1964, it is estimated the comparable figure will be \$283,100,000. Total plan costs for general hospitals in 1964 are estimated to be \$306,200,000, as compared to \$273,900,000 in 1963. When you add to this, Mr. Chairman, the costs for mental and tuberculosis hospitals, all of which are included in our hospital insurance plan, these costs are \$70,110,000, and we have a total expenditure of \$376,310,000.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would ask whether it is not incumbent on any hon. Minister who presents his estimates to this House to either present them slowly enough so that the people in the House can understand them, or to put the effort into it to make it understandable. What the hon. Minister has said in the last few minutes is completely incomprehensible. I am certain, to all the hon. members of this House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have deliberately gone over this rapidly because

the figures are of such magnitude that it is impossible for one reading them off to make them comprehensible, but I would like to advise the hon. member through you, sir, that I have stood in this House for ten years and this is the first time that I have ever been told that what I said was incomprehensible. I think I will take the hon. member aside and give him a few lessons in language.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I was asking you if it is not the obligation of any hon. Minister who presents his estimates in this House to present them in an intelligible manner. I did not anticipate that the hon. Minister of Health would usurp the position of the chair by answering the question himself.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The estimated costs for 1965 are: general hospital care \$357,800,000; and mental and tuberculosis hospital care \$74,247,000; for a total of \$432,047,000.

Sources of revenue for 1964 are estimated as follows: premiums \$105,000,000; federal government \$141,200,000; and provincial government \$130,110,000; for a total of \$376,310,000.

Regarding additional insured services, as already stated, PKU testing of all infants will be done as an insured service under the hospital plan where the hospital laboratory is equipped and staffed to do this work. This service will begin July 1, 1965. In addition, we plan to provide as an insured service, the routine Papanicolaou smear to all women between the ages of 20 and 65 admitted to hospital. This test is a simple one to detect cancer of the uterine cervix. The interpretation of the test is difficult and requires special training of the pathologists and technicians doing the work. The Ontario cancer foundation finances the cost of this training and it is planned to expand this service as quickly as possible to all women at risk. This is one type of cancer which, if found early, responds well to treatment. This service will also begin July 1, 1965.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Is the test compulsory?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, it is not.

A further extension of benefits under the hospital care insurance plan will be the extension of coverage to include as dependants under the family coverage all those, up to age 21 years, attending educational and/or training institutions where they do not receive wages or salary. This is estimated to cost \$3.5 million in lost premiums, and will become effective September 1, 1965.

Nursing and nurse education has been the subject of intensive study and activity in the department through the hospital services commission during the past year. Having been advised and having accepted the advice that we should double the number of graduate nurses from our diploma schools in the next five years, studies of existing schools were embarked upon. From these we have learned that:

(1) Existing schools can increase enrolment this fall by about 600 students without additional classrooms, teachers or residences.

(2) Three regional schools have been given approval and this will answer the question of my hon. friend from Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar). (a) Hamilton and district school at Chedoke hospital opened last September with 21 students. It will double enrolment this fall and then will steadily increase intake to 100 students annually. The reason for the delay is that additional building is necessary and this is going forward now. (b) Quo Vadis school of nursing, which is a unique experiment, began operation last September with an intake of 30 students. It is proposed to enrol 40 this September, and additional temporary property is being acquired by this government for their use and for the use of this school, pending the development of plans for the permanent school. This school too is anticipated to steadily increase its enrolment to the point where it can graduate at least 100 students every year, but this will call for some new buildings. (c) Humber memorial school of nursing has been given approval. It will operate as a day school at least to begin with, with an ultimate enrolment of 100 students annually. Then it will be recalled, through The Department of Education—(d) Ryerson polytechnical school of nursing started September 1964, another new experiment with 16 students, and it is expected will enrol 50 students in September 1965.

During 1965 we plan to approve the development of further regional schools at Ottawa, Sudbury and North York. In each case, it is planned to enrol 100 students annually.

Least some of the hon. members of the House are somewhat confused by certain reports that have appeared in the newspapers within the last few days. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this figure of 24 regional schools meant that 18 existing schools will convert from single hospital schools to regional schools; they are not to be new schools. It is simply an expansion of their activity and function, to take on the regional function. The new schools are those which I have announced here.

At least 100 additional bursaries will be provided for the next academic year to encourage nurses to seek higher education to prepare them for positions of greater responsibilities. Special courses to assist in the upgrading of present teachers will be launched this year under the aegis of the college of nurses for Ontario and all the university schools of nursing are presently in discussion with us, seeking ways and means of increasing their enrolment, and graduation of nurses prepared to teach and assume positions of leadership in the profession.

For the record, I want to give the actual numbers of graduating nurses over the past four years: 1962, 2,186; 1963, 2,292; 1964, 2,480; and 1965, 2,650.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, in the brief space of time which I feel I can take, I have only been able to touch the highlights and to place a little more emphasis on the things that we are embarking upon in the ensuing year and if I have spoken unintelligibly, sir, I can assure you that before I come back here next year, I will have learned to speak Gaelic, so that everyone will understand me.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I can quite understand the hon. member for Riverdale wanting the hon. Minister to talk in a manner that can be understood, because the hon. Minister had no sooner started to speak than I found him very hard to follow and I sent to his friends under the gallery there for a copy of his speech. I was not able to find one, but I was able to get one from the press gallery and as a result was able to follow the hon. Minister a little more closely.

But I want to assure the hon. member for Riverdale and the others in this House, through you, Mr. Chairman, that one of the reasons why the hon. Minister, I am sure, talked fast was there was not very much in the way of concrete evidence that this province is meeting the major health problems it has to meet. So this is one reason for talking fast.

He is like the clergyman that goes on circuit on a Sunday and gives the same sermon in each of the three places, and because he talks so fast he gives it all over again on the same Sunday, and nobody knows the difference. This is the way in which the hon. Minister of Health has told us about his accomplishments.

The real problem, Mr. Chairman, is that we have not come to grips with the major health problems or the major social problems in the province of Ontario.

The hon. Minister of Health said that hope springs eternal in the human breast, I think that was his opening remark, and when I come back to speak upon the problem of mental health, I come back to a problem that I first spoke about the first time I was ever on my feet in this House back in 1960. In the Budget debate I have always spoken on it, and certainly on the estimates of The Department of Health I have always spoken on it. The real tragedy I find in this province is that so little is being done with this major problem.

We have heard that a little is being done for retarded children, how they are going to move 80 patients to Fort William and they are going to move 10 to Plainsfield. After all the talk and tragedy at Smiths Falls, after we had the loss of the lives of one or two children there, after the great public uproar, we finally get a little done.

Despite the fact that we have talked about mental hospitals, the old hospitals in the Toronto area, the old hospital in Woodstock, the old hospital in London, we see little or nothing being done in that regard. I admit some patients have been moved from London and there is some building going on in that area, but it is going on so slowly that the space provided is not keeping pace with the demands of our population.

Once again we see brought to the forefront, Mr. Chairman, this mess, literally, the public scandal that is at 999 Queen. It is not until a patient escapes and shoots himself, or there is a coroner's inquest into the death of a patient at 999 Queen, that once again this great problem is brought into the public focus. I am willing to admit that there is a public apathy to this whole problem of mental health and it is not until someone's brother, or sister, or father is taken to 999 Queen that it hits that family, that they see what a snare pit that 999 Queen Street actually is.

Queen, Victoria, Mr. Chairman, had only been on the Throne a very few years when 999 Queen Street was built. It was built in 1846, and despite the fact of that new wing sitting out in front, which is really a reception wing and is for the most part administrative offices, the old building, as it was in 1846, still stands; despite all the improved knowledge that we have in constructing buildings, despite all the knowledge that we have in bringing about cures for those who are mentally ill and in their treatment, we have done very little or nothing at 999. It is typical of the approach of this government to the whole problem as it exists.

Again, Queen Victoria was still on the

Throne and was going to be on the Throne for another 10 years when the hospital at New Toronto was built. Whitby, relatively modern, was built in 1920. This is the type of building that serves a wealthy community like the city of Toronto. London, another wealthy area, has certainly got an extremely old hospital.

You certainly cannot blame the personnel who are inside those hospitals trying to work, especially when you meet a distinguished superintendent like the superintendent in London. I know when I was on the committee going into the causes of the aging and the problems of the aging, we had an opportunity to talk to him. We were all impressed, and yet we also were all shocked when we saw the facilities with which that man had to work. In some cases they had outdoor porches for the patients. These had been boarded up in order to make the extra bed space that should have been supplied in a proper manner.

Admittedly, London is not as crammed as it was, but it is still even today a scandal and despite the new building that is going on they have a long way to go.

When you go back to 999 Queen Street and see the crammed wards, there is hardly space enough between the beds for an attendant to walk to change the beds. I have seen these instances, and it is no wonder that families have been shocked.

I know I mentioned one to the hon. Minister in this House and he said I should not have brought it up. Perhaps the government wants us to keep our mouths shut and say nothing, but I think when the public is aware, and they are becoming more and more aware, of the mismanagement of our mental hospitals in the province of Ontario, not only at the present time but over a long period of years, they are going to demand that this public scandal be cleaned up.

The report of the committee appointed to survey hospital needs for Metropolitan Toronto, in part 11, even in their rather conservative wording estimated that 999 Queen Street had 400 patients too many in the hospital. I know Dr. Christie, the superintendent, once admitted to the press 200 people in 999 Queen alone were there simply because they were too old and there was no place for them to go.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen some of our homes for the aged in the province of Ontario that have been built recently, and I know if a department wants to do something, if the government wants to do something, they can build homes for people who, by necessity,

have to live in an institution, that are decent, that are clean and do not have that frightful smell of old age. Yet you see those old buildings so similar, like the buildings at Orillia. Before they were torn down, I was in those buildings—they were torn down eventually, the older ones at Orillia, after there was a great public uproar. Even after the children had been taken out and the windows were open, it still stank—just the same way that 999 Queen smells. When you have a building with wooden floors, built in 1846, with literally hundreds of people, thousands of people over a period of years, who are incontinent going through it, obviously no detergent in the world is going to clean up the smell.

This is 999 Queen today and as it has been for years and years despite the protests of many of us on this side of the House and despite the protests of many of the public.

Again, I would be the first to admit that the building is not the most important thing, it is the personnel inside; but despite all the fine people that do work in 999 Queen, despite the voluntary help they have, they are so thoroughly understaffed and they are working in facilities which are not conducive to attracting people who want to work there and stay.

Even as you go in to the dining room where the staff eat dinner, there is always that heavy ancient smell. Again, when I compare 999 Queen with some of the homes for elderly citizens in the province of Ontario, it is obvious that there is a tremendous difference and that we can do it if we will it, if we would quit keeping our head in the sand and ignoring this very major problem.

Even in the city of Toronto, our Toronto psychiatric hospital was built away back in 1925—43 years ago. At long last we are going to have a new psychiatric hospital here in Toronto. After years and years of being announced, it is finally coming! We are glad to see it, but it shows what slow and what mincing steps the province of Ontario takes in this very major problem.

As has so often been said, Mr. Chairman, we have 32,000 patients a year in our mental hospitals—about one-half of our entire hospital population are mental patients—and on these people we spend \$8 a day per patient, on those who are in general hospitals we spend approximately \$30 a day. This despite the fact that again and again various organizations have emphasized the tremendous economic loss of people who are incarcerated, who, in many cases, could be working but are not working. We think of the crimes, the suicides and the cost of the administration of

justice because of mental disturbance, but we still sit back and do not attack this problem as it should be attacked.

I think I have used the illustration that if we could save the money that mental illness costs in Canada, the income tax of everybody making up to \$5,000 a year could be cancelled. This is what it costs Canada; and in proportion, Ontario being the largest province, that is what it costs us.

The hon. Minister and many hon. members in the government know these figures as well as I do, they knew them probably long before I was ever around. What is inconceivable to me, is that they have dragged their feet for so long and done so little.

Even today, the metropolitan hospital survey said that over 1,000 people—1,109 people—are kept in our mental hospitals who should not be there. In other words, in some cases it is not mental illness, it is just old age. I have been through our homes for the aged and seen people who are senile and I wonder how it is that some have been lucky to get in a new home for the aged, as they are in some districts in Ontario, and others are locked up in Woodstock or in London mental hospital or at Queen Street or in Whitby. It is a matter of luck!

If we are to encourage people, and by "people" I mean professional personnel, to work with those who are really mentally ill and can be cured, we are going to have to have some type of classification so that people in our mental hospitals can receive far better treatment. For example, in 999 Queen there are 1,247 patients, at least 400 more than there should be, and of these only 676 are what might be called active treatment cases. Active treatment patients are those for whom psychiatrists can do something. It is this group, the 676 that can be worked on, who can receive intensive treatment.

But how can any psychiatrist, any professional person, have the time when they are short staffed and when they have almost twice as many as they should have for such treatment services? It becomes a matter of custody, it becomes a matter of changing wet beds instead of practising psychiatry. It is no wonder you have a tremendous professional turnover among the men who could really do something.

Despite the fact they have very good men at the hospital in New Toronto, very outstanding men who have done some outstanding research at that hospital, the same situation applies. They have 996 beds, but they have only 458 what they might again call active psychiatric cases. In Whitby,

1,562 people are crammed into the hospital; 1,562, Mr. Chairman, of which only about 950 actually receive active treatment.

So you see that in our mental hospitals in many cases it is a matter of keeping people in custody, rather than treatment. After seeing 999 Queen for a great part of my life as I have driven by, it has become to me a symbol similar to Mercer in the matter of reform institutions. Even though buildings are secondary and personnel are the most important, you can have a situation where a building becomes so old, so decrepit that it becomes a hindrance in trying to cure or help the people that you want to help.

I hope, as the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) says, that they are going to demolish Mercer. I hope that in the immediate future they demolish that back part of the building at 999 Queen that was built in 1846. As long as either one of those two buildings stands it is a blot on the name of the people of Ontario, and yet we hear no mention of this building at 999 going. Let us remember this: We may say we have so many beds, and even then we are away short under our present circumstances; but we might also say, what kind of beds? When we see these beds crammed into wards we cannot under any circumstances say that this is proper mental care. Even if it is admitted that many people in our mental hospitals are human vegetables, at least they are still human beings and they deserve to be treated as human beings. Even for the sake of their families, give them some dignity in their last days.

We have talked over the years about the crowding in our mental hospitals and I know the hon. Minister often thinks, "Well, it is just the politicians talking," but let us turn to what they say about mental care in Metropolitan Toronto in a report by the committee for survey of hospital needs of Metropolitan Toronto. They say this:

With regard to the types of patients, it should be noted that, while a step forward has been accomplished by the physical separation of patients undergoing psychiatric treatment and those not undergoing such, by the use of residential units and approved homes, yet the patient population is still fairly heterogeneous. Psychotics, psychoneurotics, alcoholics, mental defectives, epileptics and old and adolescent patients with various other diagnosis, are often grouped together, a situation which has presented some serious problems. In many cases, the problems have been aggravated by the overcrowding on

the wards and by the lack of staff, especially on evening and night shifts.

You know, when I read a thing like that in very conservative and restrained language, Mr. Chairman, it is easy for me to believe attendants and former attendants who tell me, "On a night shift I had to look after 120 patients and close to 20 per cent of them have been bed patients." How can one man on a night shift properly look after 120 disturbed people? Obviously with one-fifth of them in bed and unable to move, the evening or night is spent in changing beds. Is it any wonder it is difficult to get attendants or that the patients are escaping from 999 Queen or that when they die, they seem to have to have a coroner's inquest? Is this not an obvious reason? And we are told that, with the attendants working at 999, we have a turnover of 42 per cent per year. I have heard it estimated at 50 per cent. How can you have any staff morale if you have such conditions as that going on?

The hon. Minister might say, "Well, my wage scale is bound by the civil service." Surely to heavens the government can come to grips with this problem. You are going to have to have attendants who have some reasonably good training. Often, new Canadians get the job and some of them are fairly well educated; but for them it is a stop-over. They land in the country, they get a job in a hospital, they see a better opportunity before too long and naturally they leave. And whether they come from abroad or are born here, it is obvious that they are all of the same mind, they want to get out of there—with a turnover of 42 per cent. Again I say, at times it is as high as 50 per cent.

After all, Mr. Chairman, the maximum amount allowed to a man with a family on welfare is \$3,600 a year and yet if you go and work for The Department of Health in one of our mental hospitals and you are a trainee attendant, for the first two years you get from \$3,120 to \$3,240, so even after working there two years, you get \$360 less than if you were on welfare. How can a system be run properly if this is the organization? Mr. Chairman, the blame and the fault is strictly on the hon. Minister of Health and on The Department of Health. He has been there for several years and no matter what mess he inherited, he has certainly had plenty of opportunity to straighten out a scandalous situation.

An attendant, even after he is fully fledged, is still making \$3,480—\$120 less than if he had a family and was on welfare.

Again we have to smarten up and see to it that we have a decent system. Again I point out the comparison with our general hospitals: We spend \$8 a day on a mental patient and we spend approximately \$30 a day on someone in a general hospital.

The hon. Minister says he believes that mental patients should be treated on the same basis as those who are suffering from a physical illness. Well then, why does he not see to it that they are treated in the same way? Certainly \$8 worth compared to \$30 is a comparison that is shocking and a disgrace to the province of Ontario.

We have discussed—and I know the hon. Minister has discussed on various occasions—the fact that we should have outpatient services. Certainly, we on this side of the House are all in favour of outpatient services and the fact that the general hospitals are developing psychiatric wings is a good thing in the province of Ontario. But let us remember that, whether or not we develop psychiatric wings in our general hospitals, which is a good thing, we are still going to need the Ontario mental hospitals. To date, the general hospitals have normally been taking those cases that are easy to cure or of relatively short duration in a hospital. If they are very serious and of a long duration, they are obviously going to the Ontario hospital. This to date has been the tendency and we are going to have to face that fact. If we think that by letting the general hospitals take over the whole problem, our present Ontario hospitals are going to empty by attrition, we are sadly mistaken, because there is still no indication that long-term cases are going to be taken over by the general hospitals in the province of Ontario.

Again, after a long struggle, we are glad to see that the general hospitals are taking a more active interest because it also means that the local practitioners, the general practitioners, are able to come closer to the problem of mental illness. And I think too that there is a tendency, where a general practitioner may have a patient who should have been in a mental hospital, but he did not like to put him or her there because of a stigma, he will now send that patient to the psychiatric wing of a general hospital. There is a certain amount of that.

It also means that a lot of people who normally—because of the stigma, the old-time fear of mental illness—would stay hidden, will now come forward because of what is being done in our general hospitals. Again, I urge this fact: that we are still going to need our major mental hospitals in

Ontario. We have this one greater problem in the matter of personnel because our Ontario hospitals are not that pleasant to work in; they seem backward in so many things. The psychiatrists have been leaving the service of the Ontario government and going to work in the psychiatric wings of the general hospitals where the working facilities and the atmosphere is so much more congenial.

In one respect, we give grants for these psychiatric wings of the general hospitals, and we are building up competition for personnel. In the long run it is a good thing, but we have to face the fact that we are going to have to compete for the professional help that the psychiatric wing of the general hospitals will take.

Again, the hon. Minister of Health has mentioned, I think, from time to time, that the stay in the mental hospitals has been decreasing, which again is a good thing, Mr. Chairman. But if we are going to develop a hospital situation—at least a mental care situation—in the province of Ontario we are going to have to go much further in the after-care of our patients, that once they leave the hospital there must be facilities available to a far greater extent than there are today. Again, look at 999 Queen. They have an outpatient service there; they have pioneered many things and done good work, but they are in cramped quarters and they have about 2,000 patients a year for their outpatient facilities. Any members who have seen those facilities will know that they work under a tremendous handicap, and yet, by keeping people coming to the outpatient facilities, by seeing to it that they get the tranquilizing drugs and the other drugs that are required, we are keeping down the cost of our mental hospital system. But if we look at the facilities that we have for our people—the outpatient facilities—it will be found they are very, very inadequate, and especially when it comes to children, a point on which I should like to dwell in a short time.

Even one of the doctors in the service of the Ontario government, Dr. J. S. Protten, the superintendent of the Ontario hospital at Kingston, has pointed out that by giving short stays in Ontario hospitals without having proper facilities of after-care, we are creating a new major problem. In the old days the Ontario hospitals followed the policy of closed doors—keep everything locked up. And then we went to the open door which we all want, but in fact what we are getting is the policy of the revolving door—they are going out of the hospital and very shortly they

are going back in—and why? I will quote from what Dr. Protter says in an article written very recently. After all, he is a man in our own service, a superintendent of one of our hospitals and should have a grasp of the situation.

With active programmes of therapy and changed attitudes the hospitals are now discharging about 75 per cent of new admissions in about three months but this, it seems to me, is a disservice to our patients. Hospital outpatient, community psychiatric, medical social work and rehabilitation services are not sufficiently developed or sufficiently integrated with psychiatric hospitals to provide adequate after-care which the patients need. These may be psychological supports, vocational assistance, counselling, psychotherapy, medication, and so on. Readmission rates are rapidly reaching 35 to 50 per cent of returns of former patients within weeks or a few months of leaving hospital. The American five-state study and other reports—that is the Carmichael report—indicate that readmission rates may easily be reduced to 15 per cent or less, given adequate organization and services and facilities to provide continuing community care.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we in this province just do not have those after-care facilities nor do we seem to have made a very substantial beginning in coming to grips with this major problem, because we on this side of the House are the first to admit that we want to see the patients released from hospital as soon as possible. We realize that if they are helping themselves—and after all this is the main thing for government, not to give this assistance as pie in the sky, but to help people help themselves and if people are out of the hospitals working, paying taxes, they are certainly helping not only themselves but the taxpayers throughout the province of Ontario.

We in this province do not have a vigorous after-care programme. We know from various studies that have been made how we lack the outpatient facilities in the province of Ontario; and, I assume, nothing in the way of active steps are taken by the hon. Minister of Health.

Just to give an example of that. Epileptics in the province of Ontario—I believe there are approximately 25,000 of them. Very little has been done by government to help this group and yet the vast majority of them can be kept working if they were helped and if the public were educated. We keep most of the severe cases of epilepsy in Woodstock.

In the 1930s they built a school to help train the younger epileptics. They no sooner got the school up than war broke out, and they emptied St. Thomas and put, I believe, TB patients in what was going to be the school for the epileptics. They have never returned the school to the epileptics. Again, here is a group that could be helped and could be assisted. We find in Woodstock another old hospital crammed with patients where the doctors and personnel concerned can do very little in comparison with what could be done with the knowledge that modern science has given to us in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch briefly on this subject of Fred Fawcett. Fred Fawcett has become a symbol that makes us all wonder what is really going on in our mental institutions. I do not doubt the word or the opinion, for a moment, of the doctors or the psychiatrists in the service of the province of Ontario. I think many of them are outstanding, and I think it is often unfair to say, "Well, he gave such-and-such an opinion because he is a government psychiatrist." I do not go along with this. But I do think that under our present situation, you put a psychiatrist working for the government in a most unenviable situation. Here we have the situation of a man who was arrested and charged with using firearms and then was declared to be mentally disturbed and eventually he ended up in one of our maximum security institutions; he was said to be thoroughly and highly dangerous; he was defended by good legal counsel; he was before the courts on various occasions, each time declared to be mentally disturbed to the extent that he was dangerous to the public. So four years went by and some of us here were disturbed to hear about it—not questioning so much the decision of the psychiatrists—but when first we heard that there was a witness who wanted to swear, and as a matter of fact had already sworn, that the man was not even carrying a gun! Surely there should be some procedure where such a case could be heard, even to decide if there was a legal case against the man; but in this case, nothing was done.

First of all, the hon. Minister of Health said they were not going to reinvestigate the case; then a few days later the hon. Prime Minister comes forth and sets up a committee. That committee, Mr. Chairman, consisted of three distinguished men—I believe, Mr. Justice Stewart, Dr. Boothroyd and Dr. Markson. This matter was turned over to a committee and the next thing we know, before this committee comes to a decision,

Dr. Boyd, who had kept Mr. Fawcett incarcerated there as part of his duties in Protecting, the next thing we know Mr. Fawcett is back on his farm.

Is it not reasonable for those of us on this side of the House, and for the public, to ask why? How is it a man who is so dangerous, and according to the government, it is so obvious that he is mentally disturbed there is no point of having an investigation, is suddenly released and back on his farm?

Without questioning the good intentions of the professional staff of our Department of Health, who again I say are very able men, I repeat that our system of keeping people incarcerated in such a manner is a very dangerous thing.

We should have in this province, as they have in the United Kingdom and Saskatchewan, I believe, an appeal as of right for an individual incarcerated in a mental institution, or an appeal by one of his family or someone on his behalf. The committee that hears that appeal, in order not to put any government official in any invidious position, should consist of people who are outside direct government employ, and not necessarily all psychiatrists. Again I think that in some other jurisdictions they have psychiatrists and lawyers and private persons, so that in this way there is no question that someone is being held in a wrong manner.

If I were to believe every letter that I receive from someone in a mental institution who thought that they were being falsely held, I would be knocking on the door of The Department of Health about every second week. On some of those I have looked at and had investigated, I have nothing to question; again I say, I do not question the professional personnel or the hon. Minister of Health in keeping people locked up, because they are crowded to the rafters anyway and would be glad to release them.

But you must do two things:

Protect the public—you cannot turn out a man whom you can reasonably expect, no matter how normal he might appear, might be completely disturbed in some subject. You cannot turn him loose, you have to protect the public.

Second, you must protect the individual. You must not only be just, you must appear to be just; and in the Fred Fawcett case you do not appear to be just.

This whole question should be re-examined and this mess that the department got itself into, and also The Attorney General's Department got itself into over Fred Fawcett,

should be cured once and for all by saying that an individual, as of right, should have the right to appeal to a board that is outside immediate government employees; not only that individual but anyone on his behalf can appeal, and then there is no question.

After all, Mr. Chairman, such appeals should be inexpensive and they should not entail long court proceedings; but at least the public knows, and the families of those people who are incarcerated know, that justice is being done.

The explanation that the hon. Minister has given on Fred Fawcett has failed utterly and leaves a lot to be questioned. In his speech to this House today he just ignored that whole problem; which is a vital problem, because thousands of people in the course of time, over the years, are in our mental institutions. We must not leave any doubt that there is any wrongdoing. We know it can happen and we do not want it to happen. We should set up the necessary safeguards to protect the people who come under the jurisdiction of The Department of Health.

There is one final item I would like to discuss, Mr. Chairman, and that is in regard to the utter lack of facilities for mentally disturbed children and for teenagers here in the province of Ontario.

Again, just as in the case of Fred Fawcett, who becomes a symbol, we have the case of this Jamie who has become a symbol of the utter lack of proper facilities. When the hon. Minister of Health was asked what they were going to do about him and he was told that the chief was down at the juvenile court, the doctor said, "Well, that is quite satisfactory as a holding operation."

Well, now, I do not think the people in this province think that keeping a child down in the family court—and this turned out to be quite a period of time—is quite satisfactory, either as a holding operation or any other kind of operation. It is a shocking operation that this has to happen in a city the size of Toronto, and with the wealth of Toronto. If this is happening in a wealthy area in Toronto, heaven knows what is going on in the rest of the province of Ontario, because we have gone into this problem and it crosses into The Department of Public Welfare, into The Attorney General's Department and to Reform Institutions—they are all involved in it. I think it is time you all got together, these four departments, to try to bring about some solution.

All they say is: "Well, you could take such a child to Warrendale if there was space for him." Warrendale is reputed to have an 85

per cent cure, but it costs \$22 a day. After all, if the child had a broken leg and went to a general hospital it would cost about \$30 a day. Let us bear in mind if you do not cure these disturbed children at this stage of the game, you are going to be keeping that child, either in your mental institutions or in your jails, as long as that child is alive.

So is it not wiser to develop facilities, even if it costs \$22 a day, than just let everything literally go to pot, which is what has been happening here in the province of Ontario? We live in an entirely different kind of society than which existed when the present mental health set-up was conceived. Imagine—1846, 1906, 1890; these are the dates when so many of our major institutions were built. There is much of the Queen Victoria thinking in The Department of Health today, this is why we are faced with shocking examples such as Jamie here in the province of Ontario.

It is nothing new! In 1962 a survey of hospital needs in Metropolitan Toronto uttered opinions on what was not being done for the psychiatric services of children here in the province—this was more particularly in the city of Toronto, but I would say to the hon. Minister of Health that after reading the detailed and extensive work done by the committee for the survey of hospital needs in Metropolitan Toronto, what we need is a similar survey for all of the province of Ontario. Again, if you have a wealthy area with all these inadequacies, certainly we must know that the rest of the province is in a sorry state. I for one know that northern Ontario has been sadly neglected in the field of health services from top to bottom.

This is what the survey in Metropolitan Toronto said about the treatment for emotionally disturbed and retarded children:

What emerges most clearly from this study of the facilities and requirements for emotionally disturbed children is the complete inability of anyone to gauge the needs in this area of diagnostic and treatment facilities.

The director at each inpatient service and at each mental health clinic was well aware of greater demands on the surface than the staff was able to meet, but no one had a clear idea of how great the lack of facilities seemed to be. There appears to be a general feeling among these highly qualified persons, and among practising physicians, that the volume of treatment services for disturbed children is lagging so far behind the need that it is almost useless to refer a patient for immediate care.

I repeat that:

—among practising physicians that the volume of treatment services for disturbed children is lagging so far behind the need that it is almost useless to refer a patient for immediate care. The judges, social workers and psychologists at the family and juvenile court feel the situation to be extremely serious and of great urgency and most frustrating in the face of an immense problem.

There is a great deal to read in that report, but that quotation puts it in capsule form, it sums up what they think of this situation and what needs to be done. I know cases that have come to me of children that have been disturbed whom they will not keep at public school. They are not bad enough or there is not room enough to get them in Thistletown, which is really there for experimental purposes, so what can you do? This child stays at home. I have seen a case like this for myself, and yet the Ontario association for emotionally disturbed children recently put out a brief to the hon. Minister of Health and other Ministers citing one similar case as an example.

So we see it in our day-to-day public life and we do not necessarily need it in the briefs that are presented to us, but it shows that at last a group like the Ontario association for emotionally disturbed children are now organized and coming to the fore and doing something. Recently after a lot of hard work they were able to raise enough money to build a school to help these children who are emotionally disturbed—again not retarded—but emotionally disturbed. And this is the pity of it. We know that when children are emotionally disturbed that if given proper treatment the vast majority of them can lead a normal life. The Warrendale experiment seems to prove that.

There are many pilot projects that are so-called private projects, that prove to my mind, and I think to most people, that something can be done. Again I think it is time that the government stepped in and gave more serious leadership to this problem than they have in the past, and I would plead with the hon. Minister of Health that the Ontario association for disturbed children get the support it should—first in the school that is now started, but in a greater number of schools that are needed.

The classes in our public schools or in our separate schools are so large that it is extremely difficult for a teacher to handle a disturbed child who really needs a lot of specialized care, and so the only solution is

to have a school where these children can receive the treatment they need.

Again I emphasize that it is not just the humanitarian aspect but it is the hard-boiled economic fact that unless you get these children on the rails when they are young, you are going to have to face a far more expensive problem when they are older, and one way or another the taxpayer is going to have to foot the bill. It is far more prudent to seek for a solution now when something can be done than to wait until the situation becomes in some cases utterly hopeless and in all cases thoroughly and completely expensive.

Now, I would just like to mention briefly one or two remarks in this brief of the Ontario association for emotionally disturbed children, who I think have summed up the problem quite well. They, in seeking more funds for this problem, have pointed out the various projects that have been carried on—all of them commend very highly the Thistletown project, the children's village in Scarborough, that is the Sacred Heart children's village and boys' village, and as I mentioned, the Warrendale programme, but they say this at page 7 of their brief:

We find it difficult to understand why in view of results obtained by most treatment centres the province and the provincial hospital insurance commission underwrites the entire cost of a child's care at Thistletown while paying sometimes less than half the cost of a child's care at any of the institutions classified as treatment centres. There is no provision made for collecting the other half. If the parent can pay one quarter The Department of Public Welfare at present pays the other quarter.

Well, again, in the establishment of schools and also in handling such problems, maybe they are not as severe as Jamie, because it is claimed that he is both deaf and mute and this obviously makes it a very extreme case, but if more guidance clinics were available in our public schools we would have far more opportunity to reach the problem of the disturbed child sooner than we do.

Let us bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that it is estimated that between from five to ten per cent of our school children are considered emotionally disturbed. In fact, in some American studies, and I think possibly this is a bit high—I hope it is high—they say it is from ten to 20 per cent. This means that there are literally thousands of children who now need some form of attention. A lot of them are not extreme cases and if nipped in the bud can be solved very easily and very

quickly. So if these guidance centres were established in our public schools to a greater extent they would do even more good than some of the outpatient clinics in our general hospitals.

The fact that they are going to hospitals makes a lot of children afraid to go, whereas if clinics were to be held within the school walls, there is maybe to them not the stigma that sometimes seems to apply to this problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned these three items, our mental hospitals, the Fred Fawcett case and this case of Jamie because they sum up to me three of the many inadequacies of this Department of Health. There is so much to discuss and there are so many points that one would like to pick in discussing this problem of health services here in the province of Ontario, that it is often hard to know in which the government has done the poorest. But again I say the snake pit at such places as 999 Queen have been with us for well over 100 years and it has been with us because of public apathy, but worse still because of the lack of leadership. And despite the fact that since World War II so many more cures, so many more scientific devices and therapeutic treatments have been learned, that we know so much more can be done, yet when we go through an old building like 999 Queen or the hospital at London, we see that they still have a long way to go. The niggardly policy of the government in their approach to this problem is a shame on the people of the province; and it is a shame on all of us in this House regardless of our party, because we are all a part of the province of Ontario. I regret that the government has been as weak and has been literally turning a blind eye to a major social problem that we have in the province of Ontario.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the order of business for tomorrow, I would inform the

hon. members that from 5 o'clock until 6 o'clock, tomorrow afternoon, time will be reserved for items under the heading, "Other public bills and orders" and if matters work out as we expect they will, the same hour on Thursday afternoon will be reserved as well.

With respect to the order of business tomorrow, commencing at 10.30, hon. members

of the House should be prepared for second readings, committee of the whole House, and estimates.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.15 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Children's Institutions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading	3791
Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading	3793
Department of Public Welfare Act, bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, second reading . . .	3793
Université d'Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Guindon, second reading ...	3794
Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, Mr. Allan, second reading	3796
Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	3796
Liquor Control Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wardrobe, second reading	3796
Liquor Licence Act, bill to amend, Mr. Yaremko, second reading	3806
Public Health Act, bill to amend, reported	3806
Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, reported	3806
Securities Act, bill to amend, reported	3806
Police Act, bill to amend, in committee	3806
Recess, 12.30 o'clock	3807

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1965

The House met at 10.30 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests in the east and west galleries, students from Chedoke public school, Hamilton; and in the west gallery, students from Memorial public school, Welland.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wonder if I might make a request through you, sir, to either the hon. House leader (Mr. Rowntree) or to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). Last night the hon. House leader, with, if I might suggest a broad sweep of the brush, pretty well covered the waterfront and told us that the business today might include everything which really could be included in the parliamentary form.

This creates some difficulties, as I am sure he appreciates, for the Opposition, in that we are concerned if private bills should come up. The hon. members want to study them. I just raise the point that as well as being general, he has to be more particular in telling us what the business will be.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much more specific I could have been last night. I referred to the hour of 5 o'clock this afternoon, which would be set aside for the discussion of "Other public bills and orders" and I said: "And in addition to the hour tomorrow, Tuesday"—meaning today—that the same hour on Thursday would be set aside for that purpose.

Mr. Thompson: At the end of the evening session I did not get a chance to raise this point, but I would like to know if this includes private members' bills. I am thinking of resolutions also. These are of concern to us as well.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I used the phrase, "other public bills and orders," which is an item that covers the bills advanced by private hon. members, and which is the same group of bills which was discussed on two other occasions last week.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour. Does The Hospital Disputes Labour Arbitration Act apply to homes for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, in answer, may I say that it was not the government's intention to include homes for the aged as such under the definition of a hospital, as it applies to The Hospital Disputes Arbitration Act. I think I made reference to the definition section of that bill. In any event, that was the intention behind the legislation, and the definition.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore, I conclude that it does not cover homes for the aged.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member is on the right track.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves second reading of Bill No. 154, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, before this Act carries on second reading, I think that there are one or two preliminary comments that should be made.

This Act holds within it very considerable possibilities. The amount of money that is being provided for purposes of construction, on a 100 per cent to \$5,000 bed basis, is a very, very major step, and I hope will be of sufficient inducement to various organizations to avail themselves of special homes.

The amount of money being provided on a per diem subsidy is equally significant; but

is frankly suspect, because as every hon. member of this Legislature knows, the experience with The Children's Institutions Act in the past has been, to say the least, an unhappy one. Let me remind the House that when The Children's Institutions Act was first introduced into this Legislature, the subsidy that was to be provided for children was 50 per cent of \$8 a month, for both wards and non-wards. That came to an average of 27 cents a day for the children who received the subsidy. That was the first children's institutions Act introduced into this Legislature.

The second children's institutions Act, or the amendment to it, provided for 50 per cent payment for non-wards up to a maximum of \$8 a day—at least that is the way it operated. No children's institution, to my knowledge, received more than \$4 a day subsidy for non-ward children in their care.

Mr. Speaker, this effectively meant that the principle of this bill was totally undermined. In places like Sunnyside children's centre, Warrendale, boys' village, Ottawa Protestant children's village and Sacred Heart, here in Toronto—in all these agencies where costs were between \$12 and \$24 a day per capita—the maximum \$4 a day subsidy from the government was totally insufficient to provide for non-ward children.

It meant that all the children who fell within The Children's Institutions Act, therefore, had to be wards of the children's aid society. It meant that we had to go to court and premeditatedly separate children from their parents so as to bring them within the purview of this Act because the subsidy was not sufficient.

Indeed, the subsidy was not even handed out, Mr. Speaker, unless the parents subjected themselves to a means test; unless it was demonstrated that they could pay no portion of it.

Now, the hon. Minister has said we will pay 75 per cent of the total per diem cost. I hope he means what he says for the first time—that it will be 75 per cent of the operating cost, the total operating cost—and that those operating costs will be fairly calculated and that they will be related to the differential needs of various institutions.

Let me take a moment to explain, Mr. Speaker. Under this Children's Institutions Act there are a whole range of homes involved. They range from one extreme—I suppose the Loyal True Blue and Orange Lodge is probably the best example of the extreme of what is essentially custodial short-term care—through a middle ground of

slightly disturbed children who can function in the community for school-going purposes—I suppose Linwood Hall in Hamilton is a good example of that—through to the other extreme of the very intensive treatment centre.

The financial needs of all these centres are vastly different. There must be some kind of differential established. In one instance it can be \$2, \$3 or \$4 a day; in another instance it can be \$12, \$15 or \$24; and yet we are assuming 75 per cent of the costs without any differential indicated. Since the regulations usually allow a maximum, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that maximum be related to the needs of the various institutions.

I also want to indicate to the hon. Minister opposite that I raise this because the institutions are lacking confidence, because the basis on which the operating costs have been evaluated results in a betrayal of confidence. Warrendale, Mr. Speaker, has been waiting since August of 1964 for its per diem subsidy. Warrendale, I believe, at the moment, is somewhere around \$40,000 behind in the receipt of provincial subsidies because the operating costs have not been carefully and fairly evaluated, and because no money has been paid—for whatever reason, despite the fact that monthly statements have been faithfully filed.

This is not only true of that institution, it is true of other institutions in the province, Mr. Speaker. It happens to be true, however sadly, that the difference in what the institution thinks are operating costs and what this government deems to be operating costs, is usually considerable. The institution may think in terms of \$12 or \$14, whereas the government comes in and eliminates various factors which the institution feels indispensable to its needs, and cuts it down to \$4, \$5 or \$6.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that this business of withholding payment, of slowing them up, of no differential, of no established rate of cost calculation—all of these things—will undermine the intent of this bill unless the hon. Minister moves on it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one other thing will undermine the intent of this bill, unless the hon. Minister acts. Within the child welfare branch of The Department of Public Welfare, there has never been enough people to properly supervise the children's institutions; to give them the leadership and direction they need. Let me remind the hon. Minister that perhaps the most able children's institutions supervisor he has had for many years,

Miss Katharine Johnson—who is now with the York board of education—single-handedly supervised 43 institutions in the province of Ontario for close to a two-year period. Then there were two people supervising 43 institutions for a few months; then one person supervising all of them again from November, 1964, to March, 1965. Now we again have two supervising this range.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is ludicrous to suggest that we can have an active children's institutions branch in the province with one or two supervisors for this extraordinary spectrum of services—much wider, much broader, let it be said, than even children's aid societies, because the complexity of treatment and the focus involved demands very, very close direction and supervision. Indeed, it is regarded as an impetus and incentive to the institutions themselves.

There should be a minimum of five children's institutions supervisors in the branch. There are now two. We have operated for a majority of time over the last three years with one, and everyone, on both sides, has suffered a lack of confidence and a lack of direction.

I therefore return to my initial point. On the face of it, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill. On the face of it we are breaking through the impasse of financing special centres for children. The bill directly relates to many of the problems that have been raised in this Legislature over the session. I hope the regulations will not again thwart its intent. I hope it will not merely masquerade for legislation; and I look forward to evidence that things have changed in the principle of this bill.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would almost entirely agree with the remarks of my hon. friend, the member for Scarborough West.

I think I would like to quote at this time the recommendations of the committee regarding the development of institutions. The committee said that the state would probably have to face the fact of inadequate facilities and services for the care of particular children and hence undertake or sponsor their development. The hon. Minister's committee recommended that more specialized resources be developed for children in care, including regional assessment and treatment centres, special institutional services, a whole range of foster homes and group homes as well as individual counselling services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one remark along those lines. I think we will require leadership on the part of the depart-

ment to make sure that those institutions are built. This legislation, I think, is a tremendous improvement. It does not leave the responsibility of the costs to municipalities or individuals in those municipalities. The government is accepting almost total responsibility, but I think some leadership will have to be shown and, as the hon. member for Scarborough West said, there should be many more people involved in this department in doing something so that there is a co-ordination and the construction of those necessities in the various areas.

I remember many instances where we had to place children in special institutions, and it always caused a lot of difficulty; a lot of families that were not receiving welfare and could not find a means of paying up to—I think at the time—\$30 or \$35 a day for the care of some of the children who had to go to special institutions. Now the fact that the government will pay 75 per cent of the gross cost of children going into those specialized institutions, I think, is a tremendous improvement. I think I might suggest that eventually the government might consider 100 per cent of the cost of children who have to go to those special institutions.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE HOMES FOR RETARDED CHILDREN ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 155, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE ACT

Hon. Mr. Cecile moves second reading of Bill No. 156, An Act to amend The Department of Public Welfare Act.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister could give us some explanation of this bill. This is couched in legal terms and perhaps he could give us some explanation of it.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think, in introducing the bill on first reading, I made about as full a statement as I can make in this matter. This is to serve as an encouragement for the purposes of paying costs, or helping to pay costs, which would be operational costs—in

providing more inducement, I would say to be very honest with you—in having more of the districts formed in the province of Ontario. As you know, we already have four of those and we have now four more on—if I may use the expression—the drawing board. We expect that many more will come within this scope.

Those we have now—the county of Wentworth, Prince Edward, Welland and the district of Sudbury—seem to have been working very well. The difficulties seem to have been that the administration costs were difficult to meet, and that is one reason we came in with this amendment. We hope that next year—and I rather think I am assured of this—under The Canada Welfare Act, which is supposed to become a reality sometime this year, we will be able to do so across the board; but this is something that is not sure. However, the reason this has been brought in is to provide help for the administration expenditures for a county or district consolidated service.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA

Mr. F. Guindon (Stormont) moves second reading of Bill No. 158, An Act respecting l'Université d'Ottawa.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, in the last session of this Legislature, and again in this session, I asked the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) and the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts), to reconsider the decision of previous administrations not to give l'Université d'Ottawa grants that would permit that great institution of learning to play its role in eastern Ontario. The answer given at the time was that because of its adherence to a theological system the university could not receive grants, with the exception of its faculties of medicine and sciences which were considered non-denominational.

Naturally, this answer, given at the time by the hon. Prime Minister, did not satisfy me, nor did it satisfy many other people in this province who thought that there was discrimination against a large number of inhabitants and saw in the decision, a flagrant breach of the Bill of Rights.

I was very pleased, however, Mr. Speaker, when my good friend, the very able and sympathetic Minister of University Affairs told me some time ago that discussions had been taking place between the Oblate fathers and his department, that would make it

possible for l'Université d'Ottawa to receive grants that would enable it to carry on its work as a bilingual university in the eastern part of this province.

I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, of the discussions that took place. However, I am now convinced that both groups have arrived at an agreement acceptable to both parties, and I have no intention of asking the hon. Minister to tell us the difficulties that had to be ironed out.

I would like to say that I am in complete agreement with the hon. member for Stormont, who, in introducing this bill, had many nice things to say about the Oblate order, who have done so much for education since the incorporation of the university in 1849. I did not have the privilege of attending that institution. However, I have been very close to many of its professors, and I am proud to say that I have been on very friendly terms with many of its rectors.

I think I can say that without this new arrangement, this institution would not have been able to carry on, and that would have been a great tragedy.

Eastern Ontario which has been recognized as an area needing help, in order to develop its resources, will certainly profit by the development of the facilities of the university. At the graduation exercises held last Sunday, the largest ever number of graduates received their degrees. I think there were approximately 940 graduates.

At a time when this province is making an attempt to promote the teaching of French at all levels, I am sure a large share of the responsibility for the training of teachers will fall on the institution's shoulders. While I consider it important to train people in medicine, the sciences, political sciences, law and others, I believe the authorities will make a strong effort to train professors and teachers who will play a special role in this province in teaching the French language. This may offer a solution to the hon. Minister, who spoke so eloquently in his introductory address to this House, last Wednesday.

Monsieur le Président, la nouvelle de la présentation de cette législation a fait les manchettes des journaux de la capitale le Jeudi, 27 Mai dernier.

Je crois qu'il serait utile de lire le premier Ottawa, sous la signature de M. Willie Chevalier, intitulé "L'Université." Et je cite:

D'aucuns regretteront les transformations à l'Université d'Ottawa, annoncées hier. Leurs sentiments sont compréhensibles et très respectables, mais ce n'était un secret pour personne que les RRPP oblats, qui

faisaient vivre l'Université depuis 1848, ne pouvaient plus suffire à la tâche. Leur dévouement, et leurs sacrifices, ne suffisaient plus à diffuser le savoir à une jeunesse de plus en plus nombreuse dans un monde chaque jour plus compliqué par les découvertes et les inventions de ces dernières années.

Le projet de loi relatif à la réorganisation présente plusieurs côtés positifs. L'institution demeure bilingue et chrétienne, au service des deux cultures du Canada, mais on lui donne en outre le but précis de "préserver et développer la culture française en Ontario," ce qui, de la fait du gouvernement, équivaut à reconnaître la nécessité de préserver cette culture française. D'autre part, le bilinguisme de l'Université n'est pas nouveau et il est normal dans la capitale du Canada. Que désormais le bureau des gouverneurs sort compose en majorité de laïcs, c'est conforme à un tendance qui saute aux yeux et que, d'ailleurs, l'Eglise encourage dans une certaine mesure; et, surtout, cela rend l'Université éligible à de plus équitables subventions provinciales, grâce auxquelles il lui sera plus facile d'accomplir sa mission sans renoncer à ses caractéristiques essentielles non plus qu'à ses traditions.

Ces transformations assureront le progrès de l'Université lui permettant de perfectionner plusieurs de ses facultés. La liste des gouverneurs mentionnés dans le projet de loi est impressionnante; en elle-même elle est une garantie de dynamisme. On devine bien que tout cela est le fruit de longues négociations; à tout prendre, ce fruit n'est pas du tout amer.

Je crois que les sentiments exprimés par Monsieur Chevalier sont ceux de la majorité des personnes de la ville d'Ottawa et de tout l'Ontario français, qui s'intéressent aux problèmes d'éducation.

Mr. Speaker, the other two Ottawa papers also had very favourable comments on the introduction of this bill and I quote from an editorial in the *Ottawa Citizen* of May 28, entitled:

NEW ERA FOR UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Introduction in the Ontario Legislature of a measure that will establish the University of Ottawa as a non-sectarian institution opens up new opportunities for a university that has already made an indelible mark on the life of the community. Its character is vividly stamped by the make-up of the new board of governors, a predominantly lay body drawn from diverse faiths and disciplines.

I shall also quote the last paragraph of this editorial:

People in this city and of Canada will want to wish the board of governors and the administration of the new University of Ottawa God's blessing in their future endeavours.

The *Ottawa Journal* commented editorially when the proposed changes were announced last March. On March 24, the newspaper had this to say:

It is not necessary to await all the details or the formal announcement to approve, in principle, the far-sighted plan to broaden the role of the University of Ottawa in this community and province. The key policy decision has been taken. The Oblate fathers who founded the university and tended it for more than 100 years are, in effect, turning it over to new owners.

The University of Ottawa will not be a Roman Catholic institution. It will not be an Oblate university. It will be as public an institution as McMaster or Windsor universities which have shown the way in the tradition from the denominational to non-sectarian status, such as Queen's or Toronto.

While the university becomes a public one, we would hope that it would cherish and even deepen its bilingual character. The University of Ottawa is specially able to serve the French-speaking citizens of Ontario. It should be the ornament of higher education in the French language in this province.

Nothing could be a better testimonial of the biculturalism of Canada than to have grow and flourish a bilingual university in the national capital. With goodwill, these are details that can be worked out. The fundamental changes now afoot show in what exciting days we live, and how quickly the old order is making way for the new.

Mr. Speaker, with such unanimity on the part of the local press, it is difficult to criticize this bill. This is a step forward for the good of all citizens of this province.

If my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) will permit me, I would like to suggest that the University of Ottawa, with its expanded facilities, will become a very special institution for graduate studies, a university where scholars from many parts of this province and this country could come to do post-graduate work in a bilingual atmosphere in order to better equip themselves for duty to their province and to their country

in the fields of politics, business and diplomacy, and also as public servants.

Mr. Speaker, as spokesman for my party and as the representative of this great constituency of Ottawa East, which has the honour of having this university, I would like to say that we will support this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves second reading of Bill No. 160, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MENTAL HEALTH FOUNDATION ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 161, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines), in the absence of Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary), moves second reading of Bill No. 162, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the principle of this bill, I would like to say that our party over the years has fought hard to get some order and rationale into The Liquor Control Act. I think that all of us have realized the ridiculous and absurd compulsion which this Act has inflicted on the people of the province, and I say that particularly for the benefit of those on the other side, who say they hate and detest compulsion. If we have ever seen the most ludicrous aspect of compulsion, we have certainly seen it in this Act, and for those, sir, who hate and detest compulsion, may I say that they let this disease fester for over 20 years.

We saw something like little Jack Horner sitting in the corner eating his Christmas pie, in that the hon. Provincial Secretary stood up—and I am sure he must have felt embarrassed and shamefaced when he was

suggesting the new amendments to the Act—time after time had to say that this was not Canadian justice.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—a correction, if you please—I was not ashamed; I was very proud of the amendments I was introducing. This is a change for which there is a necessity.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say, sir, that if the hon. Minister is proud of the amendments, he should have been ashamed that he had to admit that Canadian justice had not prevailed over a long period—and his government has been in for a long, long time. Over a long period he permitted injustice to persist with this Act, and now, sir, the government has come out with some amendments.

Of course we appreciate that it has brought these amendments in. It listed the new opportunities that the people will have for enjoying drinking under standards of recreation. I notice the hon. Minister omitted the bagpipes and this was brought to his attention, or he added it as an afterthought. Last night we were with a person, a former Lieutenant-Governor, who felt that instead of considering the bagpipes as an afterthought, they should have been up ahead in his—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I also omitted the bandore; that will be permissible too.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say that I consider that real discrimination.

Apart from this, we have asked that there should surely be a recognition by the government that the people have arrived at a sense of maturity. It was for this reason that we were suggesting that if people should wish on a Sunday that they would have wine with their meals in a recognized and a dignified manner in a dining room of quality and of standard, they should not be compelled—and let me emphasize “compelled”—not to have this privilege. But this government still feels that the people are not mature enough to have this. I understand there were some in the caucus who might have felt differently, but timidly the government went forward a little bit; I suggest to the government that it should recognize that the people of Ontario are more sophisticated and civilized than the government recognizes they are.

Let me turn to the next aspect: We have asked that there should not be a patchwork approach but there should be order in the system so that there can be proper inspection, so there can be proper standards. It is for

this reason that in looking at a revision of the whole Act over the years, we have advocated, rather than having the situation of local option where the government will permit a patchwork, bringing in a whole uniform approach throughout the province in connection with the liquor laws.

And then, sir, we have had the situation that the government seems to have omitted the procedure to get a licence in a restaurant. It was not too long ago that the hon. leader of the new party (Mr. MacDonald) brought what we would consider very grave charges before a committee of the House. Frankly, we would have hoped that when he brought such charges he would substantiate them. He brought grave charges that there was an atmosphere of patronage attached to restaurants getting a licence. I think he still has the opportunity to substantiate the charges if he so wishes and we would hope that he will do this.

But anyway, there is a smog attached to the whole aspect of getting licences in restaurants. Is there any reason why there should be this smog? I suggest there is, because there are no clear ground rules for getting a licence to sell liquor in a restaurant.

Again, when the hon. Provincial Secretary was talking with emphasis about now bringing Canadian justice into The Liquor Control Act, I would have hoped he would have also thought of going a little further than he did. He talked about the right of appeal for producers and others. Surely he might have thought of the right of appeal for the restaurant owner who has put up money to provide a dignified and high standard in a restaurant and is turned down, but never knows why he is turned down and cannot appeal the decision. Does that not, somehow, seem to be less than Canadian justice?

When you make an approach to apply for a licence, you are never sure why you were turned down and you cannot appeal the reasoning of the judge who made the decision. Is that not a denial of Canadian justice? When the hon. Provincial Secretary was changing some of the Act, we had hoped that he might have had the enthusiasm to see that Canadian justice prevailed throughout the whole of the Act.

May I say that the other thing that was encouraging to us, and yet somewhat ironical, was that having enlarged the conditions under which we can have liquor and wine in the province, the government came in hurriedly, through the hon. Minister of Health, emphasizing that it was taking a new approach to alcoholics. Mr. Speaker, in

view of the revenue which the government gets from the sale of liquor, I would have hoped, when we think of over 100,000 alcoholics in this province, that this government would have been emphasizing this problem long ago. I would have hoped that in the schools—as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has outlined time after time—I would have thought that in the schools there would have been a programme, a comprehensive programme, to indicate to the school children in this province the dangers of abuse of alcohol. I would have hoped, instead of just the few beds that are given as a pittance for the treatment of alcoholics, that there would have been a number of beds for treatment, that there would have been a whole new approach to the treatment of the alcoholic.

This surely should have been done long ago; but we have to be thankful at this point that there is some recognition that there are 100,000 people who are suffering from the disease of alcoholism.

This point has been made strongly by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer). At that time I thought he spoke with a liberal philosophy with concern for the people of the province and we appreciated his remarks.

May I say, sir, that in looking at this Act, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, we will support the Act because we are appreciative that after 22 years the government has decided to look at the mores and the customs of its people as being those of people who have grown up, have matured and become civilized. This legislation, in a small way, gives recognition to this fact.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I think for at least two years we have heard rumours and stories, some of which seem to have been inspired on the fact that the government was reviewing the liquor legislation of the province and had substantial plans for changing it. These rumours have been particularly strong in the last two months, and sometimes I got the impression that the Conservative caucus spent most of its time talking about liquor with the result we could not get onto two o'clock sessions in this House.

Then one sees the bill that is now before us, together with the bill following it on the order paper, which is really a second part of a total whole; and one can only say that the mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse.

What we have before us, essentially, is a

series of housekeeping amendments. Apparently there have been all sorts of sections in the Act that are not necessary and are being dropped. In addition, the government is abandoning enforcement procedures in the Act. The onus was shifted and it advised us that those procedures are not necessary. I presume they have not been necessary during all the years they have been there. If they are not necessary to secure satisfactory enforcement, then certainly it is most desirable that they should be removed. We in this group are happy to see them removed.

Beyond that, there really is not very much in the bill. There are provisions whereby the character of taverns may, we hope, be improved. I have often complained in this House, as have many other hon. members, of the dingy, repulsive places that go under the name of "taverns"—or I am not sure if they go under the name of "taverns"—at any rate the men's beverage rooms and the mixed beverage rooms, which are nothing but drinking emporiums. There is nothing that a person can do in there except guzzle beer or have a noisy television programme inflicted upon him while he is doing so. They are huge, dingy, unattractive rooms that, as we all know, compare most unfavourably with the English pub. I hope that the changes in the law will make it possible to change the character of these so-called beverage rooms. I am not sure that it will. Their layout is such that it is hard to see how they can be improved without considerable changes in the total approach. It is now possible, at least, to provide something other than mere guzzling in these places.

On the other hand, will the proprietor do anything about it? I do not know. I think that the liquor licence board should now put some heat on them to make these institutions a little more attractive. I would say, also, that there should be a greater emphasis in our legislation than there now is on the provision of alcoholic beverages in association with food. I am somewhat regretful at the attitude which the government continues to take with regard to the licensing of restaurants that meet reasonable standards. There are some that seem to be able to get licences, while others do not.

In fact, if one goes to the corner of Bloor and Yonge in Toronto, one will find on one side of the street a restaurant called the Club Socrates, I think, that waited for several years before it was able to get a beer and wine licence. I do not normally frequent such expensive places, but I was there once and it seemed to be a well-run establishment. I could see no reason why it could not get

a licence. Recently it got one, but then another place opened on the other side of the street and had a licence at the same time as it opened up.

Now, how can that be? It is a strange sort of anomaly and it is not confined to the corner of Yonge and Bloor. One finds it all over the place. I believe that properly operated restaurants should be able to get licences. I believe that the emphasis in licensing policy should be on giving licences to those establishments that serve food and to make the licences available in association with the serving of food. On the other hand, licences should not in future be issued to establishments that do not serve food. I think that this change in policy would have an important bearing on the problem of alcoholism, about which the hon. Minister of Health was talking last night.

My understanding of the researches of the alcoholism and addictions research foundation, as published in its little magazine, *Addictions*, and elsewhere, is that it has found that the danger of alcoholism is reduced when the consumption of alcohol is associated with the consumption of food. I do not see, even now, any basic change in our policy that would try to associate those two things. I think the failure to permit reputable restaurants to serve wine with meals on Sundays shows a continuation of the attitude of the government that it is not particularly desirable to have food and alcohol associated.

I am not suggesting that people should have to drink with their meals; but I am suggesting that, if they do feel like taking a drink, we in our public policy should do everything possible to encourage them to do so in connection with the eating of food.

There is one change in the legislation which I do not think is a forward step at all. In fact, I think it is a retrograde step. It is one of the few significant changes; that is the new provision whereby the serving of alcoholic beverages can now take place in hotel rooms, which clearly are not, shall we say, a second home for the person who is occupying them—a home away from home. The provision that there must be evidence that the person is occupying the room as a temporary home before he can serve alcoholic beverages in the room is being removed. I am suggesting to the government that that is a retrograde step and will militate against the policy that the hon. Minister of Health enunciated last night. The effect of this, as the hon. Provincial Secretary himself explained, is that it will now be quite all right to use alcohol in hotel rooms as part of the

normal process of transacting business. That is what the change is for.

A salesman sets up a sample room in a hotel and serves a few drinks to make his customers, or prospective customers, feel in a better mood; although he is technically breaking the law if that room is not being occupied by him as a place of residence. Similarly, at conferences and conventions that go on almost constantly, rooms are engaged in which alcoholic beverages are served—not in association with food—merely as a goodwill gesture. I think that the government should start to take cognizance of the problems that are arising from the increasing association of alcohol with the normal transaction of business, and which they are now facilitating by the amendment they have put before us.

The researches of the alcoholism and addictions research foundation clearly indicate that the growing custom of having a drink in connection with almost any business occasion is an important factor in the growth of alcoholism. It is a little ironical that, on the one hand, we should have the hon. Minister of Health—at long last—advising this House that steps are being taken to provide both education and treatment on a substantial scale with regard to alcoholism and, on the other hand, the hon. Provincial Secretary asking us to pass legislation which will help to create alcoholics for the hon. Minister of Health's clinic. On the basis of all modern research, that is in fact what is happening from this custom of bringing in drinks on almost every business occasion.

I may say, in addition, that the whole practice is really a disguised form of graft. The cost of the drinks that are given so freely in the interests of so-called goodwill is, of course, charged up to the company that is sponsoring the event; and that is charged back to the public in the form of the prices that the company charges. Thus we are really facilitating here a procedure whereby the public can be willy-nilly assessed by private companies to put on free cocktail parties and similar affairs in order that businessmen in the country can expose themselves to an increased risk of alcoholism. I think that the hon. Minister should reconsider that section of the bill before it gets into committee.

The government has decided that it will not change the age at which it will be possible for people to purchase or consume alcoholic beverages. We, in this group, think it is right in that decision; except in one respect. I really cannot understand why the government persists in maintaining the myth

that it can prevent parents from permitting their own children, under age, to consume alcoholic beverages in their own homes. We hear a great deal about the invasion of privacy and about the undesirability of compulsion. Now, by what moral right does the government claim to tell parents how they are going to regulate the conduct of their children? There are many people now in this country from Europe, whose customs are perhaps a little different from some of the extreme puritanical customs under which some of us were brought up, and who regularly serve wine with meals—at the family table—to the children as well as to themselves. Let us face it, the law of the province of Ontario says that is illegal. The law of the province of Ontario has no effect on the custom whatever. It does not prevent it. People regularly violate the law. All we do by such a silly law is to bring the law into disrepute.

It is something like the law that was on the statutes up until just a few years ago, under which it was illegal for a man to drink a glass of beer in his own backyard. We can all recall that the ridiculousness of that provision of the law was called forcibly to public attention by a magistrate in Kitchener who said he had to convict a man of that heinous offence because he clearly had committed it; but that it was a matter of grave regret to him to convict and penalize a man for doing what a thousand other people in the city of Kitchener were doing at exactly the same time. As a result of that publicity, we removed the ridiculous anomaly from the law.

I am suggesting to the government that it should also remove the ridiculous anomaly under which it pretends that it can prevent parents from serving wine to their own children in their own homes. The alcoholism and addictions research foundation has stated that this is an unenforceable law, that it contributes nothing to the liquor control legislation of the province and that it would be desirable to remove the provision. So why does the government not face up to reality and take its courage in its hands to the limited degree that is necessary in this case by making it abundantly clear that the law does not try to dictate what parents will do with respect to their own children?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments on the question of local option. The government has seen fit to retain that principle in the legislation of the province. We do not object to this decision, in fact we support it. Normally, we do not believe in legislation by plebiscite, which this in effect is, but there are always exceptions to every rule. There is no question that

the local option principle with regard to liquor is well established in the traditions of this province, and indeed, of most of this country. It has worked reasonably well in the past, there is every prospect that it will work in the future and under those circumstances we think that it should be retained, as we have usually argued.

I think there probably has been some pressure from cities to have local option removed, I do not know. But actually the local option principle does not apply in cities of a population of 50,000 or over in any case. We in this group believe that if people in a rural community do not wish to have liquor outlets or wish only to have certain limited kinds of outlets in their communities, that is their business. We do not see any reason why people in cities should impose their will upon them.

There is, however, one aspect of this problem that I would like to call to the attention of the government and the House: We are engaged inevitably in this province in significant municipal reorganization. The municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, of course, is the outstanding example. The process is one that has been going on for a long time and will undoubtedly accelerate in the future. Municipal boundaries will be redrawn, and new municipal units will be created. I would suggest to the government that, in retaining the local option principle, it should ensure that it does not thereby entrench a local option decision of some time in the remote past, made when the municipal boundaries were in a certain form, which becomes unchangeable after those boundaries alter.

I do not think I have to dwell upon the anomalies that exist right within the city limits of the city of Toronto proper, where two areas of the city, because of some ancient decisions, are dry areas. I do not think that the residents of the areas are any drier than the residents of any other areas. They just go to other people's neighbourhoods to get a few drinks, but they scrupulously keep these terrible institutions, which they themselves are often willing to patronize, off their own main streets.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is the hon. member talking about Bill Temple, the former CCF member?

Mr. Bryden: I was not talking about anybody.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He strongly supported that view.

Mr. Bryden: Many people have different views. There are many different views on these questions.

I am suggesting to the government that although it is fine to retain the local option principle, it should make sure that in doing so, it does not entrench anomalies of that kind in the future. It should try to consider the principle in terms of up-to-date municipal boundaries. I do not think I have to belabour the point; I think we are all familiar with the anomalies existing in Toronto. I hope the government in the development of its legislation will try to avoid that sort of problem in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say that we in this group support this bill with the exception of one section to which I have made reference. We will deal with that section again when we come to it in committee. Otherwise, we support the bill, indeed one could say that this bill and Bill No. 163 are two pretty innocuous documents. It would be hard to whip oneself into an attitude of opposing them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): **Mr. Speaker,** I am a little disappointed that when the hon. Provincial Secretary went on his tour of discovery, which involved his finding that there was such a thing called Canadian justice, he did not find out that it was perhaps against the ideals of Canadian justice to allow the continuance of arbitrary decisions from administrative boards without appeals. To complete his exercise in his voyage of discovery he could have and he should have brought in a system of appeals from the decisions of the liquor licence board and the liquor control board.

It seems to me, **Mr. Speaker,** that as we see the government stand up clothed in this self-righteousness, talking about discovering Canadian justice, we have to look at some of the basics of Canadian justice. There is nothing more arbitrary than leaving the important decisions that can affect the livelihood of individuals to the arbitrary, unreasoned decisions of the administrative boards. The simplest thing that could have been done in both of these Acts would be to write in sections which would compel written decisions in connection with each determination made by either the liquor licence board or the liquor control board.

Second, provision should be made for appeal from these decisions to other bodies. When the appeal system is from Caesar to Caesar, when one appeals from the liquor licence board to the liquor licence board, or

from the liquor control board to the liquor control board, there can be nothing more arbitrary, there can be nothing that is more obviously a denial of Canadian justice. I just wish that the hon. Provincial Secretary had continued on his voyage of discovery, if he really was on one at all. I suggest that his approach in his presentation—that he has suddenly discovered Canadian justice—means very little, because the government has not struck at the roots of justice and equity in continuing to grant these arbitrary powers to the two boards.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this bill because to me it is a vindication of some remarks that I made in this Legislature during the first session when I had the privilege to sit in it, in respect of the appeal provisions that have been drastically altered in principle in this statute.

I am going to deal with that just a little bit later, but I want to digress to say that the problem of alcohol has been a very vexing one and one fraught with great anxiety among governments in this country, and a problem indeed, sir, which, as you know yourself, has been attended with much human misery and suffering. It strikes me that many of our approaches to the problem of alcohol within our community give all the earmarks of being somewhat in the category of panic measures. We recognize the breadth and scope of the problem and it always strikes me that government is attempting frantically to deal with it.

I noted with interest the comments of the hon. Minister of Health about his new scheme for the handling of alcoholic people who are taken into custody. He made the remarkable statement that whether this new system works or not, it does not really matter in respect of our trying it, because certainly the one that we had before did not work at all. I think he used the phrase, if I quote him correctly, "Anything would be better than the former system, which was based upon custody."

I think that gives proof to what I say, that our approach has been anything but scientific and it has been a frantic grasping after some panacea that we hope will do something to mitigate the evil effects of the force of alcohol and its impact upon our society.

I listened to a psychologist a year or so ago, who had made a study of the history of alcohol in North America. I will not go into the details of his account of it, but he pointed out very significantly that the impact of the reformed and non-conformist churches

on North America was such that alcohol was looked upon by the adherents of those churches as being an evil per se, with the result that there had developed in North America an attitude toward alcohol that was completely different from the attitude of central Europeans. He summed it up this way:

Central Europeans, through their cultural folkways in the handling of alcohol, meet and drink; North Americans meet to drink.

That "meet to drink" is summed up by the oft-quoted phrase that you hear among North Americans: "You get the hotel room and I will get the booze."

It is my own opinion that we can never reach the Everest of conquest of the problems of alcohol until we change the attitude of our citizens, particularly our young citizens, toward alcohol.

I said that three or four years ago, and I recall one March 17 when we had a day-long debate on the problems of alcohol and the government approach to it. I think, beyond question, the government intended to lower the drinking age to 18 years, because so many respectable organizations and so many clergy could not have got that impression if there had not been a germ of truth to it. Some of the reformed churches made very frantic and emphatic protests to the Prime Minister of the province until finally he gave his assurance that there was no intention of lowering the age to 18 years.

I would be unequivocally opposed to lowering the age to 18 years, and I base my opposition on scientific grounds. I am told by those learned in the science of alcohol and its impact upon the human system, that if a person takes to using alcohol in excess at the age of 17 or 18, then anywhere from 15 to 20 years later, the chances are about three out of five, that that person is going to have a problem with alcohol. It is extremely likely that that person is going to become an alcoholic.

And what is meant by excessive use of alcohol? I am told by scientists that anything over one or two ounces of alcohol taken in a short period of time is excessive use. The reason is that as soon as alcohol is taken into the human system, the human body treats it as a foreign substance—a poison, in fact—and the human body wants to get rid of it. Anything the human body wants, upon intake it begins to break down into those nutritional factors that the body needs.

But not so with C_2H_5OH . The body wants to reject it immediately. The problem, of course—and I do not say it facetiously—is

with the liver. The liver is the main organ that tries to break down the alcohol and get it out of the system. It works at a very slow rate. If one or two ounces is taken in a short space of time, the liver gets away behind in its task, the alcohol gets into the blood stream, courses through the system and affects the intellectual centres.

I suppose that is the reason Aldous Huxley called alcohol the "mind changer," because the alcohol gets into the cranial nerve centres and something happens in there to change a person's mind. He does things because of its effect upon the lobotomy that he would not do when sober. For that reason, I would be very loath to support any principle at any time that would lower the drinking age to below that which it is now.

I agree with the hon. member for Woodbine that if the individual parent—and I hope he is a sensible parent—wishes to encourage his children into a very continent, reasonable, sane approach to alcohol, then that is the prerogative of the parents. I wish I could feel that if we gave a licence to the whole of society to permit the indulgence in alcoholic beverages to children in their homes, it would be used in a responsible way, but I cannot even feel that assurance.

Now drinking on Sunday is a different matter. How many times have I heard Judge Robb say that what we want to encourage in this province is the consumption of alcoholic beverage with food. I am one who pays very close attention to television advertising of alcoholic beverages—only beer of course, because the liquor interests have never put forward any claims to use the electronic medium for the advertising of their wares—but I watch the television advertising of beer and I do not see much association of beer with the eating of food. More often, if I judge correctly, it is associated with the great outdoors. In other words, to be a red-blooded, healthy, masculine North American or Canadian citizen, you go into the great outdoors, of which we have so much in this country, and you cannot possibly feel content in those wilderness places unless you have a case of Carling's or Labatt's with you.

You simply will not enjoy yourself and especially, I gather, if you get in a canoe and you are shooting the most dangerous rapids on one of our larger rivers—you cannot exercise that manoeuvre with accuracy and good judgment—unless you have 12 Labatt's.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: It is like the advertisement I saw one time about Canadian Club in one

of the slick magazines. The title always reads: "Wherever you go in the world you will find Canadian Club." There was a picture of a mountain climber, and the caption underneath claimed the mountain climber was 8,000 feet up the mountain and after he completed the climb, he would sit down to a drink of Canadian Club. I wondered if he had had a few shots of it before he started up so that he would be able to execute the manoeuvre with more agility or—if he fell—after a few charges of Canadian Club, it would not hurt as much.

Judge Robb has said time and time again—and I have seen Judge Robb in operation on many occasions—when a person comes and wants an extension of the facilities which he is operating—the very first question the judge asks him is, "How many meals did you sell last year?" That appears to be the basis, the cardinal rule, for Judge Robb's consideration of whether these extended facilities will be granted.

Therefore, if we want to encourage the consumption of alcoholic beverage with the taking of food, I would be in favour of the sale of alcoholic beverages in good restaurants with meals on Sundays. We have been condemned from many a corner for the puritan aspects of our Sundays, and I would think that this would be a step in the right direction.

Again, with the lowering of the age of consumption of alcohol to 18, the sale on Sundays was one of the things bruited about the community, and it was thought that the government was going to take that step. Unfortunately in this bill as it is before us, the government has not summoned up sufficient courage to take that step, and I, for one, regret it.

Now, my hon. leader spoke the truth when he referred to this business of "Canadian justice," and it is strange that this morning I should say that I am very suspicious of any concept identified as "Canadian justice." I would want to look that one over for a while, because, with my experience of the law, I prefer British justice, to "Canadian justice." I prefer the thousand years of jurisprudence which is now crystalized in the decisions of the British courts and in the development of the common law, to any concept of "Canadian justice." And knowing, as I do, that many of the judicial occupants of the bench have not got the time under our system to write reasons to support their decisions, I would prefer to keep the reliance on the decisions of the Court of King's Bench, the Court of Chancery, the House of Lords,

as we do, and which after all, forms the great body of the common law, of which we are the inheritors.

So I suspect this concept that the hon. Provincial Secretary has discovered of "Canadian justice."

To go back to my earlier assertion, and I say particularly to my hon. leader, through you, sir, that we should be joyful that they have in this bill taken out those sections relating to appeals from convictions under this Act, and a principle, which—and I measure my words carefully—bastardized one of the most important principles of the criminal law. Nowhere in any other statute, in any other jurisdiction, did I ever see the vicious principle inherent in section 140 of The Liquor Control Act which has now come out.

These people who talk about compulsion, that are against compulsion, have enshrined in that statute a feature of compulsion which, if you were convicted of an offence under the Act, before you could appeal and get a re-hearing and a review by a superior court you had to swear a solemn affidavit—under oath—to say that you had not committed the offence with which you were charged. So gone was all the jurisprudence relating to the burden upon the Crown to prove the guilt of the accused. Gone too were all the procedures of the criminal courts and the protections given to the accused. If the accused wanted to appeal on a matter of procedure; if he wanted to tell the appellate court that he did not receive a fair trial in the court of first instance; if, indeed, he was denied the right to cross-examine his accusers, then before he could take that miscarriage of justice up to an appellate court he had to swear an affidavit saying that he did not commit the offence.

Even The Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, relating to poisonous substance which does far more harm to the individual—though not to society—than alcohol, did not have the appeal provisions in it that were in The Liquor Control Act, and which this government left enshrined there for 22 years. Indeed, in the session 1961-62, after much pressure had been brought to bear about appeals from the liquor licence board in respect to the cancellation of licences, this government lifted the appeal provisions out of The Liquor Control Act and, by the enactment of section 43a of The Liquor Licence Act, said the appeal provisions of The Liquor Control Act shall apply to The Liquor Licence Act. So before a person who had his liquor licence cancelled could appeal,

he also had to swear an affidavit to say that he had not committed the offence. Again there was a denigration, if not a mutilation, of the well-trying principle of the criminal law that the burden is upon the accuser to prove that the accused committed the offence—and to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt.

So it is a matter of great joy to me, because I recall that I raised this point during the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General in the session of 1960. So, five or six years later, one sees fruition of the things that one sought; after all, that is not really too long a period to wait in terms of human affairs, I suppose.

With the abolition of the appeal procedures, the hon. Provincial Secretary and his advisers have gone through the Act and they have removed many other features that were in violation of well-established rights. For example, they take out sections 111 to 115, which gave fearsome powers to the police if they sniffed alcohol. All the police had to do was sniff the odour of it and then, under section 112, they could come in your house, your motor vehicle, your automobile, vessel, boat, canoe or conveyance of any description and search for liquor.

Then they have removed the one that shifted the burden of proof from the Crown to the accused, section 133. So, having accomplished that—having cleaned up this statute—and I am looking at the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), then let us turn to The Securities Act, which is the other great offender against well-established principles of the common law and the criminal law. Let us take the arbitrary features out of it, some of which are far worse than this one. Then you will, in the community, be able to hold up your head and say: "We are against compulsion in any form."

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, just a word or two. On the occasion of the introduction of the liquor control bill and the liquor licence bill, I did take—with your indulgence and the indulgence of the hon. members of the House—some time in a very thorough explanation of all the principles which ran through the two bills. It is not my purpose, at this time, to review them.

I think, with respect to the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that the point of view of the Liberal Party and the point of view of the government is—as he is wont to say—on the record. The people, in due course, will make their future decisions on the basis of what has been said in the course of these discussions. However, there

are one or two points which hon. members have raised which I should like to touch upon.

The hon. member for Woodbine did express his support of the principle of liquor with food and in this he was concurred with by the hon. member for Sudbury. This, in fact, is, and has been, one of the very basic principles which has underlined the licensing policies of the liquor licence board throughout at least the last half dozen years—if not the past decade. As proof of this, I would draw to the attention of the hon. members of the House a pamphlet which I have here, called *Guide to Good Eating in Toronto*, issued with the compliments of a utility corporation—which I shall not name. You can, I believe, pick up copies at the entrance of the Legislature from The Department of Tourism and Information attendants. In this pamphlet there are listed the names of some 97 restaurants, as such, they are really first-rate dining places. I suggest to the hon. members of this House, that these 97 can scarcely be duplicated in any city around the world.

Toronto is becoming a very cosmopolitan city, one of the great cities of the world. In this list you will find dining places and dining rooms, the facilities, food and service of which are equal to that of London, New York, Mexico City, Tokyo and any of the other great cities of the world.

The interesting thing about it is that prices, compared with what any member of this House, who might pay \$10 or more per person in any of these other cities, are within the reach of the ordinary man in this city of Toronto.

I should like to take this opportunity of stressing the fact that it is the combination of food and liquor, the consumption of food and alcoholic beverages, which has underlined the basic attitude of the licensing board—as is evidenced by what it has licensed in Metropolitan Toronto. This has been duplicated to some degree throughout the rest of the province, in those urban areas where the community will supply a sufficient number of clientele to warrant the capital investment of the type of facility that I am speaking of.

I direct the attention of the hon. member for Woodbine in this regard. As a matter of fact, those in the list that are not licensed have really not been licensed by virtue of the fact that they do not wish to be licensed, have not been in operation for a sufficient length of time to be licensed, or came under the provisions of a local option bylaw. If there is any dining place which has a standard,

which is of a kind that the hon. member has described, they either have been licensed or probably could be licensed in the very near future.

With respect to the question of alcoholism, and in this I want the hon. members of the Legislature to know that in the course of the study that has been going on, all departments that have had an interest in the consumption of alcoholic beverages have had a liaison and have been in contact with each other.

As I stated in my opening remarks, just as we execute the will of the people in meeting the needs of the second half of this century, so, too, we have been aware of some of the problems that are created in this field. I suggest that the hon. Minister of Health has announced that this is not something that is springing from nowhere. The alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation has already won for itself a reputation around the world, and in this field the province of Ontario has led.

With the programme that the hon. Minister of Health has announced, we will be far in the forefront of other jurisdictions that have been held up as examples in Europe and other parts of the world. This is a bilateral approach to this matter.

I would point out one factor though—for the hon. leader of the Opposition has criticized this fact in relation to the income derived from the sale of alcoholic beverages—that the federal government derives even more across the country. To my knowledge, not one single dollar of this is expended by it in any way, either in education or in combating the effects of alcoholism. Just think, and I suggest this to the hon. members of the House, when the hon. Minister of Health has announced a programme which envisages the expenditure of some \$18 million in the course of dealing with this in a programme over the next few years, what a wonderful thing it would be if the federal government said to the provinces, "Because we derive revenues from this exact source, we will provide a matching dollar." The province of Ontario would then have \$36 million for a programme of this kind. I would like to see the hon. leader of the Opposition take the opportunity of rapping his desk to indicate his firm approval of this approach having been taken.

The hon. member for Woodbine did raise the point of the local option section and supported it, but he brought out some of the problems he saw in the expansion of municipalities, and the problems that arise

when one municipality, with one set of liquor laws by virtue of its previous determination under the local option privileges, will have a set of laws different from the annexed or to-be-annexed area. It is interesting to note that this has had some widespread discussion throughout the province in the last two years. One of the municipalities passed a resolution to this effect, and it was followed by some three dozen municipalities that subscribed to its resolution.

The problem, as I see it, is that those who have supported this resolution seem to have looked at it from the point of view of a so-called wet area annexing a dry area. Then, accordingly, by adoption of that resolution, the dry area would take unto itself the wet laws of the annexing municipalities. This would, in effect, do away with the principle of local option privileges within the annexed area.

I point out to those people, however, that the other side of the coin is that there are municipalities in the province of Ontario that are dry, and which in the course of annexation proceedings, would annex areas which are to some degree wet or wetter than the annexing municipality. One can well imagine that if this situation arose and if we were to adopt the principle as expounded by the hon. member for Woodbine, we would then be injecting into the proposition of annexation of municipalities, this rather extraneous item:

Rather than people being concerned, sir, with the merits of the annexation as such, and whether the community would benefit by having an enlarged municipality in this regard—and this, by itself, has been a controversial subject in some communities in the past—we would be injecting a very highly emotional item upon which people have some very strong opinions. They would be basing their support or opposition to annexation not on the merits of annexation and the enlargement of municipalities, but on this, what I call, extraneous item.

It is true that this has created difficulties in the past. I think the city of Peterborough, by virtue of certain annexations of portions of townships which surrounded it, at one time had at least four or five sets of laws in the municipality after all the annexations had taken place. However, by virtue of procedures worked out by the city clerk and by the chief election officer, who has supervision of this, a vote was taken and the matter was settled to the satisfaction of the whole community.

It is my feeling, both that of myself and

others who have made studies in this field, that this procedure, which we have accepted in the past, will continue. Even in the areas which were referred to as the west Toronto area and north Toronto area, procedures are in the process of being carried out in order that the people might give an expression to their opinions under the local option bylaws.

Mr. Singer: Utter nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. member for Downsview, whose chief word in his vocabulary in the exercise of his function as a member of the Opposition seems to be "utter nonsense"—

Mr. Singer: It applies so well to the hon. Provincial Secretary, I cannot think of a better word.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The people of the province will decide this.

Mr. Speaker, when the two Acts, The Liquor Licence Act and The Liquor Control Act came to me by way of reporting to the Legislature on behalf of the boards, I went through them very thoroughly. I acquainted myself in detail with the various sections and at that time became intimately aware of the sections in which the principles to which I have referred to as the principles of Canadian justice seemed to be in conflict. It became a personal study of mine, and a very thorough study of the responsible authorities and of those others who participated. I am very proud indeed, as I pointed out to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that I have the responsibility for introducing the bills that bring about these changes.

I was very much interested in those remarks.

I wish to point out to hon. members of the Legislature as they go through the sections, that we have provided for appeals from the decisions of the liquor control board in respect of the cancellation of licences. This has been introduced earlier in respect of the licence board in this House—and I will refer to that in greater detail in a moment. We have provided for appeals by way of a stated case in respect of all items, so that we have provided for appeals in all those fields which are necessary for the welfare of the citizens, concomitant at the same time with the discharge by the two boards of the responsibilities assigned to them by this Legislature in carrying out the administrative functions of these two boards.

There is just one item on which I want

to conclude. I am going to take this opportunity because I have listened to lectures on law from the hon. member for Sudbury for some time—and today he got into the field of health. I was very interested when the hon. member appeared before the commission on civil rights to speak on behalf of himself and not the Liberal Party. He went into quite a diatribe—that is the word he would use—on the shocking proceedings and arbitrary actions of the liquor licence board. I quote here from the *Toronto Daily Star*:

The liquor board may deprive a man of his licence, ruin his financial investment of hundreds of thousands of dollars, drive him into poverty and the courts cannot even inquire whether the board came to a just conclusion.

Now, I think he has learned something in the interval. Today he referred to the fact that in 1962, this Legislature—of which he was an hon. member—introduced a section re appeals against the decisions of the liquor licence board. That which in 1965 he accuses the board of being able to do was put an end to in 1962. No man can be deprived of his licence without the right of appeal to the court of appeal and that right has been had since 1962.

I am afraid that the hon. member for Sudbury committed what is considered in practice as an almost unforgiveable sin. Even the most fledgling law student would not be forgiven if in reference to a statute, he went to the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1960, and did not read all the statutes that came in between. I am afraid that is just what happened to the hon. member for Sudbury. He read RSO, 1960, and did not read the Statutes of Ontario, 1962.

I say to the hon. members of this House, no man, and indeed no corporation, after this bill will have been introduced, can be deprived of a license without an appeal to the courts of this land.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill No. 163, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The thirty-second order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 120 reported.

THE SURROGATE COURTS ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 121 reported.

THE SECURITIES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 122 reported.

THE POLICE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 123, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 6:

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 2 of section 6, be amended by striking out the words "first day of July 1965" in the third line, and inserting in lieu thereof "first day of January 1966," so that the subsection shall read as follows:

Section 23 of The Police Act as re-enacted by subsection 1 does not apply in respect of acts of members of police forces occurring before the 1st day of January 1966.

The purpose is quite clear, I think, to extend the time, the effective date of the coming into force of that provision.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, section 6 is the section which involves, in principle, the inclusion of civilian employees within the police bargaining unit, and makes applicable all of the provisions of The Police Act to civilian employees. The mechanics in the garages, the clerks, the typists, the people who maintain and clean up the police stations and that sort of thing, all now become a part of the police bargaining unit. As a result of that, I think that these persons are put into a very difficult

position. I can see no reason or logic in it at all, and I know in fact that the police organizations are not interested in this, either.

We have taken away from policemen the right to strike, as we should. We have taken away the right to strike from the firemen. But if the garage mechanic in a police station wants to go on strike, why should he be put into that position? Why should the typists? Why should the clerks? Why should the maintenance staff of the police stations be put into that position?

There was a decision, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Attorney General is aware of, that came down fairly recently, that the garage mechanics working for the Windsor police commission did not come within the police bargaining unit, and as a result of that we are getting this amendment here. Surely all of these groups should have their independent right to bargain. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, what is being done is that the government is taking away through the back door, this right of theirs to organize and to bargain collectively themselves, and I do not think this should be allowed.

I can see no reason at all for the inclusion of section 6 here. Why should the civilian employees of police forces be put into the same position as police are, insofar as their negotiations with their employers are concerned? I think this is a bad section and I wish that the hon. Attorney General would take it back and have another look at it. I can see nothing that is going to be achieved, other than the infliction on this group of people of an untenable position insofar as they themselves are concerned.

It is too bad that in Windsor this type of dispute arose. Surely the garage mechanics in Windsor should be able to work out their

own salvation under the provisions of the pertinent statutes, and because they won a victory in the courts, now the government is taking it away by legislation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I submit there is no denial of the right of bargaining, and working out of arrangements of this nature. These people will be treated, however, as members of the police force.

The reason for policemen, constables and members of the police force being denied the right to strike and go off duty in a dispute of that kind, is so that we may maintain law and order. The garage mechanics, the persons who run the telephone switchboards, and all the people who work with the police force, could very well put it out of commission by refusing to go to work. The police would be immobilized, the communications could break down; these people are, when they take on that responsibility and that work, in effect, members of the police force.

I submit, and I think quite clearly, that it was always the intention that that should be so. The court decision reached an opposite judgment and said these people are outside the police force. It was never intended that they should be. Those who work with the police force, are part of the police force, and the Act just simply makes that clear. But the police do not complain of the denial of the right of bargaining and of being improperly treated in all labour matters, and in all matters which deal with all the features of their employment. These people will be no different.

It being 12.30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 8, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Police Act, bill to amend, reported	3811
Public Service Superannuation Act, bill to amend, reported	3820
Public Service Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	3820
Racing Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	3822
Ontario institute for studies in education, bill to establish, reported	3823
Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, bill to amend, reported	3823
Financial Administration Act, bill to amend, reported	3824
Corporations Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	3824
Logging Tax Act, bill to amend, reported	3824
Income Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	3824
Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	3825
Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, reported	3825
Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee	3825
Appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies, and to define the commis- sioner's powers and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer, on second reading	3839
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	3847
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, on second reading	3847
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	3848
Recess, 6 o'clock	3848

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Chairman: We are always glad to welcome visitors to the Legislature and today we have students from various schools, and especially from Grandview school and Fairview school in the city of Brantford.

THE POLICE ACT

(continued)

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I have to pray the indulgence of the House in connection with Bill 123 which is before the House now. I overlooked an amendment which I proposed to make in section 4 and also one which I had intended to propose in section 5. They are both the same, actually, and I would now, with the consent of the House, move that we might consider these. I move that:

Subsection 1 of section 13 of The Police Act, as contained in section 4 of the bill, be amended by striking out the words, "and assistants" in the fourth and fifth lines, and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "assistants and civilian employees."

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh now wait, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, if I might, before the hon. member speaks—and this is on the subject we were discussing when the House rose—the amendment on section 5 is in the same tenor, and if I might read it it has to do with the matter we were discussing in section 6. I move with respect to section 5, Mr. Chairman:

That subsection 2 of section 19 of The Police Act, as contained in section 5 of the bill, be amended by striking out the words "and assistants," in the fourth line, and inserting in lieu thereof, "assistants and civilian employees."

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that in effect, these two amendments are the same, and they are complementary and in the same tenor as the language of section 6 which we were discussing when the House rose.

I regret I overlooked those two amendments and I now bring them before the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, may I speak on a procedural point for one moment? I wonder if it would not be just as well to stick to section 6 where we were debating the principles of this issue. If it is resolved here, presumably it can apply to both cases.

Mr. Chairman: I was just going to suggest that. We will go on with section 6.

Mr. Singer: My hon. friend for York South suggests that we stay on section 6; actually, the amendments now brought in by the hon. Attorney General to section 4 and 5 make the intent that much more obvious.

I was not satisfied at all, Mr. Chairman, with the hon. Attorney General's explanation for this. He said it was always the intention of the Legislature, in his mind, that civilian employees be included as members of the police force, but suddenly the Supreme Court of Canada came along and said, "No, you never said that."

The legislation speaks for itself and the Supreme Court of Canada is the last word. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that this is only a matter of comparative novelty, that for the first time there have been organizational efforts made, and perhaps successful organizational efforts made, among the civilian employees of police forces. You are not going to make anyone believe, Mr. Chairman, that if the maintenance men who look after the lawns around a police station want to go on strike it is going to endanger the enforcement of justice; you are not going to make anyone believe that if the clerks who write the letters, who are civilian employees, decide that their working conditions are not satisfactory and they cannot make a satisfactory bargain with their employers and they decide—as is their right, as is the right of everybody in the province of Ontario—to deny their work to their employers, that the administration of justice is going to collapse.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are embarking on a brand-new principle;

and the principle is a bad one, a very bad one. My hon. friend says that if the mechanics in Windsor went on strike that possibly the cruisers would not get out on the road. By the same token if General Motors wants to go on strike and there are no spare parts I suppose that would endanger the administration of justice. By the same token, if the milkman who supplies milk to the police chief goes on strike and he is not able to go to work because his child is sick, that would endanger the administration of justice. How far along the line do you extend this principle?

If the police forces want to have this sort of control—and my understanding is, Mr. Chairman, that the police forces do not want to have this type of control; there may be a few members of police commissions who do, but the police forces themselves do not want to have to bargain for the non-police personnel—if this is their desire, then bring these people in and put them in uniform, the same as was done in wartime. You can have police clerks in uniform, you can have police mechanics in uniform. If they are policemen, make them policemen; but I suggest that this section as it is before us is a real invasion of the right to bargain collectively and a real invasion of the privileges that are granted in The Labour Relations Act.

If people, having gone through the legal steps that are laid down, cannot agree to agree, then they can agree to disagree and it is within their power and their privilege to withhold their labour. I suggest that the attempt to take this right away is a real infringement on the right of organized labour to organize and to bargain together collectively. It is nothing more or less than that, Mr. Chairman, and any suggestion that the whole field of the administration of justice is going to be slowed down or harmed by the fact that the situation is allowed to continue as the Supreme Court of Canada says the statutes are written is, I think, an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail.

I do not think that the first part of section 6, should become a part of the law of the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably out of the House when we began the debate on this before the noon adjournment and I do not want to repeat anything that the hon. member for Downsview has said about the general background and the principles involved here, but I do want to add a word by way of general plea to the hon. Attorney General and to the govern-

ment with regard to what they are seeking to do in these amendments.

What has distressed me about this government is its capacity, on the one hand, to pay lip service to the principle of granting collective bargaining rights and its willingness—indeed, on occasion, its eagerness—to limit the full exercise of those collective bargaining rights. We have had many debates in this House on a related matter—section 89—related in the sense that the government grants collective bargaining rights generally under The Labour Relations Act and then it ends up its Act by a sting in the tail, so to speak, with a concluding section which grants the power to certain people, namely, municipal councils and bodies thereof throughout the province of Ontario, to take away these rights.

Now, you cannot, on basic rights, grant them and then give somebody the power to take them away. In my view, collective bargaining rights in the second half of the twentieth century are a basic civil right of people in a free society.

You did it in section 89. You did it a year or so ago in regard to the Crown agencies, by accident. You brought in an amendment expressly for the purpose of relieving Crown agencies of certain tax obligations—these would be the federal authorities—and then you discovered that the lawyers could interpret this as bringing Crown agencies, or the employees of Crown agencies, into the categories of civil servants so that they could be deprived of the right of collective bargaining.

What has this government done? Did they come in and say that this was an unexpected development; “unwittingly, we have deprived these people of their rights”? No; they were quite willing, they were almost anxious, to perpetuate an unwitting denial of full collective bargaining rights to people, who in the first instance, by their own words, did not want or seek to take away these rights.

We have another example of it here. The hon. member for Downsview has put on the record that there were cases across the province which gradually built up to the kind of situation which has provoked the introduction of this amendment. The last case and the most illuminating one was the case with reference to the Windsor situation and the garage mechanics. The garage mechanics in Windsor were members of what was known as the Windsor civic local, with a separate contract. Following merger, they got into difficulties in resolving their contract and they sought conciliation from the Ontario

labour relations board. The board refused to grant conciliation services and so the case was taken to the courts and in the highest court of the land—the supreme court—it was decided that these people should not be deprived of their rights.

On occasion we in this House have had to cope with circumstances in which the court made a decision that was technically accurate in terms of the law and therefore we sought to correct the law so that you would not have to have this kind of decision being made by the court with a denial of certain rights flowing from it. But in this instance, you have a court establishing the rights of these people, saying that these people have these rights and they should not be taken away from them.

What does the government do? Do they accept this decision of the courts which bolsters and confirms the rights of these people? No; now they are going to come in and change the law so that the courts cannot protect the basic rights of these people for full collective bargaining. It seems to me that this is a pretty indefensible procedure by people who like to pay lip service to principles and then in the next Act deny the right of people to be able to realize these principles in everyday existence.

This, in essence, is the situation before us. As the hon. member for Downsview said, this government has had to cope with the problem of where you draw the line in essential public services for arbitration procedures. We have tried to draw the line so that we do not classify any and every industry, on flimsy excuses, as being so essential to the public that we have to have arbitration. The same kind of an argument is used by the hon. Attorney General: Because the clerks may not be able to type the letters that would assist the police forces in doing the job they have to be described under the Act as members of this police force and therefore have their right to qualify. The same applies for garage mechanics, the same for anybody else; anybody who becomes associated with the police force, notwithstanding—and I emphasize this once again, as the hon. member has done—notwithstanding the fact that the police association, made up of the policemen themselves, not the commissions, are not anxious to have all the civilian employees brought in under the restrictive arbitration procedures that have been laid down for coping with differences in labour-management relationships in this field.

I think this is an important principle and I am shocked and disturbed to find the

government once again being willing to violate this principle. It underlines what we have said, and usually it has provoked outbursts of protest from the government side of the House, that whenever you have a situation which will permit it, you will come up with an anti-labour decision. You will restrict as much as you can the full collective bargaining rights, and that is what you are doing in this instance.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring this matter to a head and I move that:

Subsection 1 of section 6 of Bill 123 be amended by striking out the proposed new section 22 of the Act.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. MacDonald moves that:

Subsection 1 of section 6 of Bill 123 be amended by striking out the proposed new section 22 of the Act.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, there is a clear and simple principle at stake here, and as I have said earlier in discussion of this section, I am satisfied—and I think anyone who looks at the legislation in The Police Act would be satisfied—that the intention was that anyone who was a member or employed in the operation of a police force should be subject to the provisions of The Police Act, one of which is that members of police forces shall not be entitled to strike.

There is what appears to me to be a very confused situation here when hon. members get up and say, "But you are depriving the people of collective bargaining rights." This, let me make clear, is not so for one moment. There are several sections in The Police Act, beginning, I think, at section 26 under the heading, "Bargaining and arbitration," and those sections run through the Act, up to and including section 35, all having to do with the right of members of police forces to bargain and to have their bargaining subject to arbitration. I think you will not hear, and I have not heard, members of police forces complain that they are badly dealt with.

The principle is that persons who are charged with the protection of the public, protection of property, enforcement of law and maintenance of order, should not have the right to walk off the scene on strike—that is firemen and police. In this Legislature this session there are certain restrictions being discussed on the right of strike with respect to hospital employees. Perhaps that is an encroachment, but the principle, however, has long been established and long been clear, that in these areas where protection of

persons, prevention of damage to property, enforcement and administration of law, the persons responsible should not be permitted, should they have a desire to strike. But their rights to bargain are maintained and the Act is very specific and clear. All we are saying here is that any person employed by a police force is a member of the force.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the violation.

Mr. Singer: That is the violation, surely.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I consider it no violation. It is all very well for the hon. member for Downsview to say "Put them into uniform." What does that do for them?

Mr. Singer: Then you are making policemen of them.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Stop and think a moment. What difference does it make whether a man is dressed in blue or grey, or civilian clothes or a blue uniform?

Mr. Singer: It makes an awful lot of difference.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If it was going to help the situation, I would be glad to put him in a uniform, but I do not see that that changes the basic facts of the matter for one moment or one iota. Why dress a man up in blue and say, "That takes care of the situation?" It does not. His rights are not going to be changed. He is a member of the police force and let me say to you, that with the communication system we have today, with the mobile type of forces we have today—radio communication, telephone communication, Telex, motorcycle squads—and the maintenance which is necessary for our police vehicles and on the switchboards which run those very fast and efficient communication systems, if those people—and I think they are very loyal and capable employees, but I say they are part of the police force, part and parcel of it—were to walk off, they could cripple the whole administration of justice.

All we are saying is, when you come on the police force as a civilian employee—call it civilian if you like, and I say again it makes no difference to call them constables or give them a rank or put them in a blue or red uniform, they are members of the police force—those persons who perform those very essential duties in the maintenance of law and order shall not strike, shall not cripple the force, shall not endanger your protection and mine and the protection of the public, person or property. They have all the rights

to bargain which are left in the Act in the sections I have mentioned.

It is true that this will perhaps be a new departure and that the police may or may not want to adopt them with open arms and assist them in their bargaining. But they may bargain by themselves, if they want to form a separate little group, or they may bargain with the police—the constables and the men and the officers up to the rank of inspector on the force—and they would be in a pretty good group.

The hon. member for York South says that because a court decision has brought this to our attention we should not now bring in legislation. There are numerous cases all down through our legislative history where a court has interpreted a section of the Act to indicate that the intention of the Legislature was not expressed or was not clearly expressed or the subject perhaps was not in the mind of the Legislature, and the Legislature has sprung to action and met the omission and stopped the gap by legislation. This is clear time after time. It seems to me this morning a member, perhaps it was the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), mentioned that a court, a magistrate or a judge, had indicated that The Liquor Control Act had expressed itself in such a way that a person could not drink a bottle of beer in his back yard, and that this having come to light in the courts, the Legislature came into action and cleared it up.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It was quite clear that was their intention.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That was their intention and that is what I have said to this House. I am satisfied that it was the intention, in simple language, that anyone who is a member of a police force is a member of a police force. That is all it means. And he shall be subject to the rights and rules and regulations which affect everyone employed in that union. That is the principle that I must ask this House to accept.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney General is apparently of the opinion that he can read the intention of people who sat in this House a good many years ago. I was not in the House, nor was he, at the time legislation was passed making special provisions with regard to labour relations affecting police forces and fire fighting forces, providing among other things for compulsory arbitration as applied to those forces.

I was not here, but I know a good many people who were here at that time and it was not their understanding or intention that this

would apply to anyone except the people who were in uniform. The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled, and I do not think we can challenge it to that extent, that no such intention was disclosed in the actual legislation. The argument the hon. Attorney General is now putting forth that we are merely formalizing what has always been the intention, is a specious argument. It may always have been his intention and understanding, but it certainly was not the intention and understanding of a great many other people. It was not an intention that the Legislature disclosed in the words of the legislation they passed. I would find the hon. Attorney General a little easier to follow—if not more convincing—if he came right out and said that, in the past, civilian members of police forces have not been treated as members of the force and have had the same rights in labour relations as other employees. Now the government has decided that it is going to change that situation. Why does he not come out and call a spade a spade? That is what is happening. The government is changing a situation that has existed in the past and that has been understood by most people to exist.

This, I may say, causes real alarm to us in this group because, as my leader pointed out, this is just another little chip taken from the whole fabric of the rights of employees in this province. Every year almost, we have another piece of legislation brought in to circumscribe the bargaining rights of a group of employees, or indeed to deny collective bargaining rights to employees altogether. My leader pointed out that a few years ago there was a bill brought in here, passed through this House, called The Crown Agency Act. He takes a more charitable view of what happened than I do. It was explained in the House that this legislation was designed only to deal with certain matters of taxation but we found that, in fact, the only effect it had was to deprive large groups of employees of any collective bargaining rights at all; employees such as those of the workmen's compensation board, the Ontario hospital services commission and other large groups.

I discovered during this session, in the public accounts committee, that that Act has had no effect at all with regard to taxation, as was purported to be its intention. It is a complete dead letter as far as its original alleged intention is concerned, but as far as denying people collective bargaining rights, it has become a very effective piece of legislation. Yet the government keeps it there. Personally, Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances, I can come to no other conclusion than that it was the intention from the very

beginning to deprive people, quite illegitimately, of collective bargaining rights.

This has happened in other fields. Compulsory arbitration was imposed this session on employees of hospitals. Now it is to be imposed on civilian employees of police forces; so the process goes on. If it keeps going this way, we will soon find that the traditional democratic rights of association and of free collective bargaining will be eroded away.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Collective bargaining is not touched.

Mr. Bryden: Collective bargaining certainly is touched. The hon. Attorney General is a first-class lawyer, but he knows absolutely nothing about labour relations. His statements today exposed his ignorance in a most remarkable fashion. If the hon. Attorney General does not think that the right to strike is part of the total process of collective bargaining, and the total rights involved in it, then he knows nothing about collective bargaining at all. It does not follow that strikes usually occur in collective bargaining relationships. Indeed, contrary to the impression one might get from the newspapers, they rarely occur. But the point is that the right to strike, the right to resort to the ultimate instrument, is inherent to the whole concept of democratic collective bargaining.

The hon. Attorney General has argued, and I am not going to argue against him at this point, that there are certain instances where these basic accepted rights have to be circumscribed to a certain degree. He says—and I think this is probably the most obvious place—that they have to be circumscribed with regard to sworn police officers. Well, that is already in the law of the province; none of us is questioning that point now. But what I would like to convey to him is that this sort of procedure is completely exceptional. It should be resorted to only under the most unusual circumstances.

One can argue that almost any form of employment is, to some degree or other, essential to the welfare of the community. There is no absolute standard by which one can say that this job is essential and that one is not. It is a proposition in which there is no clear dividing line. I would like to suggest to the government that one resorts to this extraordinary type of legislation only in extraordinary cases, where the situation is clear beyond all possible doubt, as in the case of sworn police officers. This we can agree to. But as soon as one starts extending the principle, first to hospital employees and now to civilian police employees, where will it

end? The next thing we know it may be employees in meat packing plants or employees in steel plants. After all, steel is pretty essential to a community too. Before we know it, there will not be any democratic collective bargaining at all.

We would perhaps be a little less alarmed about this section if it were not part of a total pattern, which we can see unfolding itself on the government side of the House. We would still oppose it, because we think it is wrong in principle. It becomes particularly alarming in the context of that pattern now unfolding before us. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Attorney General has not made a case for applying the extraordinary type of procedure that now applies to police officers, to the civilian employees of police forces. I submit to him that a police force would not collapse if, in quite unusual circumstances, civilian employees in some particular context decided to go on strike. I submit to him that it would be still possible to carry on the essential police functions.

It would be difficult, but work stoppages—whether strikes or lockouts—always cause some inconvenience. They would not be of much use as instruments in collective bargaining if they did not cause inconvenience. I have no doubt that police commissions—who no doubt face many difficult problems in any case—would like to reduce the inconveniences they may have to suffer. On the other hand, I think we have to look at the basic principles involved, and I think they have to run the very small risk that may be involved in a strike occurring of civilian employees in some police department. They must run that risk in order to protect the basic rights of collective bargaining.

I would submit to the House, Mr. Chairman, that the section now proposed has no place in our law. It is not necessary to the point where it is completely inescapable and it would only be in those circumstances that I would agree that we should circumscribe free collective bargaining. That being so, I think we should vote in favour of the motion of the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party and delete the proposed new section 22.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I am drawn to my feet really by the—I say this with due respect—almost flippant attitude of the hon. Attorney General from the point of view of collective bargaining.

I might not have heard him correctly, and if so I know he is thoroughly capable of getting on his feet to rebut what I am going to say. As I understood him, he kept saying

that the members of the police force have all the rights of collective bargaining. But surely he must recognize—and if he does not recognize it it is unfortunate that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is not here so it could be explained to him—that when you have compulsory arbitration you are emasculating the very force of the collective bargaining; taking away the historic rights of the group in order to bargain with the fact that they will have some kind of bargaining force behind them.

I think that the hon. member for Downsview has shown indeed a concern which all of us in this House should have, and I am hoping that we will hear from the hon. Minister of Labour; that he will be coming back to express his concern in connection with this proposed encroachment on the rights of people, whether it may be a cleaning woman at the police force, a gardener and so on; and that it is not going to imperil peace, order and good government if they try collective bargaining and do not get it through collective bargaining, to decide to go on strike. We cannot really say that if the cleaning ladies were to go on strike that this would change the whole course of peace, order and good government. In view of the pay that cleaning women get in some government establishments, I would say if they were to go on strike, in some cases God bless them. This is a right that they should have, but with a great sweep—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Do you approve of civil disobedience?

Mr. Thompson: I do not approve, sir, of taking away from the people the right of collective bargaining in that they can go on strike if they want to. I hope that the hon. Minister of Labour will stand up to enunciate that principle, because I am sure—in view of the remarks that he has made in the past about the rights of labour—that he, with us, was deeply shocked when he heard the cavalier approach of the hon. Attorney General when he said that they have collective bargaining, all the rights of collective bargaining, and then as an afterthought he said, of course we do have compulsory arbitration.

I say, again with due deference, that I have real admiration for many of the personal qualities of the hon. Attorney General, but I have come to the conclusion that he does not have sufficient knowledge of collective bargaining—the deep essence of collective bargaining. I hope the hon. Minister of Labour will point out to the House that to

suggest you can have an all-embracing approach in connection with cleaning women and so on, that they are going to be drawn in on this picture, and yet they can be forced to compulsory arbitration is a very dangerous precedent.

Therefore, we will support the amendment. We would certainly have let this section go, and I appreciate that the hon. member for Downsview stood firm and said that there was not going to be this sweeping approach which would bring everyone under police discipline.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, the hon. members preceding myself have made our point fairly clear. But I want to put another aspect on this amendment.

The hon. Attorney General has stated that what necessitated this amendment was to prevent strikes in the police force, and he gave some of his reasoning. But he remembers also, Mr. Chairman, the debate in the House and opposition to the compulsory arbitration for the hospital workers. I submit that, as much as we were opposed to that legislation, this amendment is even worse.

In the arbitration bill in relation to the hospital workers, at least they had the right to join what union they wished to join, the union that was conducive to their type of operation. I submit this amendment forces the civilian employees of the police department either into the police association, if, in any event, the police association would accept them.

What happens if the police association says: We want nothing to do with your groups. We do not know what your problems are, and we are not going to bargain for you? They are then left out in the cold. I would think that if the hon. Attorney General was going to do anything, he would at least have given them the right to join what union they wished to join, even if they were under compulsory arbitration.

Take for instance the group in television and radio. Maybe they would want to join the communication workers; the clerks and traffic ticket processors might want to get into the clerks and technical office workers union; mechanics might want to get into the automotive mechanics' association, a group that understands their problems and would be conducive to their needs in the collective bargaining field.

So, I submit, as much as we oppose this amendment, it is even worse than the hospitals' arbitration bill, inasmuch as it does

not give these employees the opportunity to join at least the union of their choice.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think before we vote I should be permitted a further word in winding up the debate. I hope I did not appear flippant to the hon. leader of the Opposition, I did not intend to be. I certainly think I understand the principles of collective bargaining, and I am quite sure that the provisions in The Police Act take away the right to strike. In order to make it amply clear that I am aware of what the Act says, and so that this House may know what it says, the section in question is section 26, and the way it reads is:

A member of a police force shall not remain, or become a member of any trade union, or of any organization that is affiliated directly or indirectly with a trade union.

Now, that is the prohibition.

Then go on to the other sections, and this is all under the portion of the Act headed "Bargaining and arbitration." I am quite aware that once you take away the right to join a trade union you have cut down, by a very considerable quantity, the right of bargaining, but all I said was there are these sections in the Act which do retain certain wide rights for bargaining.

I would draw to the attention of the House that last year by an amendment to section 27—the first section which follows the one I read—we enlarged very considerably the bargaining rights, spelled out very specifically all the things that must be in any agreement to be bargained for. And we added a further section to provide that in addition to the persons mentioned in subsection 3 a bargaining committee may be accompanied by one legal or other counsel and we spelled out the rights of a lawyer to attend and assist.

Mr. Singer: That was on my amendment, and after great representations by the police associations in committee.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, I must say that I supported this and—

Mr. Singer: Yes, the hon. Attorney General did, eventually.

Hon. Mr. Wishart:—brought this legislation forward. We enlarged the bargaining rights, and extended to a very ample degree the power of these police associations deprived of the right—if we want to put it briefly—to strike, or the right to join a union. We enlarged to a great extent their powers in the bargaining area.

So I was not unaware of what those rights consisted. The whole crux of the matter is this, the section which I read, section 26, says "a member of a police force." The whole question turns on what is a member. The hon. member for Woodbine keeps referring and repeating the expression "a civilian member of the police force." Nowhere is the term used in the Act. A member—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I might have used that expression inadvertently, but I think what I said most of the time was "a civilian employee"—a civilian employed by the police commission.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Very well, I will accept that, but I did take down the expression "a civilian member of the police force." Now, the Act speaks about a member of the police force, and all I am asking this House to do is say that everyone employed by the police force is a member of the police force, and that is it.

Mr. MacDonald: That is where we disagree.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. MacDonald's amendment, say "aye."

Those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. MacDonald's amendment, please stand.

All those opposed to Mr. MacDonald's amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 24 and the "nays" 52.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 6, with the amendment to January, 1966, agreed to. Now, about those two earlier ones—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, sections 4 and 5 were passed by committee of the whole House. It is my understanding of the rules that unless there is unanimous consent, they cannot again be dealt with. I, for one, do not propose to be part of the unanimous consent.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would point out that when the House opened this afternoon at two o'clock, the hon. Attorney General asked the consent of the House to revert to clauses 4 and 5, and there were no objections raised. He proceeded to read his amendment to clauses 4 and 5, and then it was indicated that it might desirable, having in mind the

sequence of the debate immediately before the House rose at noon, that he should continue and complete item 6 in the knowledge of what had been said on items 4 and 5, and, thereafter, having dealt with clause 6 that we would revert and deal with clauses 4 and 5.

I think the consent has already been given.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that an hon. member has indicated to you that he does not give consent, so it follows that there cannot possibly be unanimous consent. As far as this group is concerned, we would have been prepared to give consent, but I think the rules should be enforced. I do not think a member has to be "hot on the spot" and jump right up the second the thing is mentioned to say he does not give unanimous consent. Before the question is dealt with he can indicate his unwillingness to give consent, and that settles the matter as far as I can see under the rules.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Acquiescence!

Mr. Chairman: Well, I took it that if it carried on 6 it endorsed the whole principle.

Mr. Bryden: We suggested from this group, Mr. Chairman—I am in no position to commit anyone else—that we thought it would be better to deal with 6 first and then revert to the other matter. But there was no agreement, that I understood, that we could proceed with 4 and 5; that matter really did not come forward.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I pointed out in my reference to the amendment proposed to sections 4 and 5 that the wording "and assistants and civilian employees" was the very question we would be debating in section 6; and that the three sections are really complementary in the sense that it would be inclusion of civilian employees on police forces that would be the whole subject matter of these amendments. So, for whatever that was worth, I pointed it out at the time. I would now say, Mr. Chairman, that we did debate the principle of this whole question in section 6.

Mr. Chairman: I took it just as the Attorney General explained it a moment ago; that when we endorsed section 6 we carried the whole principle of the others.

Mr. Bryden: But, Mr. Chairman, surely the rules are quite clear that before the House can revert to a section that has been already dealt with there must be unanimous consent,

and it is obvious that there is not unanimous consent. The rules are—

Mr. Chairman: We had unanimous consent—

Mr. Bryden: No, sir, it was never asked for from the chair, and that is the only place where it counts. There was never an opportunity for a member to stand up and say that he did not give consent. We still have not reverted, and it has been indicated that there is not consent. As far as I am concerned, our group would be willing to give consent, but I still think we should pay some attention to the rules of this House. Certainly, we on this side have to work hard to find ways to operate within them, and I think it is time the government started to act according to the rules, too.

Mr. Chairman: I maintain that unanimous consent was given when he moved his motion to revert to sections 4 and 5.

Mr. Thompson: Did you rule on unanimous consent at any time? Have you already ruled on it?

Mr. Chairman: I am ruling on it now.

Mr. Thompson: But you had not previously, so you are safe in—

Mr. Chairman: I took it as before.

Mr. Thompson: For what reason, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: We took it because I said when we went into number 6, we understood that the other principles would be carried along with it.

Mr. Bryden: No, sir. There was never a formal request from the chair to revert to those sections. We are only now coming to the question of reverting to those sections.

Mr. Chairman: We reverted at 2 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Bryden: The rules are enforced only against this side.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could say this, that surely there may be many private hon. members in this House who often wish that there was unanimous consent, but there is not unanimous consent until the Chairman rules on it. I suggest, with deep respect to you, sir, that you had not asked the House for unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman: The Attorney General asked for it and no one objected.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple proposition; if I get up and ask for unanimous consent, the Chairman, the Speaker, or whoever is in the chair, asks the House if he has unanimous consent. You do not automatically get unanimous consent until the person in the chair requests it. You are requesting it now for the first time.

Mr. Chairman, may I just say this: If the government is unhappy about this situation it has made its bed and is now lying in it, because yesterday we had an inversion of the rules in this House—with no announcement to the Opposition—which suited the government's position. I have not yet had an opportunity to explain our position. It came from the chair, I grant you, but we will have a chance before we get finished with that bill. If you are going to use the rules of the House to make might become right, then on occasion we are going to use the rules of the House to protect our position.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should say a word. I was not in the House at 2 o'clock, therefore I accept your ruling of the facts as they occurred when the House sat at 2 o'clock. However, I would like to say—during the time I have been in this House, and in this chair—there have been many occasions when the procedures of the House have been changed by unanimous consent and I have yet to hear a vote taken on it. It is the Chairman or the Speaker, in the instances that I recall when this has been done—for instance, I believe that one of the hon. Ministers in the last 48 hours has asked to change the rules of the House to revert to introduce a bill—there was no vote taken as to whether there was unanimous consent. The person presiding, either the Chairman or the Speaker, assesses whether the House agrees or disagrees; and this is the way it has always been.

As I say, as far as the actual events of 2 o'clock this afternoon are concerned, I have no comment, as I was not here; but I will accept whatever the chair says.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister would agree that the hon. Attorney General or any other hon. member of the government has the right to ask for unanimous consent; but he has not the right to assume that he has received unanimous consent until that question is put to the House by the presiding officer—be that the Chairman of the committee of the whole or the Speaker of the House. Surely my hon. friend cannot ask

for, and get in one breath, unanimous consent. If it is put by the Speaker, and then if there is unanimous consent, the member concedes but this is quite irregular, and my hon. friend knows that too.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I can only repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot recall a vote being taken on such occasions. Once again it has always appeared to me that if whoever is presiding—whether the Chairman or the Speaker—felt that unanimous consent was there, then he proceeded on that basis. I cannot recall ever having a vote taken as to whether there was unanimous consent—

Mr. Oliver: We are not talking about votes!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, but I am only talking about an expression that whoever is in the chair feels, because if it is not there, it cannot happen. This is the whole point. If whoever is presiding is not aware that there is unanimity in the House then, of course, it is an impossibility—

Mr. Bryden: How can you read the minds—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will adhere to the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the hon. Prime Minister and the House that, in the normal course of events, unanimous consent is given and it becomes rather a routine proceeding in which we do not often observe the forms, but I think the forms require that the Speaker or the Chairman ask if there is unanimous consent. Now, when it is obvious to the hon. Prime Minister that in this case there is not unanimous consent—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): There was at the time.

Mr. Bryden: Well, whether or not, as long as opposition is registered before we actually revert, then it is properly registered.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is your ruling.

Mr. Bryden: No, sir. That is the rule.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I submit again that it was never asked. An hon. member took advantage of the opportunity when it arose and the government made no—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. After 2 o'clock the Attorney General asked for the unanimous consent of the House. Now

there was not a word. I asked: "Will this motion be concurred in?" and they said: "We shall go on to number 6 or section 6."

Mr. Bryden: The matter was not dealt with.

Mr. Chairman: Now, wait a minute. At that moment the Attorney General went back and read the amendments that he wanted to bring in on number 4 or 5—section 4 and section 5. Then we reverted, and then we reverted back again, because they said the whole thing was all tied up in one parcel—the whole principle. Now that is the principle; and I say that unanimous consent was given as far as I am concerned, and that is my ruling.

Sections 4 and 5, inclusive, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 7 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 123 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

That, where a payment into the public service superannuation fund is made pursuant to The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963 with respect to the unfunded liability of the public service superannuation fund, interest shall be credited to the public service superannuation fund out of the consolidated revenue fund at the rate of 5 per cent per annum from the date of such payment in any year to the end of the then current fiscal year,

as provided in Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask before we proceed with these sections, are these amendments that have been considered by the joint council and have the support of the civil service association?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): These amendments have to do entirely with the administration of the Act. There are two sections of importance and the main amendment is the doing away with the retirement fund and handling of the funds through the

superannuation fund. The other is an amendment which is in one of the other sections of the Act, to provide for the fringe benefit arrangement. It, too, has only to do with the administration.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question? To what extent are casuals included, or is that great group of casuals still excluded from this?

Hon. Mr. Allan: It is exactly as it was. This matter is receiving consideration but there is no change.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Provincial Treasurer means that the matter of including casuals is receiving consideration?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes. It is not a part of any of these amendments.

Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 124 reported.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-1962.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, let me ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if I may, what exactly does this mean?

This strikes me as being an extraordinary power: "The commission may exclude any position in the classified service from that service for such period as it determines." In other words, I come back to the question I asked a moment ago, and perhaps I was doing it on the wrong bill: were these powers that you are now putting into The Public Service Act subject to negotiation and discussion by the joint council or is this another unilateral and arbitrary action by the government?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, it is not a unilateral action in that it affects, generally, the public service. There are a few positions where it is necessary to pay a salary higher than the salary that is in the classification that covers that particular position. This enables that particular position to be taken out of the civil service and to have a salary paid on a casual basis for the purpose of obtaining some particular person.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Might I ask a question? Would the recent raising of the

scale of teachers in the reform institutions come under this kind of a clause?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Young: This is not the intent?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the explanation given by the hon. Provincial Treasurer expresses the government's current intention. I notice that proposed section 4 (a) is written in terms of "any position" and I take it that what the government has in mind is that only a single position, or perhaps three or four positions, might be affected. The only trouble is that as now stated it could include anything. It could be so broad as to cover a couple of thousand employees. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that we have slowly, over the years, developed an attitude that we would like the government to say precisely what it claims to intend, because we find that bills which are capable of a broader interpretation than the announced intention often get that broader interpretation. Then there is nothing that anyone can do to get the government to revert back to the status quo ante. So I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that this should be more carefully drafted to make clear precisely to whom it is to apply. It could, as it now reads, apply to the entire civil service.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Oh, no!

Mr. Bryden: It could under the wording! Why do you not put in the words to express what you mean? Then there would not be any danger that on some subsequent date this section might be given a much broader interpretation than the currently announced intention.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me add, before the hon. Provincial Treasurer replies: We have already had a debate this afternoon on differing concepts of collective bargaining. I can say with assurance, though I have not had the personal experience of collective bargaining in a genuine trade union, that if at some stage along the way management, by its own decision, without any discussion with the employee through the joint council, were to come in with amendments like this it would be a serious departure.

And this is the case. These have not been discussed by joint council at all, you are taking this action on your own. If, for example, Stelco, the steel company, and local 1005 were suddenly to arbitrarily take unto itself the right to begin to take people out

of the bargaining unit or put people into the bargaining until in that sort of a fashion, it certainly would not be acknowledged as a normal procedure in collective bargaining. This is precisely what you have done.

I repeat the comment of my hon. friend, the member for Woodbine, vis-à-vis the hon. Attorney General: your concept of collective bargaining is a very strange concept of collective bargaining. In addition to the vagueness of the phraseology, whatever the hon. Provincial Treasurer may say, he is a kindly man and he knows what he wants now and he perhaps would only do that, but some sharp lawyer on the government side of the House who wants to achieve something else in another department, for another objective, takes a look at this wording, which is wide open, and proceeds to use this for his purposes. That is the reason, quite apart from the fact that this has not been discussed in the appropriate agency where it should be discussed, quite apart from that you have the validity of the argument of the hon. member for Woodbine that your phraseology is wide open.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the hon. member misunderstands what we are trying to do. In the first place, this legislation refers to a person, not to a class of worker. I think the hon. member would agree that if you are going to appoint an assistant to the president of the Steel Company of Canada that it would not be considered something that should be negotiated. This is a similar matter. I am sure the hon. member who mentioned this must realize that one of the responsibilities of this government is to have an excellent civil service.

Mr. MacDonald: It does not say any "person;" it says "any position."

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, a position.

Mr. MacDonald: If it is in the classified services, it then is not a single person.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No; this is exactly as I have outlined it, and regardless of whether this is as tight as it should be surely no one is going to feel that a government is not going to do the things that are going to enable them to obtain and maintain an excellent civil service, which is exactly what we are trying to do.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we do not get into that argument. We had a few things to say about it in the estimates of the civil service commission and I do not think the government has shown

very much intention of trying to maintain excellent relations in the civil service. I think we fully understand what the hon. Provincial Treasurer's intention is with regard to this section, but what we are looking at and what we have to look at is what the section says. The section as it is worded is capable of a much broader interpretation than the hon. Provincial Treasurer has indicated.

It says that the commission may exclude any position; if they can exclude any position, they can exclude all positions. There is no limit on what they could do under this section as it now stands. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think the government should reword the section so that it expresses its intention exactly and not put through this broad an authority as now appears to achieve what is stated to be a fairly limited sort of objective.

Mr. Chairman: Carried?

Mr. Bryden: No.

Section 3 agreed to.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we did not agree to the carrying of section 2. We said no, when we were asked to carry it.

Mr. Chairman: The majority did.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are outvoted.

Mr. Bryden: There was no vote taken.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of section 2 becoming part of the bill, say "aye."
All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.
Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of section number two being included in the bill, please stand.

Those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the yeas are 49, the nays, 20.

Mr. Chairman: Therefore it is carried!

Sections 2 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 125 reported.

THE RACING COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 126, An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 126 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the cost of the establishment, maintenance and conduct of the Ontario institute for studies in education shall be payable, until the 30th day of June, 1966, out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 127, An Act to establish the Ontario institute for studies in education.

Resolution concurred in.

ONTARIO INSTITUTE FOR STUDIES IN EDUCATION

House in committee on Bill No. 127, An Act to establish the Ontario institute for studies in education.

Sections 1 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 127 reported.

THE ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question regarding this section. I am not clear as to what powers are outlined here. In the House on April 13 I asked a question of the hon. Minister (Mr. Simonett)—it occurs on page 2235—I asked at that time whether the OWRC had the power to order certain work being done and I was assured by the hon. Minister it had. Now we find section 4 giving certain powers “that the commission may order whatever is necessary to implement the report to be done at the expense of the municipality and the commission may recover the expenses incurred in doing it, with costs, by act of a court of competent jurisdiction as a debt due to the commission by such municipality.”

Now, did the commission have this power before and is this to make clear certain ramifications of that power? Does this mean that the OWRC will go ahead and do the work and then recover? And what is the relationship of the Ontario municipal board? Can that order be made even though the OMB may not agree to the enlargement of a debt which may be incurred by the municipality?

I wonder if the hon. Minister would make this clear to us.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, I understand that they had the power before. This is just spelling out that they now can recover any expenses—actual expenses of the OWRC—if they do put down an order. It only has to do with the costs.

Mr. Young: Recovering the costs?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes.

Mr. Young: Well, could I ask the hon. Minister about the second part of my question? How does this relate to the powers of the Ontario municipal board?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I cannot answer that. These are the powers that were given to the Ontario water resources commission which they have had since the enactment of their Act as far as an order is concerned.

Mr. Young: But if this order is given and the OMB decides that this—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I think I might be able to assist in this question which has come up before in relation to the function of the OWRC, and particularly as it may relate to education where you have requirements on both hands, with the Ontario municipal board saying that the municipality is not able financially to carry the financial load that may be required. I can assure the hon. member that this section does not give the Ontario water resources commission power to overrule a decision of the municipal board. That decision, in the broad function of the municipal board, is maintained.

What in fact happens, is that there is very close co-operation between the Ontario water resources commission and the Ontario municipal board in order to ensure that what the board may order to be done is within the financial capability of the municipality to do. The water resources commission confers with the municipal board, in fact, before issuing any such order. So in the situation that the hon. member envisages, that aspect of the matter is dealt with before the order is made.

Mr. Young: And consultation would overcome any of this difficulty?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, yes, it would, because the water resources commission would ascertain the facts from the municipal board; it is part of the administrative process of developing a project under the powers of

the Ontario water resources commission to find out if the municipal board, in fact, can fit the cost of it into the overall financing being studied in the municipality.

Mr. Young: But this still does not overcome the situation if there is a serious menace to health; if a serious pollution is taking place and certain works need to be done and the board considers they should be done and the OWRC agrees, yet the OMB says that the municipality cannot stand the capital cost. Where do we go here? This is a matter of health.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that in such a situation you have reached a bit of an impasse, and we have to look for extraordinary remedies for extraordinary situations.

Sections 4 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 128 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, (a) the Treasurer may pay out of the consolidated revenue fund accounts for legislative and departmental printing, paper and stationery and other supplies delivered to the Queen's printer, but the amount of such deliveries remaining on hand, and in the course of distribution, shall not exceed in any fiscal year the sum of \$1,000,000; and

(b) where, in the opinion of the Treasurer, a person is indebted to the Crown in right of Ontario or in right of Canada in any specific sum of money, the Treasurer may authorize the comptroller of accounts; (i) to retain by way of deduction or set-off, out of any money that is due and payable by the Crown in right of Ontario to such person, such sum as the Treasurer sees fit in the circumstances; and (ii) to pay such sum to such public officer as he thinks appropriate to receive it,

as provided in Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 129 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, every corporation as defined in The Corporations Tax Act shall pay to Her Majesty for the use of Ontario, the taxes imposed by that Act, in accordance with that Act,

as provided in Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 130 reported.

THE LOGGING TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Logging Tax Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 131 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, an income tax shall be paid by every individual who was resident in or had income earned in Ontario, being the percentage of the tax payable under The Income Tax Act (Canada) as follows:

1. 21 per cent in respect of the 1965 taxation year; and

2. 24 per cent in respect of the 1966 taxation year,

as provided in Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Resolution concurred in.

THE INCOME TAX ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 132 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, every purchaser of certain tangible personal property shall pay to Her Majesty,

in right of Ontario, a tax in respect of the consumption or use thereof,

as provided in Bill No. 133, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Resolution concurred in.

THE RETAIL SALES TAX ACT, 1960-1961

House in committee on Bill No. 133, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Sections 1 to 5, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 133, reported.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 134 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That, the moneys required for the purposes of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965 during the fiscal year 1965-1966 shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

Resolution concurred in.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

House in committee on Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

On section 1:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on section 1 of the medical insurance Act, we have had a discussion of principle in connection with that bill and I think that it was clear that although the government believed in the Ontario hospital insurance commission and have been satisfied that this is a good vehicle by means of which people can get free hospital care on paying a premium, they felt that for medical services there should not be one government body, one carrier.

I, sir, have listened very intently to the discussion on principle. I had hoped, frankly, that there would perhaps be more detail; and I still hope that there will be more detail when this bill is discussed, because there has

been an enormous amount of investigation on this matter across Canada. With all respect, I think that the Hall commission report is probably the most comprehensive study that has been done in the history of Canada on health service needs. The Hall commission came out very strongly and very clearly; no matter what the hon. Prime Minister may say about how you can look in the Bible and can interpret it in whatever way you want, Chief Justice Hall made it very clear that he believed that the approach to be taken to provide medical services and health services—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I am going to submit to you, sir, that this is once again a debate on one of the principles of the bill that was decided on second reading. On a point of order, I would submit that the hon. leader of the Opposition is out of order.

Mr. Chairman: I am afraid I will have to agree. Under Rule No. 49, the subject matter being decided upon, it cannot be debated further.

Mr. Thompson: I certainly respect your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I was talking about the first section of Bill No. 136. I perhaps have a peculiar way of working towards the point I want to make and I may have veered off a little on this.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I should in all honesty say I am aware of the point the hon. leader of the Opposition wants to make, but I am just trying to see that he stays within the rules of the House as he makes it.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that the hon. Prime Minister is aware of the point. I am sure most of the country and of Ontario are also. It gets down to this: Those of us who will not be subsidized by government do not know what premium we are going to have to pay.

I can appreciate that the hon. Prime Minister has been concerned when we say Saskatchewan. Why should he not be? The way they are approaching it in Saskatchewan, you get not only medical care, but you also get hospital service for \$36; and a family gets medical care plus hospitalization for \$72. I think this is one of the details in which we are going to be interested.

We are going to be interested, on the basis of using private carriers, whether they are going to be able to supply it as cheaply to the citizens as they do in Saskatchewan.

I am convinced that when the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) tells us what the premiums are for a standard coverage, in no way will it be equal to the fee which has been asked of the citizens of Saskatchewan.

We want to know the answer to this. Why, in this province, are you suggesting that it is more efficiently run by private carriers? Why are we going to have to pay something like \$180 just for medical services, and on top of that hospital services, when in Saskatchewan they get both medical care and hospital care for \$72 and for \$36?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, once again on a point of order, I would like to know where the hon. member finds the right to mention this? He is in fact once again debating something that has already been debated. The financial background of the scheme and the principles of this bill have been accepted by this House when it had second reading, and I suggest this is not further debatable.

Mr. Chairman: The matter was endorsed on second reading. You will have to stick to particular sections as we go along.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, I did not think that under principle we were saying whether it was \$26 for the premium or \$180. I notice that has been avoided in principle.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is not a principle you want adopted!

Mr. Thompson: I suggest that is some of the detail, and I suggest the reason that is some of the detail is because—I am coming to my point now—under section 1, clause b, carriers, I am suggesting that with the definition of carrier which you have here, that it is of necessity going to mean that we are going to be charged a great deal more in premiums than if you had one carrier. It is for that reason that I move that;

Subsection b of section 1 shall be amended to read as follows:

Carrier means Ontario hospital services commission which hereinafter shall be called Ontario health services commission.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Thompson moves that: Subsection b of section 2 shall be amended to read as follows:

Carrier means Ontario hospital services commission which hereinafter shall be called Ontario health services commission.

I am afraid I will have to rule this out of order, because it changes the principle of the bill from what we agreed on second reading.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, one of the things I have not learned of the government, do they consider that the hospital services commission is compulsory? If they do not consider it is compulsory, then I am applying the voluntary aspects of this, and it is not against the principle. But if they will admit that groups of 15 employees or more must by compulsion belong to the plan, then it is compulsory.

Mr. Chairman: I would say that this is outside the scope of this bill entirely, this amendment.

Mr. Thompson: On the basis that is a compulsory aspect, which was against the principle previously, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The hospital services commission—its bill, its Act, or its function, is not under debate in this bill. It is not even mentioned in this bill. I would submit to you, sir, that the amendment is completely out of order since it bears no relationship to what we have under discussion.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to rule it out of order.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you again to give us the reasons for your ruling. I am making an amendment to the effect that instead of a variety of carriers, they have one carrier, using the hospital services commission, which would now be called the health services commission.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, this is part of the amendment voted down in the second reading of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: It is outside the scope of this bill entirely. I have to rule it out of order.

Mr. Thompson: I would like, sir, to have your ruling on why it is outside this scope. I am suggesting you have one carrier, I am suggesting that according to the very enlightened and flexible definition by the hon. Minister of Health, this is a voluntary carrier, in spite of the fact that 15 employees or over have to belong to the commission, yet he still says that it is voluntary. That indicates to me a very flexible and agile mind on his part. If this is a voluntary commission, then I do not see that it is against the principle of the bill. I think that it is order. Instead of a variety of carriers, I am moving an amendment to say that you have one carrier.

Mr. Chairman: I have made a ruling that it is not in order and, therefore, the ruling

of the Chairman is not debatable, so if you challenge the Chairman's ruling, it is quite all right.

Mr. Oliver: Well, I think we will have to challenge this, Mr. Chairman. You read in section (b):

Carrier means a person, firm, group, association, society.

In the judgment of our hon. leader, we do not agree that these are the only carriers there should be, and in our judgment, we believe it should be a different carrier. Surely, that is a proper amendment. It is not at all a negative amendment to the bill. Rather than the carriers in the bill, we substitute for that the carrier named by my hon. leader. Surely, that is an amendment and nothing else? How could it be anything else?

Mr. Chairman: This is the same thing that was voted on.

Mr. Oliver: Well, I agree, but I think that is the only substance you have in your ruling, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference, certainly, so far as the amendment being in order had something not transpired before. I mean, there is no question in my mind, and I do not think in yours, that the amendment itself, as such, is in order. What has gone before I am not arguing at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: I quite agree with your argument, but the fact remains we voted down the very same amendment on second reading. Therefore, I cannot alter it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, we are placed in a very difficult position, an almost impossible position. I think the reasoning you advanced is correct.

We put a resolution on the order paper which members were given an opportunity, within the framework of the rules of this House, to discuss this situation, and by specious reasoning it was thrown out—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, there was an appeal from the Speaker's ruling on that, I believe, and I do not see how it can be debated either.

Mr. Chairman: That cannot be debated either.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This is the situation. The Speaker in the chair considered the motion and gave a ruling. Now, under another bill, and under another procedure, apparently

we are going to proceed—if the hon. member has his way—to discuss the merits of the Speaker's ruling when he ruled the motion out of order. I just maintain, sir, the committee simply is not in order in considering this.

Mr. Chairman: The Speaker's ruling is not debatable. If you want to challenge it, it is all right, but it is not debatable.

An hon. member: Put the question then.

Mr. Chairman: Do you challenge the Speaker's ruling or the Chairman's ruling?

All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to section 2, there is a matter on which I would like clarification from the hon. Minister relating to subsection 2 of the section, and specifically clause (b), which provides that:

The Minister may (b) exempt licensed carriers from the requirement of providing standard medical services insurance contracts.

This is a matter that arises at various points in the bill, and this is the first place that it arises. I would like to ask the hon. Minister exactly what the intention is with regard to the exemption of licensed carriers? Presumably he envisages some situations where it may be necessary to exercise this power. On the other hand, I assume that he does not envisage a widespread exercise of the power, otherwise the bill would become a nullity. I wonder if he is in a position to clarify the matter for the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: First of all, exemption would only be considered by the Minister on recommendation of the medical services insurance council to whom application must be made under the law. There are a few instances, I am told, where exemption could be considered. In one case, it might be a small organization doing a limited type of work, but doing it well. And having done it over a period of time would find it financially impossible to carry on. They might not have the reserves that the superintendent of insurance insists on, and would insist on under this bill. Yet they are quite capable of carrying on in the small limited area in which they now operate. This would be a possibility,

but all of these are only hypothetical possibilities.

Secondly, there might be a type of programme permitted under the Act which would call for the complete revamping of an organization now in the field. Again, this would very likely apply to small and very limited organizations.

Then there might a type of organization which would not lend itself to offering the standard contract, and yet they, too, would be performing a useful service.

All these three hypothetical cases are really variations of one, they refer to some small organizations which have been carrying on, have been doing a good work and could continue to do a good work provided they were not called upon, as they might be under the Act, to go into the widescale offering of the standard contract with all the administrative and other demands that would be put upon them.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, would it then be fair to conclude from the hon. Minister's explanation that exemptions would not be contemplated in the case of any carrier that purported to carry on business in the whole of the province or a substantial part of it? Would it be fair to assume that you would not contemplate exemptions in those cases?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 2 form part of the bill?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask about the designated open enrolment period. Could the hon. Minister tell us roughly how often these enrolment periods would be? Is the hon. Minister thinking of them once every three months, or does he think it might be advisable if this were actually designated in the Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, at one time we did contemplate designating it, not in the Act, but in the regulations, but then we recognized that, if you were to designate the open enrolment period, of course, you would nullify its value.

There will be a substantial open enrolment period at the beginning of the proposal, that is prior to June 1, 1966. After that, they will come at intervals, and it would be quite unwise—unbusinesslike, actually—to advise much in advance of the onset of the open enrolment period, since the great advantage of enrolling during the open enrolment period

is, of course, that there is no waiting period, except for pregnancy and such other limitation as are outlined in the bill. But they will be reasonably spaced, and I think that you will have to accept our word for this, because we must look at the business end of the operation as well.

If we were to say in the Act that on such-and-such a date there will be an open enrolment period by law or by regulation, those who might want to come in would wait until such time and, therefore, they would not have a three-month waiting period. I suppose one could say that the waiting period is something of a penalty for not coming in during an open enrolment period. I think we would defeat the purpose of the bill if we were to designate, or lay down by the Act, or by the regulations, when the open enrolment periods would come.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could be excused for making this remark, it seems to me there has been a great deal more emphasis on the aspect of business than there has been on general coverage for people across the province. I still think that there are people who may be justified exemption in the sense that they had not enrolled during the period—men who perhaps have served in the armed forces or something. I admit they have coverage while they are in the armed forces, but they have been out of the country and when they come back they have to wait until the discretion of the hon. Minister to have an open enrolment period. Others might have gone down to the U.S. to study or doctors who have gone over to take some special kind of tour around the hospitals in Europe—I am just throwing out a variety of situations—and through no fault of the individual at all, he comes back and finds that he is not covered and then he has to wait.

I suggest there should be some means by which a person could come before a board of appeal in order to express his case. I know under the hospital services commission that the hon. Minister has been, I think, very reasonable in some cases. I can think of one case where the mother was becoming senile and had forgotten to look after the premium. This was brought to the attention of the hon. Minister and, in his compassion, he arranged for this to be overcome. There could be a number of other cases where this could be done. Business is all right and this sort of hard, systematic approach may have some justification; but we are still talking about the health of people and I would hope that some means where the extension could be

given consideration could be reached. Is this something the hon. Minister is considering?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is quite true and it is a very good point. Some of the cases which he presented as possibilities would actually have no difficulty because there is provision in the Act for moving from one plan to this without loss of benefit. I would also assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the very same rules will obtain in this case as now obtain in the case of the hospital services commission where there is a committee to consider all these unusual cases on their merits. In fact, the Act states that the medical services insurance council can hear all complaints. All of these things would automatically go before them and we would act upon their recommendations.

I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that while it may sound as though we are putting emphasis upon the business aspect of it, our main concern and our main intention, of course, is to provide the best possible coverage we can. Nevertheless, one must be realistic and must understand that money does not grow on trees, and I am afraid it would hurt me dreadfully if I had to spend it wantonly or foolishly. Nevertheless, it will be spent with an eye singled to our concern for the people first.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, section 3 in my view, is one of the most important sections of the Act because we are now dealing with the medical services insurance council, which is the body that is going to guide the destiny of this plan.

On the basis of the experience we have already had with this government's choice of so-called public representatives, and then discovering that by strange coincidence they all had the same point of view, I think we should be alerted here. For example, in the Hagey committee that the government established, there were some 13 or 14 members on it and when all their views had become sorted out we discovered that there was one person who was in favour of a public Medicare plan; and that was the one who was designated as a representative on behalf of the Ontario federation of labour. All of the others had either links with the associations, or were themselves personally convinced that private Medicare was the kind of Medicare that they were going to recommend. This was the term of reference in which the whole committee had to operate.

Now let us see what we have here. It is a proposal that there will be a committee of nine members: five representative of the public, two representative of the medical profession nominated by the Ontario medical association and two representative of the licensed carriers nominated by the corporations. In other words, the only two bodies that this government has seen fit to give the right to make certain that their views are represented by somebody whom they have absolute confidence in are the medical association and the insurance carriers.

They are going to be four of a group of nine. Conceivably, when you choose a chairman, you are going to have a 4/4 split in the council under normal circumstances. In my view, Mr. Chairman, this is not a representative body of the kind that should be responsible for the basic decisions in the operation of the kind of plan that the government is taking its famous "first step in the direction of."

Therefore, I want to present to the hon. Minister—and I shall do so by way of an amendment—proposals that this body should be broadened to include genuine representation of the public. The right that the government is going to retain rather exclusively for the Ontario medical association, or for the licensed carriers, should be broadened to other groups in the community who have indicated during the course of the public debate on this issue in the last two or three years that they are people who have intelligent views, well-substantiated views that are a reflection of a good many people in this province.

Also, if you move to section 2, subsection 2, you will note here that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one of the members of the council as chairman. Now, quite frankly, I think when you are establishing a council to operate a scheme of this nature that it should be clearly indicated in the Act that the man who is going to be chosen as chairman is not going to be representative of the vested interests in the field up until now, namely, the insurance carriers or the medical association; but somebody who can be as an impartial chairman, representative of the public and get as good a balance as possible among all of the various views that may emerge.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to move that:

Section 3 of Bill 136 be amended by striking out subsections 1 and 2 thereof and substituting the following:

1. That there shall be a medical services

insurance council which will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and which shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

i. 7 representative of the public, one of whom shall be nominated by the Ontario federation of agriculture; one by the Ontario farmers' union; one by the Ontario branch of the Canadian association of consumers; one by the Ontario federation of labour, one by the Ontario welfare council; one by the Canadian association of social workers, Ontario division; and one from the Canadian council of churches from among its members in Ontario.

ii. 2 representative of the medical profession, nominated by the Ontario medical association.

iii. 2 representative of the licensed carriers, nominated by the corporation.

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one of the members representative of the public as chairman.

Mr. Chairman, you will note that, in the organizations that we have suggested should be given representation, you have bodies which have indicated an intense interest in this whole issue. I cite, for example, the council of churches. You have had many of the churches playing a very active role in the public discussion and presentations to the Hagey commission and, subsequently, presentations to the government. All of these bodies, I think, have had their say and should form a part of the broader public representation and that, from their ranks, the chairman should be chosen—rather than leaving it open for the chairman to be chosen from either the representatives of the Ontario medical association or the insurance carriers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would have thought the hon. member for York South would rather leave it since there might be the possibility of one of the representatives of the profession, the so-called vested-interest people, being present. Having said the chairman would be in the position of having to cast the deciding vote on occasions, it would seem to me that this would automatically let one out.

However, this was never contemplated, I can assure you, and I would point out to the hon. member that the section states that the council shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. While it is laid down in the Act also that the representatives of the profession and the representatives of the carriers shall be nominated by their own bodies, it is not laid down in the Act that

they shall accept the nominations. One, I suppose, would expect that this would be done, but this is not inherent in this section of the Act and this is very often done. We ask those who are concerned in these matters. Of course, the profession is going to provide the services and the carriers are going to carry the insurance coverage on four-fifths of our people, and naturally they have a deep and abiding interest in these things, Mr. Chairman.

I cannot say I am overly enamoured of the proposal that we single out representatives of particular groups. The hon. member has mentioned seven groups, all of them good, but they do not embody all of the people of the province of Ontario, nor do they represent all of the people of the province of Ontario.

I so well recollect, sir, when the former Prime Minister spoke in this House about setting up the Ontario hospital services commission. He was very meticulous in pointing out that it would not be representative of any particular group or interest but that the members would be chosen to represent the people of the province of Ontario.

Whether my hon. friend believes me or not I can assure him that so far as I was concerned, and the hon. Prime Minister can speak for himself, from the intimate knowledge I had of this matter of the Hagey commission, neither one of us, I am quite sure, had any ideas of the views of these people. We did expect that a representative of labour would have a certain view and, of course, he did, because he never made any secret about it. I had spoken to Mr. Simon on previous occasions and knew his views. On the other hand, I looked upon him as a man of sound intellect and broad vision. I had some very interesting chats with him and was very interested in some of his views.

I would therefore say, sir, that I could not willingly accept this proposal that we tie down by law a stipulation that our representation must come from these organizations. Not all the churches are involved in the Canadian council of churches, or at least as far as I know. What about the women's institutes? What about the IODE? What about all of the service organizations? What about all of the fraternal organizations and the great many other bodies, all of them deeply interested in matters of this kind and all of them concerned about their own welfare and the welfare of their fellow men throughout the province? Why would we pick out representatives of seven special groups? We have always believed, at least as I understand it,

that all of our people have equal status in the province.

I therefore submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that it would be far better to leave this provision as we have it, so that we have free rein to choose the representatives of the public from the population at large. If we find on experience that our wisdom has not been sound, and that the belief of the hon. member is better, then I am quite certain that this Legislature in its wisdom at a later date will give further consideration to it. But who is to tell whether my thinking is better than the hon. member's or his better than mine? I believe mine is better, I believe mine is reasonable, and he has the same right to believe likewise of his own. But I believe that this is a sound way. We did not agree with the recommendation of the committee, we added to the public representation, and I believe that this can work.

I would point out, too, sir, that I think the hon. member believes the council has greater powers than it actually has. Further on in the section it will be noted that the council is an advisory body. It is not responsible for the day-to-day executive operation of the plan. It is an advisory body to the Minister on all of these various things.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words in supporting this amendment. I am quite willing to admit that there are weaknesses in having seven certain groups on such a board, but the amendment suggested by the hon. member for York South is much in preference to the very narrow basis which the present section gives to this council. This council, in effect, leaves the control of the operation of the health scheme in the hands of doctors and insurance companies, because if you have two representatives for the doctors and two for the insurance companies there are four on one side already; all they need is one out of five in order to swing any vote their way.

This goes to the heart of the bill, section 3 and section 4. In essence we are making a strong vested interest that much stronger, and if we take this false step we are going to have an extremely difficult time in the history of this province in order to get a health scheme back up on the proper rails. Again, as is said so often, this is a sellout to two particular strong groups and we are going to have an extremely difficult time to break the vise-like hold that section 3 and section 4 give to these two groups.

I may question this matter of someone from the Canadian council of churches being on this, but again we know this, that the

Canadian council of churches has supported broad views in health services. I would want to see someone from labour on it, because labour today in its large unions is highly articulate and well trained. The unions have views that help not just organized labour but are more or less for those people in the lower economic groups in our province, so that the amendment gives a far broader suggestion and far broader interest to this council than the present section.

The weakness which I think is going to be a very serious thing for the future of all health services in this province, is that you have given the control to two groups that are already far too strong, particularly insurance companies.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister put up quite a smokescreen in opposing this amendment. He argued that the government has not in the past, and should not now, adopt the policy of giving recognition to special interest groups in a matter of this kind. How can he make such an argument in face of the section that is right in front of us, I do not know. The section in front of us provides specifically that there are two special-interest groups that will be specifically represented on this council. So he cannot say that he is treating all people equally; some are obviously more equal than others, namely, the medical association and the—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would point out to the hon. member that I thought I had made it eminently clear that the two groups were the two groups very much involved. There are three groups actually included in the council—the three groups much involved—the consumers, represented by five; those who provide the service represented by two; and the third party, which pays for the service through the insurance it collects, is the insurance carriers. This is the only differentiation or specification laid down within the terms of the clause.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the comment really makes no difference to the point I am proposing to make. There is no indication of where the public representatives are to come from. That is the first point. Second, I would suggest to the hon. Minister that though the interest of the Ontario medical association and the licensed carriers should certainly be given full recognition; the basic principle should be that paramount over everything is the interest of the public. Under this council it is most unlikely that primary

consideration will be given to the interest of the public.

We proposed in our amendment that there should be seven public representatives or that there should be a council of 11, with seven of them public representatives. Of those seven one would be chairman, so that the other members would split six for the public and four for the special-interest groups, whose interests are quite legitimate and we agree should be recognized.

The hon. Minister has suggested that the particular bodies we designate as having the right to nominate members to the council, does not represent the entire public. One of the difficulties, of course, is always the problem of finding a way of getting genuine representation of the public. I suggest to the hon. Minister, however, that if one takes the seven organizations suggested in the amendment, they directly or indirectly represent the overwhelming bulk of the public in this province. Unquestionably, the farm organizations, the central federation of labour, the consumers' organization, the welfare council, the churches and the other bodies together, represent the public.

Hon. Mr. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What about the synagogues?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I was just coming to another point, which the hon. Minister has now precipitated. If the government feels that there are other organizations that should properly be allowed to nominate people for this council, we would not dispute the point. I think the hon. Minister of Health made a fairly good point when he mentioned the women's institutes. We would be quite happy to see this as a 15-person council, with three or four other organizations designated.

We do insist, however, Mr. Chairman, if certain bodies are to have the right to nominate members, then the thing will be in very bad balance if the others are merely to be chosen from the ranks of good Tories, or according to some other principle that this Legislature knows nothing about.

That is the normal way it has been done, and we can only go on past experience. The problem is, Mr. Chairman, that up until now the hon. Minister has listened to absolutely nobody except the Ontario medical association and the licensed carriers. He is now proposing to set up a council to advise him, in which the voices of those organizations will predominate. Thus we not only will have legislation which really only reflects

their viewpoint, and the viewpoint of very few people beyond them; but we will also have the administration reflecting their viewpoint. I presume that the hon. Minister—since he sees fit to set up the council—will consider its advice very carefully, and it is natural that he will be greatly influenced by its advice. We would like to see some other voices coming to his attention and to the attention of the government for a change. All of the bodies that we have listed, and others that we have not listed here, are large, widespread organizations, or else organizations with a very special contact with the consumers of medical services—such as the welfare council. All of these bodies have advocated a different type of approach to medical care insurance than the government is putting before us in this bill.

The two bodies that are specifically entitled to nominate members of this council have advocated even a narrower approach. It was only under public pressure that the government went slightly beyond their approach, but very slightly. But the other bodies—the federation of agriculture, the farmers' union, the federation of labour and the welfare council—all of them proposed universal medical care insurance.

There is one other reference I would like to make during the course of the debate on second reading. I am not going over that debate but one interesting new point came out; that was that the government regarded this bill as merely the first step of a first step for comprehensive health insurance. In the past, when we had a bill of a similar nature before us, the government stated that it was the be-all and the end-all; the final solution to the problem. Now it has changed its opinion, and under the circumstances, I welcome that change of opinion. I think that under the circumstances we should do everything possible to ensure that the government's clear voice—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, would the hon. member tell us from what fact or source he got the statement he just made, that a previous bill we introduced was stated to be the be-all and the end-all?

Mr. Bryden: This was going to solve the problem. That was your position, not only in this House, but the position of the Tory party in the election campaign—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I asked on my point of order, if the hon. member would quote his reference.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I could certainly get you lots of evidence. I do not have them here—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I asked if the hon. member would quote his reference.

Mr. Bryden: I suggested that this was the position that the government took, and more particularly that the Tory party took in the election campaign—

Mr. Chairman: Order! Order!

Mr. Bryden: Let us leave it at that, I think the public can decide for themselves what position you took.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: If it was really that important, I would be happy to go back and dig up the files on what your party said in the election campaign and what you said in the House.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Stick to the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: Well, he was the man who diverted the matter.

Mr. McKeough: You were away off the point.

Mr. Bryden: No, no! The trouble is that the hon. member for Kent West—I had better make sure I get the direction right—the hon. member for Kent West is most of the time away off. He occasionally comes up to hear what is going on, but he does not hear it in its context, so he sometimes gets confused.

Mr. Chairman, what I was on the point of saying, when the hon. Minister challenged the accuracy of my remarks, was this: If the government is now prepared, as appears to be the case, to treat this as merely a first step that will be enlarged, that will in time I hope, cover more people than will now be covered, that will lead to universal medical care insurance and ultimately to complete health insurance, then I think it is very important that it should hear from the people who believe in that concept, in carrying on the administration of this bill.

We all know that administration can make a big difference to a bill. It can broaden or contract its import. I am in favour of the principle of broadening as we gain in experience. I think that is probably in line with government thinking. So let the government hear from the people who want a broader approach. Let them not hear only, or mainly, from the people who want the narrowest

possible approach. My feeling is the government should hear all sides of the question, and therefore should accept our amendment or something similar to it. We are not wedded to the specific words. We would be quite prepared to consider an alternative that would accomplish the same basic purpose. If the government would accept that, then I think we could look forward to a gradual broadening of the administration of the Act, and ultimately to legislative amendments that would put in a genuine medical care insurance programme in this province.

As my leader, the hon. member for York South said, this is really the central clause in the whole bill. How this council goes, the positions it takes and the advice it gives to the Minister will have a great influence on the future development of medical care insurance in this province. I believe the government should accept the amendment, with such modifications as appear reasonable—accepting the spirit of it in place of the clearly unsatisfactory section that is now in the bill; a section that unquestionably is going to give a dominant voice in the future to two interest groups, the same interest groups as have had the dominant voice in the past.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this proposed amendment and I would agree that, in principle, it is trying to get a broader section of the community to be advising concerning health services. I think this is completely commendable. To me, in the construction of this bill—as has been said by others—there has been far too much closed-shop thinking on the part of the hon. Minister of Health. It was during the Hagey commission, the studies by the commission and the representation that you found the aspirations and the wants and the needs of the people being expressed. Unfortunately, they were not listened to.

But I bring up another point why it should be widened. I think that there is going to be grave concern that the people throughout this province should be aware of exactly what you are offering. They will want to know about the enrolment date. I suspect, frankly, Mr. Chairman, that there are a large number of people who, at this point, believe that the intentions of the government are to provide complete health coverage by this bill. They are going to be bitterly disillusioned when they find out that they still have to pay for prescription drugs and for a number of other services. In fairness to them, I think that if you have a board of representation on your council: it may be able to suggest to you

that people really do not know what this bill is all about, or what is being offered in it, and that there should be a much more massive campaign by means of advertising.

After the amendment is spoken to, I hope that the hon. Minister will tell us something of the approach that is going to be taken to get across to the people just what services are being provided. Are social workers going to be used? Or doctors' offices? Just what is going to be used?

I appreciate that, in discussing this amendment, it is not the time to raise these points, but I hope the hon. Minister will clarify for us how this bill is going to be explained to the public.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, what we are asking the government to do is to recognize the preponderant public interest in the whole plan and scheme which the government has put forward in this bill and in this particular section. Surely, it is not unreasonable—just as the government felt that it was not unreasonable that they could not accept the Hagey commission report, which would have reduced public representation to three, with two each for the carriers and for the Ontario medical association. The government raised this by its own volition to five to four in the council—surely, it is not unreasonable to ask that the public be properly represented.

The hon. Minister has stated that for some reason or other the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is not going to have to accept the nominees of the medical association or of the carriers. That is quite contrary to what is stated in the bill. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council, when this bill is passed, will only be able to appoint to this council, persons who have been nominated by the Ontario medical association and by the carriers.

There may well be a way in which the government could deal with persons who had been put forward by suggesting that they were not acceptable people. But ultimately they have to have persons on the medical council who are, in fact, nominated by those two organizations. What we are saying here is simply why not take a broad spectrum of the associations in the province of Ontario which represent the people of the province of Ontario. We have made our suggestions as to which those associations should be. Let representatives be appointed from those organizations as representative of the public.

Then we make the further point that the bill should be specifically clear that the chairman of the council, regardless of any change in the government views from time to time,

must be a member representative of the public.

I am certain, Mr. Chairman, that the government must recognize why we take this position, that is because we have no confidence in the government because of the way in which they appointed the members of the Hagey committee. The Hagey committee was not in any way representative of anywhere up to 50 per cent of the people of the province of Ontario that this bill is designed to assist, and yet the government purported to suggest to the people of the province of Ontario that in some way this was a broadly representative committee which dealt with this bill.

The government knows, as well as we know, that had that committee been a committee representing a wide spectrum of the associations of people throughout this province, it would not have come up with that particular kind of report.

Now we are faced with that report. The principle of the bill was approved by this House, and now what we are asking is that the government will recognize the very important interests of the people of this province. They are far greater and far more important than the interests of either the medical insurance carriers or of the Ontario medical association.

We recognize that they have an interest, but we do not recognize that they have an interest which, on a mathematical calculation, is somewhere in the ratio of five to four under this bill. We think the amendment put forward by the hon. leader of this party is eminently reasonable, eminently sensible and would, and must, appeal to the people of the province of Ontario. And it must appeal to this government.

We would ask that the government, for once in this debate, recognize the merit of at least one of the proposals which are being put forward to this House. It is not an unreasonable request. We ask the government seriously to consider accepting this as a recommendation, and if necessary, adding other groups so that, as I stated at the outset, the preponderant public interest in this whole plan would be recognized clearly by the government. Then as this plan develops, if there is a small opening toward the left in the way in which a medical plan should be carried forward, there will be a council and a vehicle which would lead us eventually to a comprehensive scheme.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add two points in conclusion on the debate on this amendment.

There is one basic factor in the approach to medical insurance that we have apparently not succeeded in conveying to this government. Medical insurance is not for the doctors. Medical insurance is not for the insurance companies. Medical insurance is for the people, and even when you get to the body which is going to be advisory, you should have a clear preponderance of representatives of the people.

At least I give the hon. Minister of Health marks for being consistent. When I was revealing two or three months ago the nature of the committee that he established back in 1962 to advise him—a committee which had 24 doctors and 11 spokesmen for the insurance company on it—he said quite frankly—and it is in the record—“I asked the people who I thought could give me the most help.” In other words, the doctors and the insurance companies! Now, what about the representatives of the great mass of people for whom medical insurance was being established? That is my first point.

The second point is that the hon. Minister of Health got into a bit of an argument on what exactly he had said in the last election campaign. The significant fact, and it was nowhere more emphatically underlined than in the concluding words of the hon. Prime Minister when he ended the debate on second reading, is that until two years ago, this government was completely and irrevocably in support of exclusively private medicare. Now the pressure of events has driven it away from that position.

Today you have a bill which is a real philosophic mongrel; it is public medicare for a million people; it is mixed public and private medicare for 800,000 people and it is purely private medicare for the other 75 per cent of the population. It is a complete mixture of everything, and the hon. Prime Minister concluded his comments on second reading by saying—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, are we once again debating second reading of this bill?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wish the hon. Prime Minister would not try to play the role of obstructionist—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. We must keep to the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: We are talking, Mr. Chairman, in this amendment before the House of the nature of the body which is going to guide the destiny of the organization, and

how representative this should be. I was drawing attention to the fact that the hon. Prime Minister, in the concluding part of his remarks, said that he agreed and sympathized with those on the other side of the House, and that they were going to move toward it, they were taking the first step.

Mr. Chairman, the council, as the hon. Minister of Health has indicated, is the body that is going to be advising him. Are you going to have a group of people whose advice will take you back to the private medicare from which you have been driven by public pressures, or are you going to have a group of people, genuinely representative of the province of Ontario, who will persuade you to move in the direction the hon. Prime Minister professes he is interested in going slowly—“in the fullness of time.”

The object of this amendment is to broaden the representation of that group. As hon. members in the Liberal Party, and some of my colleagues have conceded, let the government take it, make it 15, bring in the women's institutes, bring in all groups that you think will make it as nearly as possible representative of the people of Ontario, because I repeat, medicare is for the people and not for the doctors and the insurance companies, no matter what this government persists in believing.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment moved by Mr. MacDonald, say “aye.”

Those opposed, say “nay.”

In my opinion the “nays” have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of Mr. MacDonald's amendment, will please stand.

Those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the “ayes” are 20, the “nays” 54.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in regard to this, and the administration of Medical Carriers Incorporated as set forth in section 4. It is much similar to section 3, and in this again we find that the corporation is completely in the hands of the licensed carriers, except of course for the chairman. When you have a board of directors consisting of seven and just one chairman, who is appointed from some area

other than the licensed carriers, it is obvious that the licensed carriers, in effect, are going to control the whole system of medical insurance having to do with the public over and beyond those who are receiving their insurance free or subsidized. After all, the licensed carriers are literally going to control 75 per cent of the market for medical insurance here in the province of Ontario.

What is even worse, Mr. Chairman, it is going to hinder the expansion of health insurance throughout the province of Ontario, because if there is any single group worse than the present Tory government in dragging its heels in bringing in any kind of insurance to protect the people of the province, it has been the licensed carriers, with the one exception of the non-profit groups.

But it is obvious that the real power, the real control, is going to centre again in the hands of a vested interest. Even through such groups as the physician-sponsored groups it intends to be dominated again by the Ontario medical association, and this is proved over and over in the last year or 18 months. Let us bear in mind that even the Ontario medical association includes only half of the number of doctors in the province. We can see that again it is a very tightly controlled group which is going to have the real economic control of such a system.

Therefore I would like to bring in an amendment to this section. In that amendment I am going to suggest that the seven directors be appointed by order-in-council for that reason. I do not specify that they belong to any particular group in the community; I realize in this there is the danger, as was pointed out by the hon. member for York South, that the council could be loaded with one political party. This is true in so many of our appointments. Even despite this fact we have a good opportunity of getting a broad spectrum of the public, and at least we should not be dominated by one single group.

I realize, as the hon. Minister of Health said, if you name a number of groups to appear as directors on this particular corporation you may leave out some who would be annoyed. It was proved, even in Saskatchewan, that when they started out the council got too cumbersome when they tried to name too many groups to the board. It is wise to keep the board of directors on this corporation small.

The paramount consideration should be the public, and the directors should also lay out the ground work for the future of medical insurance, and, over and above

medical insurance, health insurance. If, again, we leave it in such control where doctors obviously dominate the chiropractors, the osteopaths and the dentists, all of these groups are going to be found to play a secondary role, a very much secondary role in that they hardly have a voice. It would be hoped that when you do appoint a board of directors, you bring in such groups as the labour unions who have shown such a wide experience.

Bearing this in mind, I am going to submit this amendment, Mr. Chairman:

That section 4, subsections (1) and (2) be amended to read as follows:

(1) There is hereby established a corporation without share capital under the name of "Medical Carriers Incorporated," whose membership shall be composed of the licensed carriers, and seven members to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

(2) The board of directors of the corporation shall consist of seven directors all of whom shall be representative of the public and shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council; the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one of the members of the council as chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Trotter moves:

That the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of seven directors all of whom shall be representative of the public and shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one of the members of the council as chairman.

That section 4 be amended to read as follows:

(1) There is hereby established a corporation without share capital under the name of "Medical Carriers Incorporated," whose membership shall be composed of the licensed carriers, and seven members to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is this not redundant to the bill itself? Does this not change the principle of the whole bill, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Trotter: No, it is administration. When we argued the principle we opposed that the carriers be members of the corporation; we did not want the licensed carriers ever to be part of the corporation—that was the principle.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The principle was carried.

Mr. Trotter: All right, we lost on that. Now we are suggesting a change in the administration; it is not an argument on principle.

An hon. member: Let us vote on it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend from Parkdale has very obviously not read this section of the Act. First of all, the setting up by law of this Medical Insurance Carriers Incorporated has nothing to do with the control, or otherwise, of medical services insurance, or health insurance. This corporation is established for the business of running the insurance function only.

It would be absolute folly, Mr. Chairman, to accept this amendment which the hon. member has made. This would be tantamount to saying to the board of directors of the Toronto General Trusts that by law, "we are going to state that no person who has any interest in your business can sit on your board of directors." This is really what this is.

This is a business corporation. Its main function is to administer the combined business of the carriers and nothing else. It is quite true that the corporation has the right to make certain recommendations to the council, but its most important function is the pooling of the high-cost risks. This is a matter which must be done by those who are experts in the field of insurance and know what they are talking about.

If we were to accept the amendment which the hon. member has made, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, we would have to go out and find persons expert in the business of insurance to administer this and that would be ridiculous to the point of folly. I suggest, therefore, sir, that this amendment should certainly not even be considered.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment please say "aye."

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I was waiting to see whether you were ruling this in order or not, and I presume you are ruling it in order.

Mr. Chairman: In order!

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I want to make some remarks regarding it. I would prefer to see some other method used in amending this section but we will support the amendment.

I think what the hon. Minister says makes

some sense, that this is an organization of the carriers, and therefore should be dealing with their business. If it is that and if we are to maintain that that is such, then it seems to me that these powers that are spelled out—the various sections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of section 5—are powers which should not be given in legislation. Certainly section 6, which says:

(6) The corporation shall establish and administer a system for the pooling of standard risks—

—is logical and proper for this kind of organization. But when it comes to the matter of recommending changes and benefits, subscription rates, and the enrolment periods, these are matters which should be dealt with by the council and I recognize the council has the final say.

This is a pressure group which is going to make recommendations, and the members are going to recommend for the benefit of the carriers, not for the benefit of the citizens themselves. What we are giving here is legal status to a pressure group, to a lobby. These people will lobby anyway, they will make their representations to the council, but I see no reason why they should be given the legal status in legislation to do this job.

The council should have this responsibility; it can listen to whatever representations it wishes but they should be informal representations. These people in this corporation will have a direct interest in the matters which are spelled out here and therefore they should not deal with them in an official capacity at all. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this matter should be kept as it is, that is, as far as the corporation is concerned, although we are quite willing to go along with the recommendation or the amendment because of the fact that we cannot make the other one at the present time. But we certainly would like to see this legal status to a lobby removed. We do not object to the lobby being there—this is a normal practice of democracy—but if we are not going to cut out subsection 5, I think the only answer is the answer which the hon. member for Parkdale has given, and make the directors people who represent the public rather than the carriers.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to re-emphasize the remarks of both of the previous speakers. I am sorry, I exclude the hon. Minister of Health from that and the hon. member for Riverdale. I do not infer that they did not speak but I naturally do not support their remarks.

I would say on these grounds that under 4 (c), which says:

(c) pass bylaws governing the qualification, classification and regulation of its members;

I think it is very obvious to us that any group that had self-interests, any group that had profit motivation above community motivation, could exercise it. As the hon. Minister of Health has said: Why not have profit motivation in connection with health; I am all for this! I paraphrase you, sir, but this is pretty much in a nutshell what you had mentioned.

This profit motivation may be the main purpose, and I do not say it is, of all the schemes. But what a field day they will have with this section where they can decide among themselves what are the necessary qualifications for their closed group. Why, they may stop any other groups from coming in; sitting among themselves they may decide about the co-operatives, "We are not overly happy about them because they do not have the profit motive aspects to the same extent as we have them; they do not rancor their blood in the same way, so let us work out some bylaws to exclude them."

I say, sir, that you have given a closed shop to a group of insurance-company carriers, you have given them a complete licence to go ahead and set up the kind of regulations whereby they can put a large fence around themselves, and if they want to, they can have a field day sending out standard policies, and so on, arranging what the standard policies will be, and cutting out people. Just let me read section 3:

—pass bylaws governing the qualification, classification and regulation of its members.

It seems obvious to me that this is surely giving the decision of who can be enrolled to a group of private insurance companies themselves, and I say this is dangerous and it is abhorrent, and therefore I concur with the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say any more on this, but I really stand aghast at the shallow thinking of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition. I had believed that he could do a more penetrating analysis of a piece of legislation than it is obvious he did. How in the name of common sense can this "carriers incorporated" rule out anybody? First of all they must be licensed under one of two Acts, The Insurance Act or the P.K. Services, or whatever the name of it is under The Corporations Act. They must first be licensed to sell this

type of insurance in the province of Ontario, and then they become licensed under this Act. If they are going to continue in the business they must belong to Medical Carriers Incorporated, this is inherent in the setting up of the corporation. So how in the name of common sense can Medical Carriers Incorporated rule out any of the 190—in fact there are over 200 indemnity carriers, 44 prepaid or nonprofit plans and I do not know how many self-insurance plans, all of them now operating in the province. That certainly cannot even be imagined under this section.

Now, the hon. member for Yorkview had some fears about the first two, but I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, this only gives them the right to recommend. As the hon. member said, if a group is disposed to lobby they will lobby anyway, whether you give them the right to do it legally or otherwise. I do not know whether lobbying can ever be considered legal or illegal, but they will do it in spite of anything you do. By giving them the right to make recommendations to the council, which in turn shall make recommendations to the Minister, who in turn will submit them for final decision by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, I do not see that there is very much basis for fear. As the hon. member pointed out himself quite clearly, if this is to be interpreted as lobbying, the insurance carriers will lobby in spite of anything we do.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say through you, sir, to the hon. Minister of Health, that I will just throw out one regulation which could be a means of causing groups to be omitted. I hearken back to the discussion we were having in the Legislature, I think yesterday, in connection with a group who are in the health field, and they are deciding that you cannot advertise the price of drugs. Under this situation I see no reason why—the hon. Minister either has a greater faith in profit-making institutions than I have, or profit-making agencies—when you say how on earth could they in any way exclude a group, do you have section saying: "pass bylaws governing the qualification, classification and regulation of its members"? Why is this in if you say that the membership is already screened and decided on through two other processes? Why do you have this group making qualification, classification and regulation of its members?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the only right that this group has is to pass bylaws governing qualification, classification and regulation of its members with respect to Medical

Carriers Incorporated. It does not have any right to interfere with any other part of the operation of the Act. It only refers to this corporation, which is going to run its own affairs, and nothing else.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a little more than, I think—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the hon. member? I made a commitment that at 5 o'clock we would deal with other public bills and orders. We will return to this debate in due course.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain resolutions and certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 57th order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 32, An Act to provide for the appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies, and to define the commissioner's powers and duties.

COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of this debate the last time this matter was before the House, I had begun to outline some of the reasons why I believe that we should have an ombudsman in Ontario. I am not going to go back and repeat what I have already said, but I will carry on with the remarks that I originally intended to make.

As to the actual power and authority of the commissioner, I know as you have read the bill, sir, that you will realize that he has no power to make anything in the nature of an executive order or decision. He cannot give a judgment. He can make a recommendation to the appropriate Minister in the department or agency concerned and request that the department or agency notify him within

a specified time of the steps, if any, he proposes to take to give effect to this recommendation. If, within a reasonable time after his report, no action is taken, which seems to him to be adequate and appropriate, he may at his discretion send a copy of his report to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and may thereafter make such report to the Legislature on the matter as he thinks fit.

The bill that I present to the House provides that no report under it that is adverse to any person shall be made unless the person has been given an opportunity to be heard and unless the person has been given—when being heard—an opportunity to be represented by counsel. While it may be suggested that this procedure might work theoretically, and there may be some criticism addressed to it because the ombudsman has no power to make any orders, it would seem to me that the decision of such a commissioner should not be anything more than a recommendation; the action in respect of which must be determined by government—by the government of the day, in fact. The ultimate sanctions of publicity in Parliament and of public opinion are those to which government departments and agencies are especially responsive, as we all know. I would be very surprised if many, or in fact any, cases would be likely to arise where any governmental official, be he elected or appointed, would be likely to discard out of hand the sort of recommendation made by the ombudsman. Provided in my bill is a statutory provision for persons in custody, or those who are inmates of private sanatoria or mental hospitals, to have the privilege of communicating directly with the commissioner and that no one shall have the right to censor such correspondence.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this matter has already been the subject of some discussion in this sitting of the Legislature. I am not suggesting for a moment that the ombudsman is the complete answer to all of the problems of administrative justice. He is only one weapon, but quite a good one, too, and I think that the appointment of such an official would be a real attempt by the Legislature of the province of Ontario to ensure equal treatment for all of our citizens by this vast machinery of government.

What I am suggesting, sir, is really something quite new in this country and on this continent. The official whose appointment I urge would not be a part of the judicial system nor a part of the administration. He would have to be an officer of the Legislature. I do not believe that the office should

develop the formal tradition and trappings of a court, if so, it would fail in its object. By the same token, if it came to be regarded by the people as another arm of government administration, it would also fail in its object. The ombudsman must carve and tread his own particular path, being careful to maintain his independence of both the executive and the judiciary, so as to be able to build a tradition of strong and impartial criticism of government administration on the one hand and of helpfulness to citizens in their dealings with the administration on the other hand.

If this can be achieved, justice will be better served and efficient and humane administration will be promoted.

Some might ask why the problems I have outlined cannot be handled by our courts and our judges. It is my opinion that judges, as a whole, tend to be extremely cautious in dealing with the administrative field of law. There has been a climate in Canada which regards the judge as a danger in the political field, that he wants to second guess the tribunal or the civil servants. The judges, to prevent this criticism and to keep from feeling that fire, have tended to withdraw. By and large, I have found that our judges, in this particular field, have been most cautious and generally unwilling to interfere.

I do not think that I could sum up with more effect, the reasons for the necessity for this office in the province of Ontario, than to quote from Lord Shawcross's introduction to the Whyatt report, which was a report made to the House of Commons in England. He says:

In every growing complexity of the modern state, the interventions of central and local government into the lives and affairs of the ordinary citizen inevitably multiply. For the most part, no doubt, these interventions are for beneficent purposes and have beneficent results, but the nature of governmental and local governmental activity is now such that large areas of discretion are created in respect to all sorts of matters affecting the rights and lives of ordinary people in varying degrees.

The general standards of administration in this country, I think, are high, probably indeed higher than in any other country.

But with the existence of a great bureaucracy there are inevitably cases, insignificant in number, when, through error or indifference, injustice is done or appears to be done. The man of substance can deal with these situations, he is near to the establishment.

I think Lord Shawcross's words have particular application to the situation here in Ontario.

He enjoys status, or possesses the influence which will ensure him the ear of those in authority. He can afford to pursue such legal remedies as may be available. He knows his way around, but too often the little man, the ordinary citizen, is incapable of asserting himself. The farmer with four acres and a cow would never have attempted to force the battlements of Chichel Down.

Well, Chichel Down, Mr. Speaker, is, as you know, a well-known English administrative case, evolving around the government having acquired during the war, a piece of land from a wealthy farmer. At the end of the war, the government gave it to another of its agencies and that agency was going to erect some public housing on it. Well, this gentleman was quite offended, and being a wealthy and affluent person, he was prepared to take on all of the majesty of government, and eventually got before the courts and, after several appeals, was able to get his land back.

But it was only a man of this position and this substance, who would have been able to attack all of the majesty of government, and to quarrel with administrative decisions, these nameless and faceless civil servants that I have been talking about.

The moral of the story, of course, must be quite obvious to us. We have had our Fred Fawcetts, our John Blanks, our Robert Roberts and others, who have benefited from aroused public opinion expressed both in this Legislature and by our news media. How many hundreds of thousands of others are there whom an ombudsman might have been able to help, and from whom we have not heard, or about whom we are not aware?

We do need in this province, this little man's helper, this parliamentary commissioner, not to deal with the things that are headlines in the newspapers. We are able to cope with those reasonably well here and the news media are able to cope with them well.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Singer: Yes, sir.

Mr. Cowling: How does the hon. member think that a man called a commissioner would hear from the people, if nobody else heard about it? How is this one man going to hear about it?

Mr. Singer: I am suggesting, sir, that he will if it becomes knowledgeable to the community—and I think it will very quickly—that there is an official who is neither a part of the government nor a part of the judiciary; a servant of the Legislature who is available, who will have time to investigate the complaints. The complaints may not be as dramatic as that of Robert Roberts, or Fred Fawcett, or any one of the others that catch the news headlines or are of sufficient news value that the great newspapers of the province of Ontario can afford to put their star reporters on for days and weeks, writing headlines and keeping on public pressure. They may be important enough to interest various members of the Legislature, to bring here. But my point is that we need a public official who will look after the little man. The complaint may not be the dramatic thing, it may not be the Robert Roberts who is being sent to jail.

Mr. Cowling: Are we not doing that now every day?

Mr. Singer: No, sir, we are not.

Mr. Cowling: I am.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I have a comment or two. I am wondering what effect this sort of thing might have on the new project for legal aid, which is a pretty broad project.

Mr. Singer: I do not think legal aid is the same sort of subject. I think legal aid is a method of bringing matters before the courts. What I am looking for; what I think the people of Ontario are looking for; what is necessary in states that have the administrative machinery of the type we have, is not another legal procedure, but a method of dealing with administrative procedures. We need a method of getting at the whole civil service, the whole administrative red tape. We must allow an individual to come before somebody, some official who is impartial, and to say, I believe I have been improperly treated, would you please investigate.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member has gone through all the legal—

Mr. Singer: No, sir. If my hon. friend would look at the bill, if my hon. friend had examined the bill closely, he would see that I am not suggesting that the ombudsman step in where there is any legal remedy. That is specifically prohibited. He should only make his services available where there is no other remedy. He should work where there is an administrative blank wall, where a

complainant cannot get an answer, where he is pushed from department to department, from civil servant to civil servant, where he is told, well that is the system and what can we do about it. That is the sort of thing. The sort of incident I raised with my friend, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), when his estimates were before the House, the man who lives beside Highway 401, whose walls and foundations were damaged by the rumbling of trucks in front of his property. When he appeals to the hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. Minister of Highways says: "Well, we hire a main contractor and we force him to have an insurance policy." So the man goes from the hon. Minister of Highways to the insurer of the head contractor and the insurer of the head contractor says, "Too bad, we're the insurers, but there are seven subcontractors, you have to tell us which one of the seven subcontractors is responsible."

I would think that in this sort of a case—and the hon. Minister of Highways sat and said: "Yes, I agree, if I was in this citizen's position, I would be very unhappy"—I would think if we had an ombudsman's report, and a commissioner's report before the House, a strong positive statement that this is no way to treat the citizens of Ontario, I would think sir, that government would be moved into action. And I would think the experiences in other jurisdictions have indicated this.

I am going to deal very briefly with some of the experiences in Sweden, and I am sure my friend, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Would my hon. friend allow me to interrupt again on the point? When he led me into the criminal field, when he talked about these causes célèbres that he referred to certainly they were in the courts. He now moves into another field and says he wants somebody to go into all these administrative departments. Well, what are the hon. members for here in the House, if it is not to protect that kind of thing?

Mr. Singer: I am not satisfied that the hon. members have either the time, the inclination or the resource to sufficiently investigate to do this job properly. The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) says we do not have access to documents. One of the things laid down in this Act, if it becomes law, will be that the parliamentary commissioner can get into the departments, can ask for the files, can bring people before him.

The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), if he has a cause célèbre—and there is not a

better investigator in the House than my hon. friend—all he can do is examine and research it to the best of his ability which is substantial. But he cannot summon anyone before him. He cannot ask civil servant "X" to come in and say why did you do this. He cannot ask for the files. He cannot ask for the correspondence. And I do not think that an individual member of the Opposition should have this power.

This is why I am suggesting that an independent person, a person who is responsible only to this Parliament, be given this power. In this way he would be able to protect to a far greater extent, and in a much broader scope, the sort of things that need protection. He would be able to act for the little man. I do not think we have this setup in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The members are supposed to do right by the little man.

Mr. Singer: Well, my friend the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests still is suggesting that that is what the member is supposed to do. I do not think I can make it any clearer. The member, sir, is limited in his time, in his capacity and in the resources that he has available to him. He has no right other than to ask questions. He can ask questions until he is blue in the face. I put a whole flock of them—a hundred and some-odd—on the order paper, and there are still some seven or eight there that have not been answered. I believe that a few of those seven or eight, perhaps all of them, are not going to be answered because the government in its wisdom has seen fit not to answer them.

Well, they will have to take their chances on that. But, Mr. Speaker, if there was a parliamentary commissioner, and he felt that this type of an investigation was worth pursuing and he was given the powers that I outlined in my Act, he would be entitled to get those answers. He would be entitled to summon those civil servants, to put them on oath if necessary and be able to get at the facts and to bring them before the public. That is what is important about this idea and this theory that we are advancing.

As I was saying—to go back to my text—we do need this little man's helper, this parliamentary commissioner, not to deal with the things that are headlines in the newspapers, but to deal with little petty annoyances that creep in despite even the best of Ministers, even as good a Minister as my friend, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. And the best of deputy Ministers.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): What about me?

Mr. Singer: Oh, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. They are all a great bunch of fellows.

It is all very well for the courts to administer law, but to my mind there is an area—and this is what I was getting into in answering the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests—in which the courts are not competent to deal, and that is the area which I have been attempting to define. It is where a person complains of grievances which are not causes of action, which he cannot really get before the courts at all. This is where the ombudsman comes in so that, in addition to the preservation of our personal liberty through the administration of the rule of law, we need to have a feeling of fairness; that our society is built on fairness as well as pure law. We need all the safeguards we can think of to preserve that which we desire in our ordinary society.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you have had an opportunity to read a recent article in the *New Yorker* magazine, the issue of February 13, 1965. This was written under a Stockholm dateline, and is a most fascinating article dealing with a gentleman, Mr. Alfred Bexelius, the ombudsman for Sweden. Quoting Mr. Bexelius the author says:

The ombudsman has another thing on his side—his annual report.

Mr. Bexelius referred to his latest report which ran to 591 pages.

Each year the ombudsman has to prepare a report for Parliament which covers the activities of his office and provides details of the year's important cases. About 4,000 copies of this report are printed and distributed to all courts and to all governmental agencies.

In Mr. Bexelius' opinion, this is the ombudsman's real weapon, because you can see no one wants to have his name in that book. It is a kind of "Who's Who" in reverse of public officials and civil servants. To keep their names out, and people and the courts and the agencies are likely to be a little more careful about the way they do their work. There you see an important thing—perhaps the most important thing about the ombudsman's office—its very existence prevents any number of faults and abuses of power.

One of the matters referred to by Mr. Bexelius was the submission by him of a rather long report to his government recom-

mending that all administrative agencies be compelled to state the reason for every adverse decision they made. The government sent this report to all agencies to ask their opinion of the recommendation. Of course, all the agencies replied it would be an impossible thing to do. Mr. Bexelius concludes: "I think the government will pass such a law before not too long."

It was a great disappointment along the same line to my hon. colleagues and myself when the bills amending The Liquor Licence Act and The Liquor Control Act were introduced. They went through committee of the whole House this afternoon, with no changes insofar as allowing an appeal procedure and a statement of reasons relating to the denial of licences.

We would have thought that this sort of statutory provision would be a most reasonable and a most logical one. The Gordon committee recommended this sort of thing many years ago when it made its report on administrative organization in the province of Ontario. We would have thought that the government would have recognized the value of this sort of appeal procedure and set it out in the statutes and made it clear. We would think, sir, if the government has yet failed to recognize it, that such an official as a parliamentary commissioner would be very quick to point out, that we need appeal procedures, and that the appeal body cannot be the same body who sits and gives the original judgment.

We would think it would make abundant good sense that there be reasons for decisions by these administrative boards. We would think that a parliamentary commissioner would again make this abundantly clear, probably in his first report.

Could there be any stronger argument for this type of office than the all too frequently heard complaint that these boards act within an atmosphere of secrecy, so that the ordinary citizen is unable to find out the reasons for their decisions?

In Sweden, the ombudsman not only investigates complaints by citizens, but initiates cases on his own, and I think this is an interesting thought, too. Most of these result from an annual inspection trip that he makes of provincial courts and government offices. He visits the prisons, inspects the courts, examines at random files dealing with civil and criminal cases to see if there have been violations, either in the spirit or the letter of the law. He uses a similar method in checking an administrative agency. He says that in Sweden—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That will eliminate the need for an Opposition.

Mr. Singer: Well, it might. It would certainly do a great deal to bring the government up on its toes, to get the Cabinet Ministers doing what they are supposed to do, and their deputies. These people—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what you are supposed to do.

Mr. Singer: These people, perhaps, are not the real target of this idea. It is the myriad of civil servants—how many do we have in the province of Ontario? Perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) has the figure—20,000, 30,000. We have thousands, anyway, of civil servants.

An hon. member: Forty thousand.

Mr. Singer: My hon. friend says 40,000 civil servants.

An hon. member: Forty-five thousand.

Mr. Singer: Well, 45,000. Anyway, we have an awful lot of civil servants. The importance of this office, Mr. Speaker, would be to have an official—a servant of this Legislature—who would have the ability to inquire into the actions of these people insofar as they affect the rights of citizens. And this, I think, is the importance of it. We can deal with our friend, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, reasonably well here in the House.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): He is easy.

Mr. Singer: But it is important that there be a bit of machinery, that there be an instrument by which the rights of the little man can be protected against the mass of administrative authority.

Mr. Bexelius says that in Sweden all public officials must be polite and helpful. If they are not, and they have committed a public fault, they can be prosecuted and he has prosecuted such cases.

Mr. Sopha: All these would be in jail!

Mr. Singer: He has laid complaints against such persons as judges who have been impolite to witnesses; the chairman of a child welfare council who dealt unfairly with a father who had been lax in contributing to the support of his child; a public prosecutor for failing to inform the court during a criminal trial that a state's witness had committed perjury; even the members of the national board of civil aviation who took a

freeloading trip to Paris at the expense of one of the airline companies with which they had to deal.

Mr. Sopha: These should all be on Devil's Island!

Mr. Singer: I would think, sir, that this sort of breath of fresh air directed at the affairs of the government of Ontario would be one of the most salutary things that could ever happen.

Mr. Sopha: Is there anything there about failure to answer letters?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I know it will be suggested that the matter that I have been attempting to deal with here, is part of a subject of an inquiry being conducted by Mr. Justice McRuer. I know that many representations along these lines have already been made to him. In fact, my submission to him, on behalf of the Liberal Party of Ontario, put forward a similar suggestion. I know, as well, that Mr. Justice McRuer is most sympathetic to this type of suggestion. He personally expressed to me the thought that perhaps an Ontario ombudsman could, in addition to the duties I have referred to, be charged with the responsibility of investigating that myriad of complaints which arise as a result of municipal administration.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member means that he has made up his mind already.

Mr. Singer: No, I will repeat it for my hon. friend. I said that Mr. Justice McRuer has been listening to it. In his remarks he has been sympathetic; he has discussed his views on this subject publicly; he has discussed them with me privately, but in casting about as to the possibility of recommending this type of office and what is going to be in his report, I have no idea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It sounds better since the hon. member fixed it.

Mr. Singer: No, this is the way I said it. I will send the hon. Minister a copy of the text. He was wondering whether or not, if the office of ombudsman was created, he could not as well have the duties of investigating the multitude of complaints addressed from municipalities insofar as municipal procedures were concerned, and I think that point deserves some investigation.

However, I think if we are going to wait until we can draft a perfect Act, then we are not going to take any action. I think we

would be taking on too much all at the one time. I think there would be an ample job here, and I think in light of the experience that we have read about and that we have seen—the experience in New Zealand and in the Scandinavian countries and other places—this is a step that the province of Ontario should presently be prepared to take.

Finally, sir, in conclusion I would make my plea to the government: Do not adjourn this debate. I think this debate at least could go to an approval of the second reading of this bill. Let us approve it in principle; let the government then wait, for a year or a year and a half, let us see Mr. Justice McRuer's report, and then do the same as with the medical plan or with two or three Acts that were brought in. Then in a year or two, let us bring back a final draft, or a better draft. Let us state, Mr. Speaker, in a meaningful way that we want to help the people of Ontario.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the government supporters in the House to the speech of the hon. member for Downsview was an excellent demonstration of the travail suffered by the Tory mentality when it is forced to consider and even to comprehend a new idea. Apparently this is new to those hon. gentlemen over there. It is not a new idea on the face of the earth—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would like these interjections to stop. The member who is speaking should speak to the bill that is before the House and he should be given the courtesy of making his remarks without too many interjections.

Mr. Bryden: I see that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions cannot take it.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, ten years from now, if, as is most unlikely, the hon. gentlemen opposite happen still to be there, they will bring in a bill precisely like that which is now before us and claim that they invented the idea. It will never have been heard of on the face of the earth until that moment! No doubt that is what would happen, except that they will not be there, so no doubt we will get legislation of this kind sooner.

I was amazed at the reaction of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, who has held the portfolio of Attorney General in the government—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I was asking some questions of the

previous speaker to try to draw out any good reasons for this if I could. The same thing would apply in the hon. member's remarks, if he can show something, but first of all, are there any extant cases that he knows of that are crying out for this kind of reform? If there are, why does he not put them on the record?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would never hope to be able to devise the kind of logic that would persuade the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests of anything. I would merely point out to him that this idea is a well-established idea in the democratic world. It is not something new and not something that the hon. member for Downsview thought up all by himself as a novel, untried idea. It is a well-established principle in Scandinavian countries. The idea is working well in New Zealand.

In those countries where it has been tried, it has been well demonstrated that the office, which has been described as ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner, or whatever you like, serves an important and useful function in a modern, complex democracy. Let us bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that our democratic society is now exceedingly complex. It is exceedingly difficult for the average man to know where to turn when he gets into difficulties with the vast organization of government.

I am not complaining about the size of the organization of government. I think it is inevitable if we want to achieve in our society the objectives we have in mind. We have to have a large government organization and it is going to grow. But let us bear in mind also that any large organization can become impersonal and inhuman, that the right of an individual can be completely ground to pieces in the machine of a great organization. That is where the role of the ombudsman comes in.

It is idle to say that the private member of the Legislature can do the ombudsman's job; that is an old saw of the government. I have no doubt that all members of the Legislature do useful work in representing their constituents before various government agencies, but the problem has now reached the proportions where there should be a formal method of dealing with it. After all, we have courts because there is a role to be performed that cannot be performed by members of the Legislature or anybody else.

We are now in an age when a vast amount of ministerial discretion is given to Ministers

of the Crown, and frankly, I think too much is given. I think that in many cases statutes which give Ministers discretion to do this, that or the other, or to decide this, that or the other, do not need to do it. It is often just a piece of lazy draftsmanship on the part of the government or whomever is sponsoring the legislation—I am not speaking now specifically of this government, but of governments generally. Sometimes the government is too lazy to sit down and think out exactly what it wants to accomplish. So the easy way out is to give the Minister discretion to do certain things.

You will find that our statutes and the statutes of all jurisdictions are simply loaded with discretionary provisions of that kind. In actual practice it is not the Minister who necessarily exercises the discretion. It may be somebody far down the line from him who is exercising the discretion given to the Minister in the statutes. Such a person can either maliciously, or quite innocently, exercise that discretion in an arbitrary and unfair way. This can happen.

In the famous Crichton case that the hon. member for Downsview referred to, a proceeding had gone on for a long time in which a private citizen got a real run-around and was most unjustly treated. The Minister of the department did not have the vaguest idea that all these things were being done in his name.

And this is inevitable in a large organization. Things are done every day in the name of a Minister and he cannot possibly know about everything that is going on. So even if he would not himself approve arbitrary conduct, there still is insufficient check at the present time to ensure that it cannot happen on the part of some other official down the line somewhere in this hierarchy of the Ministry.

The jurisprudence on the matter, as I understand it from such books as I have read, makes it quite clear that the courts are most hesitant to intervene in regard to an exercise of discretion that is conferred by a statute. The court, I understand, takes the position that if Parliament or the Legislature sees fit to give his discretion then it is not for the courts to question it, as long as it is exercised within the powers that are being given. The method, the actual exercise of the power, whether apparently just or unjust, is not a matter that the courts will normally interfere with.

That is where the parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman can come in. An aggrieved person, or anyone who thinks he is

aggrieved, can go to the ombudsman. The ombudsman, under a statute such as is being proposed in the House here now, would have powers that no member of this Legislature has—and which, I think, could not reasonably be given to anybody except a person in the very special position of the ombudsman. He can go right into the department, look into the files, interview anybody he wants under oath or otherwise; he can get right to the root of the matter.

When he looks into the files he is not at liberty to disclose them to the world at large. There may be confidential information there which should not be disclosed. He has taken an oath of secrecy that he will not reveal information unless it is proper to do so, but the point is that he can get to the information, and nobody else except the people involved in the administration can do that. Thus it is possible for a third impartial party to get in and find out exactly what has happened. There is no procedure available at the present time whereby that type of thing can be done.

Yet, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the great and necessary growth of ministerial discretion, it is desirable that there should be a procedure of this type. I have not studied in detail, or to any extent at all, the operation of the ombudsman system in the Scandinavian countries where it is best established. But I have skimmed through reports of the parliamentary commissioner in New Zealand. I would commend them to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and anybody else who is interested in this matter. The report gives a cross-section of the types of cases the commissioner has to deal with—not revealing names, of course, but revealing the basic circumstances, and they are a most interesting cross-section.

In some cases, the matter involved, I suppose, in terms of the totality of public policy, is a very small matter, but to a particular individual it is maybe the most important thing in the world. There may be an individual, who, in a programme that is good overall, gets a raw deal and just cannot get it straightened out by his own efforts. The parliamentary commissioner steps in, he can get it straightened out, usually, by negotiation.

It should also be noted that in the great majority of the cases referred to in New Zealand, the commissioner found that the complaint had no merit. It is not that one regards civil servants as ogres who are deliberately going to deprive citizens of their rights. I think the overwhelming majority of them are most concerned to look after the

rights of the individual and in actual experience that is what the parliamentary commissioner found.

However, there are always exceptional cases. It may be a dozen this year, half a dozen next year, two dozen the following year—that is what the office exists for. The question really is whether we consider that the rights of a half a dozen individuals or half a hundred individuals out of the millions are important. If they are important, then I think we should support the bill proposed by the hon. member for Downsview. If they are not important, then, I suppose, we do not support it. I think it is as simple as that.

Do we believe in the rights of even one individual who may get a raw deal and cannot by any known procedure get justice? If we consider that his rights are important, then I think we should be prepared to establish a position of ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Cowling moves the adjournment of the debate; shall the motion carry?

Several hon. members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: I may say I have the member for High Park next on my list to take part in the debate. Does the member for Durham wish to speak to this bill?

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Yes, I would like to say a few words.

As representative of a rural urban riding, I would like to take exception to some of the remarks that have been made with respect to the office of ombudsman or a commissioner.

Mr. Sopha: Let's adjourn the debate.

Mr. Carruthers: It seems to me as a representative of rural areas that this is a definite interference of the rights and privileges of a member of the Legislature. I think the idea of the last two speakers is that when someone comes to us as a private member, all we will have to say is: "Go and see your ombudsman."

This is not what we want. We are elected to represent the people of our riding, to deal with their problems and their appeals and to any injustices that they may have suffered. I accept it as my responsibility and I am pleased to accept it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, the demand for this office is due, in most cases, to the growth of bureaucracy, and I do not think that anyone in this Legislature can say that we have despotic bureaucracy in this province. Every individual has his rights—we have appeal boards and municipal boards, we have every right of appeal for the private individual. In a small country like New Zealand—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): An agrarian society.

Mr. Carruthers: —where you have a population of 2.5 million people, with a civil service of around 120,000, in comparison with the 40,000 that the hon. member pointed out for the province of Ontario—

An hon. member: Utopial

Mr. Carruthers: —there you may have a bureaucracy develop. But suddenly in the vast area of the province of Ontario, the office of ombudsman would become very difficult to manage. We would only be replacing or adding—if there was a bureaucracy—to that bureaucracy with another bureaucracy. Such an office is supposed to protect an individual from injustices, the encroachments by government on his liberties and his rights. But, as I said before, we have our appeal boards. Above everything else, we have the member himself, whose right and duty is to represent his constituents if they have suffered any injustice or have thought they have suffered an injustice.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such an office imposes a buffer or a filter between the constituent and his member, and this I say is interference in the responsibilities of appointed members and is of particular concern to myself and other members who represent rural areas. Such an official, and such an office, may tend to become simply a receptive office for crank letters. Setting up such an office, sir, would only encourage and act as an incentive to people to write in crank letters.

For example, in 1964, in the office in New Zealand we see 760 complaints. Of these 400 did not even warrant consideration, 360 were considered and out of that number only approximately 50 received any action. Now, any private member can handle that situation very easily.

I would say that such an office would only interfere with the prompt and efficient despatch of government business. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, for example, when the St. Lawrence seaway project was being developed, does this mean that such an official

would have the right to investigate all the facets as to whether a decision by a government was justified in such a development? If that is the case many of the great projects which this government has undertaken would never be accomplished.

Under Swedish penal code, a civil servant through neglect, imprudence, want of skill or disregard of his duties, according to the statutes, may be punished and the officer responsible for initiating that punishment and proceedings is the ombudsman. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in doing so he replaces the Ministers of the Crown as a person who is responsible for sound administration. We do not want such an official and I am sure the members of the civil service do not want such an official breathing down their necks, because such a situation would only create uncertainty and a great deal of insecurity within the ranks of the civil service.

The real safeguard to democracy, the real safeguard to citizens, is a fair-minded civil service and I think we all agree, Mr. Speaker, that we have such vigilant and responsible civil service in this province and also we have in this province a responsible press which can reveal any injustices which may occur.

Mr. Speaker, if a government is a true reflection of public opinion—and I feel that I am a true representative; I reflect the opinion of the county of Durham—then it is very disturbing to think that the public must pay the cost of protecting itself against its own image. It is one of the responsibilities of a private member to represent his constituents ably and responsibly, and thereafter I say that it is his right, his duty and his responsibility to do so, and I would urge all hon. members to oppose this bill.

Mr. Cowling moves the adjournment of the debate.

Clerk of the House: The 58th order, second reading of Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves second reading of Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask the member if, when he deals with Bill 33, it is also his intention to touch on Bill 34 and incorporate it with Bill 33 in his remarks?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My remarks on Bill 33 will make it unnecessary then—

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed by the House?
Agreed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, just to refresh the memories of the hon. members of the Legislature about the reason for this bill, I would say the bill is simply designed to remove the power of boards of commissioners of police to pass bylaws regulating parades, and to confer this power on councils of cities and towns. The concurrent bill for the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto would accomplish the same purpose by removing the power from the metropolitan board of commissioners of police to pass bylaws respecting the regulation of parades, and to confer that power on the metropolitan council.

The hon. members will recall that the police commission of Metropolitan Toronto passed a number of bylaws, one of which, when it was finally disclosed, was a bill passed under this section of The Municipal Act which permitted the metropolitan police commission to regulate parades or processions on highways. When the terms of that bylaw were made public it was realized that the bylaw purported to grant to the police the power to determine which signs and which placards and banners could be used in processions and in parades.

We here had expressed, as other people throughout the province had expressed, the view that this was an infringement on the right of people to associate and to parade in carrying out and putting before people the views which they believed in and which they thought deeply about, and that it was not within the power of the police to determine what banners or placards could be carried in parade and to determine the kind of banner and placard that could be carried as a condition of granting a permit to hold the parade. We were satisfied that the general criminal law was sufficient to prohibit any disturbance or breach of the peace in a parade when the parade was under way, but that the permit should not be withheld simply because of the decision of the police as to approval or disapproval of any

banner or placard which was proposed to be carried.

We then raised in this House the question of the referral by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) of that bylaw to the court under the provisions of The Constitutional Questions Act of the province.

Mr. Speaker, it was quite within the hon. Attorney General's power to make that referral to determine the validity of that bylaw, but he chose not to do so. We therefore decided that it was in the interests of the people of the province that this power be now removed from the boards of police commissioners and placed where it properly belongs, namely, within the power of the elected representatives of the people in the councils of the municipalities throughout Ontario.

This briefly is the background of these two bills. We think, having regard to the incident which occurred in Allan Gardens a few weeks ago, which is not directly related to processions or parades, that the proper place for permits to be granted relating to processions and parades and to public meetings, if there is going to be the requirement of permission, is through bylaws passed by councils of the elected representatives of the people of the province.

We would ask the support of the Legislature to make the proposed amendment to The Municipal Act and to the related Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, having in mind the hour, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, this evening, having concluded this hour which was set aside for other public bills and orders, it is our intention at 8 o'clock to return to where we departed at 5 o'clock this afternoon, namely, committee of the whole House, to continue the business which we had in hand at that point.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 8, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, continued	3851
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	3879

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

House in committee; Mr. A. H. Cowling in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The amendment to the section by Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale) is:

1. There is thereby established a corporation without share capital under the name of the Medical Carriers Incorporated, whose membership shall be composed of the licensed carriers and seven members to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

2. The board of directors of the corporation shall consist of seven directors, all of whom shall be representatives of the public and shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

3. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall designate one of the members of council as the chairman.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the amendment now before the committee, I would like to put it to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dymond) that he should do one or the other of two things. Either he should accept the amendment, or at least the principle of it, as proposed by the hon. member for Parkdale, or alternatively, he should strike out subsection 5 of the section.

As the section now stands, subsection 5 gives to the corporation, which is a corporation of private insurance carriers, the power to make recommendations on such vital matters as the changes in benefits, maximum subscription rates, enrolment periods and so on. I submit to the hon. Minister that a group that clearly and openly represents a special interest should not be put in such a preferred position in making recommendations on matters in which it has a direct and immediate interest, which is not necessarily the same interest as that of the public at large.

The hon. member for Parkdale has proposed in his amendment that we overcome this problem by making the corporation a

broadly based body, representing all interests in the community. That would be one way of correcting the difficulty.

The other way, which is the one I would prefer, would be simply to relieve the corporation of any such powers and leave it to deal with matters that obviously are purely of interest to the insurance industry—the powers set forth in subsection 6, for example, with regard to the pooling of standard contracts. Those are matters, I think, that one could say are exclusively, or are primarily at any rate, of interest to the insurance industry. But these other matters set forth in subsection 5 are of broad public interest and I do not believe that a corporation representing only one of the interests affected should be in the preferred position that the bill proposes.

I know the hon. Minister has said that the corporation has power only to make recommendations on these matters. He has pointed out that even if it did not have such power, it would still be in a position as an interested group in the community to make representations to the government. This, I think we can take as common ground. But what I would like to point out to the hon. Minister is that in the section as it now stands, assuming the amendment is not adopted, the corporation is put—and that means the private insurance carriers—in a preferred position, as far as making representations to the government are concerned.

True, other interests—organizations representing the consumers of medical services—can still make representations to the government, but they are then in the position where they have to knock at the Minister's door, or knock at the door of the Cabinet, hoping that sooner or later they may be admitted and that in a cap-in-hand presentation they may be able to persuade the government with respect to such matters as subscription rates, changes in benefits and enrolment periods.

This they can do only by operating from the outside, but in the section as the hon. Minister now proposes it, the insurance industry is on the inside. It does not have to knock at the door. It is right inside the room, sitting at the table, with direct access to

the Minister. It is obviously in a preferred position in relation to any other interest group which have just as great an interest in this matter as the insurance industry. This is what is wrong with this section as it now stands. This is what clearly cries out for change.

If you take the total picture under this bill, the insurance industry is in a preferred position at all stages. They are on the inside, able to get their recommendations to the Minister, leaving others in the position where they have to do the best they can to influence him from the outside. They also are directly represented, and in our opinion, overrepresented, on the council that the bill sets up, again getting direct access to the Minister. Then people representing the public interest have to try to compete against people with that preferred position.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that the position he is giving to the insurance industry under this bill is indefensible. He should either accept the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale, or if he feels disinclined to do that—and I can see his reasons for having hesitation, because this corporation was really intended to be specifically representative of the insurance industry—then I say to him: restrict the powers of the corporation to make recommendations, or otherwise as to those things that are clearly of direct interest to the insurance industry only.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there is a further factor, in addition to those that have been advanced by the hon. members who have spoken so far in connection with this amendment, that I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister. It leads me to plead for some further consideration either on the amendment which is before the House or the alternative, or at least something to alter what I think is a very novel but strange twist in the operation of a free-enterprise approach to private insurance.

If I may just trace the history of this very briefly: In the committee that the hon. Minister set up in 1962, it was recommended that when this body was established, membership in the corporation, which comprised all of the carriers, would not be mandatory, it would be voluntary. In other words, that first advisory group of 24 doctors and 11 spokesmen for the insurance companies said to the hon. Minister, "You shouldn't force. This is all voluntary. You shouldn't force a carrier to have to come in on this corporation and pool risks and have to share the losses around the circle, so to speak."

When the Hagey commission came up with its recommendations, they had buried this. They said, "Oh, no, we won't concede them free enterprise, not complete free enterprise. They are not going to have the opportunity to make a lot of money or lose a lot of money. You must get in with the corporation; it is mandatory, so that you will share your risks and share your losses."

The government has now adopted the Hagey commission recommendation, so that in effect, as I understand the setup, you are going to have the most inefficient carriers protected from the results of their inefficiency, because if their inefficiencies are so great that serious losses are entailed, then those losses will be shared by all who are involved in the corporation in any case.

This is a strange way to operate a private approach, because it is really a combine in which each one protects the other from losses and the people who have to pay for the losses in the final analysis, are going to be the people of the province of Ontario, who are footing the bill for the premiums. If this is free enterprise, it is a very novel concept of free enterprise—at least novel in terms of the government legislating it and proclaiming it as the kind of thing that the government supports.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a strange subsection and I see its strangeness against the background of the comments of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) when he was winding up the debate on second reading. He said that he did not understand the Liberal position in respect to this Act. Indeed, he did not understand it. Our position has been stated in the most distinct terms so that even the most unwary could understand it. We said time and time again that the giving over of the writing of insurance contracts in the health care of our citizens to private interests is a vicious principle. In that position we are supported by no less an influential newspaper than the *Globe and Mail*.

Section 4, of course, enshrines that principle for the first time in the Act. The Act is all right until it gets to section 4, where it hands over the writing of insurance contracts, to private insurance carriers.

Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to that subsection 2, and the proviso in it of the character of the directors of the corporation. Two are to be appointed by physician-sponsored carriers, one by health-insurance co-operatives, and one by self-insurers and all other carriers. I inquire of you, Mr. Chairman, rhetorically, whether it would be contem-

plated in setting up the liquor licence board to have the requirement that before a person could be appointed to that board he would have to own a hotel. In setting up the milk industry board, would it be rational to have a requirement that members of that board own a dairy? In setting up the Ontario motor transport board, would a requirement be rational that you had to own a fleet of transport trucks? Merely to state it shows the irrationality of it.

The government would never tolerate, in any of the three boards that I have stipulated, the owner of an enterprise operating in the field being a member of the board of directors. Yet here in founding the board of directors of the corporation, Medical Carriers Incorporated, one of the foremost prime requirements is that the nominees have to be connected in a most intimate fashion with the carriers. Accordingly, to state it in the way I have stated it, the amendment offered by my friend the hon. member for Parkdale makes eminent good sense and ought to be adopted by every hon. member of the House, and indeed, the executive council itself.

Mr. Chairman, let it be said in supporting this amendment and urging the House to consider it favourably, that this is the section which we in the Liberal Party are against, and which we feel makes this statute a very vicious one.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favour of the amendment because I cannot understand why the corporation should be permitted to recommend to the council, from time to time, changes in benefits. Benefits, under the Act, are either the payment of the fees for the services which are rendered and which are fixed by the statute as being the schedule of fees established by the Ontario medical association and, therefore, the corporation cannot have anything to do with those fees, or they can make recommendations with respect to the performance of those services, under the standard contracts which are to be made available.

It does not seem to me that the carriers themselves should be in a position to make any recommendations whatsoever about the performance of the medical and surgical services which are to be provided to the citizens of the province of Ontario. They have no business in that field whatsoever. It is a matter related entirely to the professional competence and ability of the doctors, and not related in any way to the carriers who are given this privileged position under this Act.

To reiterate again, they cannot make any recommendations about changes in the payments to be made because the government has chosen to enshrine in the statute the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association. It seems obvious to us here that the whole concept of the Medical Carriers Incorporated should be limited to a corporation which is authorized to deal solely, and only, with its internal administrative affairs. It should have nothing whatsoever to do with the scale of benefits or the subscription rates—maximum or otherwise—which are to be charged to the people of the province of Ontario, either directly by payment of premium, or through the subsidies to be provided to certain classes of persons in Ontario.

Similarly, it seems to me that it is not up to the carriers—the Medical Carriers Incorporated—to make any recommendations about the open enrolment period, because the ability to determine the open enrolment period determines also the people in the province of Ontario who are going to be subject to the penalty of a three-month delay period if they should choose to enroll, or not be in a position to enroll at any time other than during an open enrolment period.

The hon. Minister himself has said that the three months' delay is in the nature of a penalty, and we here certainly do not think that the Medical Carriers Incorporated should be in a position to make the kind of recommendations which would ultimately impose a penalty of a three-month delay on citizens who wanted to join in the scheme, and obtain standard medical contract coverage.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, in answering some of the remarks that have been made, I might agree with the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), who suggested that this amendment might have been improved upon, but after all, this entire bill could be improved on in a great many ways. But what we wish to get across is the idea of the amendment in section 4—to avoid a very serious offence against the common sense of the entire administration of this bill, of leaving the real power in the hands of the insurance companies.

The debate has only served to prove—after listening to what the hon. Minister of Health has said—that he is determined that the insurance companies are going to have their pound of flesh—their 28 cents on the dollar. Again, I repeat, this is the thing that should be avoided, and we in this Legislature do a great disservice to the people of the province of Ontario if we pass this section without the amendment.

Secondly, I say again that it restricts the whole progress of the bringing about of proper health services in the province of Ontario. Again you have entrenched an already powerful lobby. The hon. Minister of Health said that there are lobbies anyway—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I never said any such thing!

Mr. Trotter: You said there were lobbies—*you* certainly did—before six o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I deny that statement categorically, and I expect the hon. member to accept my denial.

Mr. Trotter: I heard you.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, what I did say was that if the insurance carriers were going to lobby, they would lobby anyway. I did not say that there was an insurance lobby.

Mr. Trotter: You know perfectly well they lobby! You know perfectly well that the insurance companies are the most powerful lobby in the Dominion of Canada, and all you are doing is sitting there and serving their purposes and doing a disservice to the people of the province of Ontario.

In this section it is the difference between administrative costs of five cents on the dollar and 28 cents on the dollar. This is what you are doing, and to say that to sit on this type of board that you have to be in the insurance business, is silly. Do you have to own a radio station to be on the board of broadcast governors? Of course not! There are so many things—as the hon. member for Sudbury said, “Do you have to milk a cow to be on the milk board?”

So again, I say the arguments of the hon. Minister of Health are specious, and as the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Troy) says: “Over there they are milking the public.” Again, I say, in summing up this debate, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): You do not really mean that!

Mr. Trotter: I most certainly do! The whole tenor of this debate—whether on principle, or debating it section by section—has been simply this: that you have to take the profit out of health insurance; that the people of the province of Ontario, and for that matter of the Dominion of Canada, cannot afford the heavy burden of the present system that is being set up; and in this section is the particular administrative system. I say that it is

a shame and a disgrace the way that you are handling this whole setup of health insurance, and I am asking this House to support the amendment.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members have completely lost the central theme of this section altogether. Three or four of them, Mr. Chairman, have made a great to-do about throwing everything in the hands of the carriers. Reading a paragraph—

Mr. Sopha: You are afraid of them!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not afraid of them, nor of you. Reading paragraph 2 of the section, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor?

A reading of paragraph 2 of the section—a glance at it, even—will show that the so-called non-profit carriers are four to two. There are two representatives of the indemnity carriers and there are—Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor?

Mr. Chairman: Gentlemen, I must ask that we observe the ordinary rules of courtesy in this debate. I can appreciate that the feelings are high in this debate, but please, gentlemen, let us be courteous.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as I said, it is readily noted that the Act states that only two representatives shall be placed on this corporation to look after the interests of the Canadian health insurance association or the indemnity companies, and there are nearly 200 of them operating in the province of Ontario, as against some 44—probably a total of 55 to 60—of all others put together and these are represented by four.

Now, the hon. member for Sudbury drew a very odd analogy—would we put hotel operators or brewers or something of that kind, on the liquor licence board? This is an entirely different thing. It would be like our setting up legislation here—as it would be in selecting the personnel of the board of the breweries and putting on it people who had no connection with the business whatsoever. This corporation has nothing to do with the programme. This corporation is only looking after the business of the insurance carriers, and the fact that one clause gives them the right to make recommendations does not put them in any favoured position.

Mr. Bryden: It does.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does not. The outsiders have exactly the same opportunity and right to make recommendations that the carriers have. Also the section does not give them right of access to the Minister. There is nothing in the Act which gives this. They may, and can, make recommendations to the council, which in turn, makes its recommendations to the Minister. The public has just as much chance of having direct access to the Minister as the corporation—and probably a great deal more. You will have to take my word for that.

I see no basis for the fears expressed here by the hon. members of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat what I said before we rose for dinner, that I can see nothing to be gained—indeed, I can see a good deal of difficulty, if we accept this amendment.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Health is answering questions at this point, I would like to ask a question under 45 (g)—4 (g), I guess it is. You ask why is the corporation allowed to designate who will offer the co-insurance contract? Why cannot any carrier automatically offer the co-insurance contract?

And while I am referring to that—because I know the hon. Minister of Health in no way would want to give just one side of the picture—I would like to mention, with your indulgence, sir, that he emphasized the report and the study that has taken place in British Columbia. The hon. Minister referred to Joan Hollobon, and he mentioned that on a number of occasions they found in British Columbia that the means test apparently was something that really was not of that much concern.

I wonder if he would have also mentioned—as was stated in Joan Hollobon's articles—that the people of British Columbia did not want a co-insurance contract; that they were not keen on this. I wonder if the hon. Minister would give cognizance to this, why has he got this co-insurance contract aspect in his bill, when he emphasized that one of the reasons for referring to these surveys was that he placed great emphasis on them.

I hope that at this point—because I know that he is a fair man and not blinded by blinkers when he sees some survey—the hon. Minister will tell us why he has this co-insurance contract in, and why he is giving the power of deciding which insurance companies can have co-insurance contracts to this corporation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have no hesitation in telling the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman. I did read that part of the survey, and I am quite prepared to admit that the co-insurance contract is not a popular one, but there is a—

Mr. Thompson: I do not wish to interrupt, sir, but could I say that it was clear that they wanted comprehensive coverage—a universal coverage—instead of a co-insurance.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They wanted first dollar coverage. The great majority of people want first dollar coverage, but there is, at the same time, a sizeable number who do want co-insurance—

Mr. Thompson: How do you know?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I know from insurance corporation experience. I know from my own practice, and I know from talking to many people across the country about this, but—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: May I say that the hon. Minister of Health has more manners than some others in this House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to suggest to the hon. House leader that if he could follow the example of some of his colleagues there would be a better relationship in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: What kind of surveys?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Health asked that you should take charge because of some unruliness. Might I also pray that you would do the same?

Mr. Chairman: I am trying to keep order.

Mr. Thompson: Sometimes in situations, you know, sir, people want to make noise because they have not any sense in them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Thompson: What kind of surveys have been done, may I ask, sir? The hon. Minister says he has done a survey in his own village of Port Perry, the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) says that he wants co-insurance. What other surveys has he done on such an important question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, once again my hon. friend seems to read words into what I say that were not uttered. At least I have no recollection of uttering them. I did not at any time say I had made a survey of my own home town. I said that in my own practice I had come across a great number of people who preferred the co-insurance, or a deductible. Indeed, this is a very popular policy in the rural co-operatives. Almost every rural co-operative has a deductible feature, and this is one of the features upon which they have built the strength of their movement. A great many people are willing to take the risk, and in a number of the rural co-operatives the deductible is \$15. A great many people are quite prepared to take that preliminary risk on their own because of the advance they gain by a much lower premium.

It would seem to me quite wrong that we should take this away altogether from those who want it. This is completely permissive, there is nothing mandatory about it. We do lay down that a certain number—a reasonable number of insurance carriers—should offer this type of contract, and that it should be the standard contract on a co-insurance deductible basis. But there is nothing mandatory about it. We believed that the insurance industry was probably the best equipped to advise us on the carriers who were geared and prepared to offer this sort of policy. That is the only reasoning behind it. There is nothing sinister, nothing underhand.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister a further question in this respect? Since we are being asked to vote on this clause, and the carriers are going to determine this particular aspect of policy, then I think we should have some idea of what the co-insurance policy means.

The hon. Minister mentioned that the co-ops have built a large backlog of business on the basis of \$15 deductible, and I can understand that, because a \$15 bill is not too heavy. But if the deductible gets up to \$50, as is the case in many of these policies, then this House should know what the government has in mind as far as the co-insurance aspect is concerned. What is this standard co-insurance policy that we are supposed to legislate on here tonight? We do not know. The hon. Minister is asking us to vote on something about which we have no knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have had occasion to say several times, in all the time we have had this bill before the House that it is very obvious to me that the hon. members of the Opposition have not read the

bill. I am absolutely positive of that tonight, because the very question asked by the hon. member is answered on page 16 of the bill, under schedule B.

Mr. Sopha: About this weird section, may I ask the hon. Minister—he did not like my analogy about these others boards—with reference to subsection 7, if he knows of any other corporation that does not hold a meeting of the shareholders?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, these are the shareholders—the directors are representing the shareholders.

Mr. Sopha: Well, does the hon. Minister know any other corporation that is not required by law to hold a meeting of the shareholders, a meeting of those people they represent?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not know anything about corporation law. I take it that the insurance carriers, as I said before, are big boys and quite capable of looking after their own interests and I am not really worried about them.

Mr. Sopha: Surely the hon. Minister knows that under The Corporations Act they are required to hold an annual meeting of shareholders.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really could not care less. If they do not observe the terms of The Corporations Act, and I am quite certain they will, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) is quite capable of enforcing it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I see the hon. Minister has difficulty in understanding tonight. I will put it in more lucid terms. Can the hon. Minister tell me any good reason why the board of directors who have the right to exercise the powers of the corporation should not hold a democratic annual meeting of the people whom they represent—200 carriers?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is up to themselves, Mr. Chairman. It has got nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. Sopha: Well, why does the hon. Minister not make it mandatory by law?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Sopha: Why does he leave it? For all we know, and it is probably the truth, the board of directors of this corporation will meet in the National club, or the Toronto club, or the York club or the other places

where real power is exercised in this province, where the establishment meets. Can the hon. Minister give me any good reason why they should not be required to give an account of their stewardship to the 200 carriers they represent?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, once again I direct your attention to the fact that the hon. member very obviously has not read the bill. If he read subparagraph 14 of the same section he would find that the corporation shall furnish copies of the minutes of the meetings of its members and of its board of directors to the council, and, in addition, such reports and information as the council may require from time to time.

I do not believe, sir, that it is my responsibility to legislate how this corporation should look after its own business. Mr. Chairman, it has nothing whatsoever to do with the operation of this plan. This corporation is being set up to look after the business of the insurance carriers who are involved in the business of providing insurance coverage for our people. Whether they observe the terms of The Corporations Act or not could not mean a bit less to me. That is their responsibility, and if their shareholders are quite prepared to turn over the responsibility of the business to their board of directors, that I think is their business.

I, as a shareholder in a company, may determine that I am quite satisfied to let the directors look after my interest. I do not think that legislators have any business in it at all so long as the public interest is not being detrimentally affected.

Mr. Sopha: How does the hon. Minister know that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are talking about a corporation without share capital.

Mr. Sopha: How does he know that? If I invest \$10 for one share of Canadian Breweries I am entitled to go to the annual meeting to get an account of the stewardship of the executive, of the directors. We have 200 carriers, and the hon. Minister gets up and confesses blandly—and expects us to accept it—that he does not know anything about corporation law. Well, why he did not ask the deputy Provincial Secretary? Does the hon. Minister notice how I emphasize “deputy” Provincial Secretary? Why did he not ask him? I know of no other corporation in the province that is not required to hold a democratic annual meeting to give an account of what has been done in the preceding year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Sopha: I have my democratic rights.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: The truth is that when one examines the section, the government—through the hon. Minister of Health and the draftsmen of this legislation—are decreeing the antithesis of democracy. They are decreeing that there shall not be an annual meeting for these people to give an account of what they are doing to the 200 members.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Filibustering.

Mr. Sopha: Do not mistake noise for common sense, my hon. friend. Under our Corporations Act we impose democracy. It is called “dollar democracy.” The one with the most number of shares controls the corporation, but we impose the requirement of holding an annual meeting to give an account of what they have done and to allow the shareholders to question the actions of the directors. Now along comes the hon. Minister of Health, who confesses his ignorance of corporation law, and he decrees in mandatory fashion, that there shall not be an annual meeting.

In other words, all of the power shall be exercised exclusively by the directors, apparently without regard to the wishes of 200 carriers, quite a large number of co-operatives and quite a large number of physicians’ plans. There are going to be seven of them invested with sole power to administer all their affairs, and they will never be called to account.

I must confess in closing, that I know of one other corporation in Ontario that administers the affairs of a large number of people, of which I am a member, and which never holds an annual meeting. I thought it was an anomaly. That is the law society of Upper Canada, and that is the only other one.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, in my question of the hon. Minister a while ago, he made his reply and schedule B is here, but it still has not fully answered the question I asked in respect to this contract. We have outlined here what the contract is, but we have not outlined what the cost is going to be to the people of the province, and I think this is the important question of the whole matter.

We are going to give the corporation a chance to regulate in this regard, and yet we are being asked to pass a bill, but we have no idea what the cost of this is going to be to the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have already said, during the debate on second reading, that I was not in a position to tell them costs. I gave the costs that would directly affect the government of Ontario. I have already put those on the record. I can only give examples of the cost.

Now this bill, as I have stated before and I must repeat for emphasis, is not going to change the present pattern of insurance in the province. There is nothing in the bill that would lead anyone, even in his wildest dreams, to imagine that it will alter the pattern as it now exists. I can only give you some examples of what happened in the province which is quoted by some of you from time to time, the province of Alberta.

There, the maximum premium is \$63, \$126 and \$159, the premium chargeable to people who pay their own, running at \$44 per annum. This is for a single. It is \$57.75 for 40 years of age and over, by another carrier; another carrier, \$36 for a single individual; another carrier, \$40 for a single individual; couples, \$115.50; another carrier, for a couple \$96 and \$120, and where both persons are 65, that same carrier charges \$126.

Mr. Young: Is this co-insurance?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, this is full payment. I have no idea what the co-insurance would be. The premium for the co-insurance is that much less, dependent upon the amount of deductible and the amount of the co-insurance.

Another carrier, for a family of three, \$132; another carrier, \$145.75; another carrier, \$122.

These are the actual premiums charged, and this pattern has not changed one bit in almost two years of operation in the province of Alberta. Now I can see no reason—

Mr. Young: Would this be slightly different policies, or the same policies?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are comparable policies. They will not be exactly the same, but we have tried to equate them as nearly as possible. One may provide certain benefits, and another may provide somewhat different benefits. You will understand that it is not possible to equate these exactly, because there may be greater demand for one than for the other. But this is a pattern

that was existing before the Alberta plan went into operation. This is the pattern which is existing at the present time.

Now, you may immediately wonder why the difference between these premiums and the ones that I have stated for ours. We have worked this out, and the difference between our levels of premiums is exactly 15 per cent, and the difference between the fee schedule in Alberta and the fee schedule in Ontario is 15 per cent. So our levels are exactly on a par with Alberta, having regard to the differences in the costs of medical care.

I would like again to point out to my hon. friend from Sudbury, Mr. Chairman, that the corporation which is set up here is a corporation without share capital and, as I understand it, there is not the same demand for an annual meeting. But I would like to refer to one who is learned in the law, because I do not think that I am now interested in studying law, after listening to my hon. friend.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): I wonder, if perhaps just to straighten the records here, in the normal course of all corporations here in this province, the business of the corporation is conducted by the board of directors, and then the shareholders have certain rights.

Mr. Sopha: That is what happened in Windfall.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, it may have happened, wherever it happened, but that is the law, and that is the normal procedure—that the directors conduct the affairs of companies, and the shareholders have supervision at certain times.

Now, in regard to non-share capital companies, there is a part of The Companies Act which provides for them, and which provides for annual meetings, and provides for measurements. All companies, whether they are incorporated by special Act, or by other Act, or by charter, in the nature of non-share companies, are subject to the provisions of The Corporations Act.

Mr. Sopha: No, sir.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, all right, just a minute.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, if I may interrupt this for a moment. It is not our wish that this company not be subject to those, and if there is a difference of opinion between the legal people

here in the House—and I suppose each one is expressing the opinion he carries from his own private practice—I would be very happy to see that this point is looked into. If a section is needed to make it applicable, it will be put in. If, in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown it is not necessary, then we can show the report to the House.

But I just want to make it clear that the assumption is that the provisions of The Corporations Act in regard to the affairs of this corporation per se, would apply. If they do not, we will make sure that they do.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: May I just infer that my hon. friend understands law when it is given to him right by verse and scripture here.

Section 100 of part 3 of The Corporations Act provides that this part, except where it is otherwise expressly provided—and it is the part with respect to corporations without share capital—applies; (c) to every corporation incorporated by, or under, a general or special Act of the Legislature, and unless there is a specific exception in this Act to that, that is the law.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to indulge in pettifoggery, but that part you read is from the part of The Corporations Act referring to corporations without share capital.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is what this one is.

Mr. Sopha: This section 4 does not so identify that corporation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does indeed. Mr. Chairman, section 4 says:

There is hereby established a corporation without share capital.

It is stated specifically in the Act, and I would like to advise you, sir, and through you the hon. members of the House, that the law officers of this government have already checked this bill, and they assure me that this is quite in keeping with established law.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment of the member for Parkdale say "aye."

Those who are opposed say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment, please stand.

All those opposed to the amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 25 and the "nays" 50.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 4 agreed to.

Mr. Sopha: I move that subsection 2 of section 4 be amended by deleting the words—

Mr. Chairman: Section 4 is carried.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, I can move another amendment.

Mr. Chairman: No, the whole thing is carried.

Mr. Sopha: Where is the rule that says that?

Mr. Chairman: This is the rule we have been carrying on.

On section 5:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the amendment moved by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Parkdale, only impeached subsections 1 and 2. It did not impeach the principle of the bill. It is not an analogy to rule 56 which is applicable to section readings. There are altogether 14 subsections to this section, if I may have your attention.

Mr. Chairman: They should all have been included in the one.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 5, I think section 5 merits more than any other section in the bill—

Mr. McKeough: That is what the hon. member said about 3 and 4.

Mr. Chairman: Order! If we had fewer interruptions we would get along much better.

Mr. Renwick: The blatant hypocrisy of the government in putting this bill forward is in the purpose they have given for the bill—the main purpose of the bill as stated in the explanatory note—is to make medical services insurance available to every resident of Ontario regardless of age, state of past or present health, financial means or occupation! Section 5 incorporates those very words in the section which is the principle of the bill. But the strange thing about this bill, the only bill that I have ever seen in which this could be done, is that you can take section 5, remove it entirely from the bill and you then have the exact bill which this government is putting

before this Legislature. You do not need section 5, either subsections 1 or 2, for the purpose of carrying out the intention of this government, so far as this medical insurance plan is concerned.

I draw your attention simply to section 6, which provides the section under which subsidies are going to be provided. Then I draw your attention to section 9 which states that standard medical insurance contracts will be offered for sale to persons who are eligible and who apply and pay the subscription therefor. Section 14 then determines the persons who are able to get that kind of a contract.

When you read section 9, section 6 and section 14, you realize that the phraseology in section 5 has no relationship whatsoever to the plan which the government is putting forward. Certainly to say in one section of this bill, which is the principle of the bill, that standard medical services insurance contracts shall be made available to residents and their dependants, without regard to age, physical or mental infirmities, financial means or occupation, is directly contrary to a section which states that licensed carriers shall offer for sale and issue standard medical service insurance contracts, and may offer for sale and issue standard co-insurance medical insurance contracts, to persons who are eligible and who apply and pay the subscription therefor.

If you have to pay the subscription therefor, it is not up to any other section of this bill to state that it is made available to people without regard to their financial means. And if you will carefully examine every section of the bill you can simply take out section 5—which incorporates the so-called principle of the government's bill—and you have a complete bill in front of you.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of our group here, section 5 is nothing but window dressing, and it was passed as the so-called principle of this bill and it has no relationship whatsoever to the remainder of the Act.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a couple of observations on section 5. During the process of the debate on second reading, there was brought to the attention of the government the important paramedical groups against whom this bill, in the eyes of several of us, discriminated. Indeed, I would suggest not only in the eyes of the Opposition, but of some of the hon. government members who had some very strong contacts with the group to which I make reference and are equally persuaded of the validity of their claim on the medical insurance compensation. The

groups are, as the House knows full well, the oral surgeons, the optometrists, the chiropractors, the osteopath—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, with very great respect, I would suggest that this is entirely out of order. This is included in the principle of the bill, the principle which was fully debated and agreed upon by this House. I, therefore, suggest that this is not in order at this time.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to agree with the Minister of Health that this is out of order, because it was voted on at the time; definitely voted on.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, would you be prepared to entertain some alternative points of view, or were these things cut and dried before we came in here?

Mr. Chairman: Not by me.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would suggest to you, sir, that the content of standard contracts is very much relevant to this bill. The question of whether we make a certain extension of them or reduction of them, that is surely within the terms of the bill. To say that we cannot, in any sense, suggest any extension of the type of coverage proposed in the standard contract, I submit to you, sir, is quite improper. My hon. friend is suggesting that in certain cases, certain other people besides physicians performing services that are normally considered to be those of physicians, should be recognized.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—Mr. Chairman, and I think I have a right—

Mr. Bryden: I am speaking to a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am speaking to a point of order on the hon. member's point of order.

Mr. Bryden: Well, why should he get up in the middle of my speech—

Mr. Chairman: The Minister can raise a point of order on another member's point of order.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I raise a point of order on this point of order that he should sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglington): The hon. member for Woodbine has the floor.

Mr. Chairman: The point of order of the member for Woodbine. He rose on a point of order.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, sir, and I was still speaking to it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, in that case, you speak.

Mr. Bryden: I was arguing to you, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order.

Mr. Bryden: I am speaking in regard to the point of order that you permitted me to do, that is, in regard to the point of order raised by the hon. Minister. I was making my comment that what the hon. member for Scarborough West wishes to do is perfectly in order in any reasonable interpretation of the rules.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Let him speak for himself.

Mr. Bryden: What place? You might as well get it over with here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is the point of order on which I rose.

Mr. Bryden: He was the one who started the argument. What we are dealing with here are standard contracts.

Mr. Chairman: Let me quote you rule 49: The subject matter which has been decided upon cannot be again proposed during the same session. Now, we have decided upon this.

Mr. MacDonald: When did we decide?

Mr. Chairman: In second reading. I submit to you there was an amendment at the time.

Mr. Bryden: There was an amendment attacking the principle of the bill. We are now dealing with a specific section, and a specific point within the framework of the bill, namely, the content of the standard contracts. We wish to propose that one variation be made in the government's proposal in relation to those contracts.

Surely, that is the type of matter that is properly dealt with in committee. The hon. Minister says it should be dealt with under another section. Well, I would say that a section dealing with standard contracts is as good a place as any to deal with the content of standard contracts.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is what I have been trying to say and what I

must repeat for emphasis again—it is obvious the hon. members have not read their bills.

On page 15 of the bill, under schedule A, the standard medical services insurance contract will come up, and surely that is the place to deal with the content of the contracts.

Mr. Bryden: No, Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Bryden: I assure the hon. Minister that I have read the bill at least as well as he has, and I get the impression from some of his comments that he is not too familiar with it.

But there is absolutely nothing that requires that a matter of this kind has to be dealt with under the schedule. We believe it is important enough that it should be within the main body of the Act, and we have the option of making our proposals when we are dealing with the relevant section in the Act. There is nothing that says we have to wait—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine was up on a point of order. Now the member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to remind the House that when the hon. Minister of Health first rose in agitated furore, he said, on a point of order, that I was out of order because what I was discussing had been dealt with earlier on principle in second reading and was, therefore, not valid. He rises three minutes later to say that it is invalid because it can be dealt with under the subsection relating to the standard contract.

You cannot have it both ways. Either it is out of order totally, or it is in order totally. I strongly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it does fall foursquare within section 5, and if I may be permitted to read the amendment that I wish to make, I think the House can be persuaded of that.

I would suggest and move that section 5 of Bill 136 be amended by adding thereto the following subsection 3:

(3) Standard contracts shall provide that, in cases where services for which fees are provided in the Ontario medical association's schedule of fees and are performed by oral surgeons, optometrists, chiropractors or osteopaths, licensed or registered under any statute of Ontario, payment for such services shall be provided under the contracts in the same manner as if they were provided by a physician.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the amendment, as it stands, falls within section 5. It relates directly to what should be included within a standard contract. It relates to the Ontario medical association's fees governing the amounts to be paid out under section 5. It relates to statutes that are passed in this House, and would apply, therefore, to section 5. So, humbly, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the subsection is in order, the amendment is in order and I wish the hon. Minister would allow it to be open for debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that the amendment is out of order in that, I am of the opinion—and I think this is a question of judgment that must be made by whoever presides—this is one of the principles which was discussed on second reading, which was how far the benefits under this bill would extend. There was a long argument, and I do not propose to repeat it, but I think that the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough West really strikes right at one of the basic principles that was decided when the bill was given second reading by this House.

As I say, I am fully of the opinion, and aware that in dealing in committee these matters are a question of degree. I put my opinion before the House that the degree to which, and the distance to which, this amendment goes, is certainly far enough to get right to one of the principles of the bill which was discussed in second reading.

Mr. Bryden: It goes very little distance at all.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to rule these extra services included in here were all included in the amendment by the Liberal Opposition on second reading.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in the first amendment that I proposed, I was taking back a number of private carriers, suggesting that it would be under one—a voluntary one—in the definition of the doctor. This was omission, you might say, and we were going back on it.

Now we talk about commission, adding to it, and you, sir, with a background in the Anglican Church, know the phrase with respect to omissions and commissions. It is a beseeching that we all make. Here we are, asking can we either suggest that there be some extension, or that there should be something pulled back. You are going to muzzle us to the extent that we can make no kind of contribution—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Wish we could muzzle you.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Thompson: Well, that might be your wish, but I assure you we will not be muzzled. We are quite prepared to listen, and we have done it for many years now, to the kind of raucous bullying that some hon. members would try to impose on us. But I can assure you we will not bow our heads.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that if you are going to limit us, so that we cannot talk about certain extensions in benefits, then what is the purpose of discussing this bill?

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that after listening to what the hon. member for Scarborough West said, I do not think this extends the services under this Act at all. As I listened—and I listened rather carefully—it suggested that those services that can and are done in some instances by the medical profession, now also can be done by chiropractors or optometrists and that they could be included under the Act. I would suggest that it does not extend the service one single bit, but rather that some of the things done by the medical profession now can be done by chiropractors and optometrists, and so on, and be paid by the moneys under this Act. I do not think it extends the services one single bit, and, therefore, I would suggest that this amendment is very much in order.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, before the Chairman comes to his ruling. I appreciate the feelings in the hon. Prime Minister's mind, and perhaps I did not make this sufficiently clear before the hon. member just spoke. I think, Mr. Chairman, there is a qualitative difference between the Liberal amendment and this amendment which I have just moved.

The Liberal amendment referred to all services. It was a comprehensive amendment. It included all the paramedical groups, and all the services that they could dispenze.

We are relating simply to the services which would be given under this bill, as of right, under the Ontario medical association fee schedule. It is precisely within the bill as designed. It simply extends payment to other groups who provide those services, to other than general practitioners, and frankly, Mr. Chairman, that seems to me completely within the accord of this bill.

Mr. Chairman: On May 25, the leader of Opposition moved, seconded by the member

for Grey South, Mr. Oliver, that a comprehensive government-operated universal health programme be instituted; that patients have the right to be treated by the doctor of their choice; that doctors shall be paid on a fee-for-service basis and shall be free to practise within or without the plan; there shall be no means test; mental illness shall be treated on the same basis as other illnesses; dental and optical services for children up to 18 years of age shall be included; other ancillary medical and health care services, such as home nursing, or orthopaedic appliances, chiropractic services and so forth, shall be phased into the programme as independent health services in order that the programme shall be fully comprehensive by 1971. The bill, in its final form, shall be of such a nature that the programme can be readily integrated into a national health programme for all Canadians.

That was voted down. Now this is the same thing.

Mr. S. Lewis: I do not think it is.

Mr. MacDonald: You are missing the point.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: How many can talk at once?

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, under the schedule proposed by the hon. Minister of Health, he suggests: "9. Examination of the eyes by refraction."

The question we are asking, and I assume this is in this bill, is whether the optometrists, if they do refractions, will be covered by this bill? And dental care, 2(b). Does this include dentists? These are the questions that we want to ask, whether the professional people who will be working on the outline of benefits, will include optometrists and dentists and so on, and chiropractors.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, these are exceptions. These are listed in the bill as exceptions, under the contract. They are not provisions.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to argue on the same ground as the hon. leader of the Opposition. But surely this is crystal clear. You, Mr. Chairman, are painfully aware of the fact that the medical profession has been keeping certain groups out on the fringe, in terms of full practice. Yet even the medical profession, through the Ontario medical association, has conceded that in certain instances, oral surgeons,

optometrists, chiropractors, osteopaths, will have payments made under the OMA schedule of fees. So that even in the monopoly that the medical profession has sustained for years—and wants to sustain—they have at least conceded something to these groups along the way.

What we are saying is that what the medical profession has conceded up until now, and is covered at the moment under the OMA schedule of fees, is to be eliminated by this bill. What the hon. Minister is attempting to do—and I am utterly astounded that he should argue that he is not acting on behalf of the medical association and the insurance companies, is to bring in a bill that narrows the monopoly even more than the medical association has done. He wants to deprive the osteopaths, the oral surgeons, the optometrists, of payments they have been getting up until now, by concession of the medical profession and the OMA schedule of fees.

We are not asking for a wide extension, such as was included in the Liberal amendment. All we are asking is that this government be not so solicitous of the medical profession as to narrow their monopoly beyond what even they have conceded down through the years and not to discriminate against these people. That is not within the four corners of the amendment that has been voted on.

Mr. Chairman: I have no alternative but to follow the rules as set forth here, and I have to rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Has it occurred to you that throughout the whole of the debate the rules have been interpreted so as to stifle the Opposition?

Mr. Chairman: I do not think there is any stifling.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Prime Minister did not want to vote against osteopaths and dental surgeons and chiropractors. He did not want to be put in the position of voting, so he stood up and said this was out of order—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would like—

Mr. Sopha: —and the rules are interpreted so that we are always out of order—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member, when he calms down a bit, will realize that if amendments are made that are out of order, they are out of order. I

will abide by the decision of whoever leads this House, and I always have—

Mr. Bryden: Always your way.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I can only say it is not my fault if you persist in making amendments that are out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat that this does not call for the extension of any services. It allows the—

Mr. Chairman: Order. Order. The Chairman's ruling is not debatable. If you want to challenge it, that is your business.

Mr. Sopha: How can we challenge it, a mere 30 of us?

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard you say: "I think I must rule against the amendment." I thought there might, therefore, be some modest flexibility—

Mr. Chairman: No, until I got the votes and proceedings, then I had no alternative.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, then, on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister through you, at this juncture in the debate, whether we will have the opportunity under the schedule, to ask for some answers, not make amendments, only to ask for some answers relating to the questions that have been raised at this point? I am frankly mystified as to why he takes the stand he does, and rather than move a succession of amendments to extend the standard contract through the course of the debate, will the hon. Minister commit himself to answering those questions?

Mr. Chairman: You are at liberty to ask any questions you desire.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to answer questions to the best of my ability, as I have tried to do throughout the whole procedure.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question right now, then. Is it a fact that under this bill, assuming it is passed—

Mr. Reilly: What section is this?

Mr. Bryden: I am talking about the standard contracts. Under the standard contract as provided by this bill, if you wish to put it that way—assuming it goes through in essentially its present form—a person who goes to an oculist—I think that is the proper

term, a medical practitioner at any rate who specializes in eyes—and receives an eye examination, will he receive coverage under this bill as it now stands?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not if the examination is for refraction.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask a further question on that, because this is obviously the point, Mr. Chairman?

If a patient is brought into hospital with a serious jaw fracture—that frequently happens—and the surgeons at the hospital, the medical practitioners deemed as such by this Act, consult together and decide—as is common practice—that the person most capable of performing the necessary operation is an oral surgeon, will that oral surgeon be compensated for that service under this Act, since it is a service within the Ontario medical association fee schedule?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there is a very great difference of opinion between the Royal college of dental surgeons and the college of physicians and surgeons on this matter, and they, together with the deans of the faculties of medicine and of dentistry, are studying the matter to advise me on it. I am very much concerned about this particular matter. I recognize that what the hon. member has said applies particularly in the teaching centres, is a very essential part of the teaching of dentistry and it is getting every possible attention and consideration.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Minister of Health define for us in layman's terms what he actually means by "refraction," and could this not be covered by an optometrist? That is the question I am getting at. What difference would there be if it were done by other than an optometrist?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Refraction is examination of the eyes to determine if one needs glasses and to check one's vision. It is one of the important functions performed by the optometrist. In the wisdom of the committee, where this was considered very carefully and was very thoroughly discussed, it was the recommendation that it be excluded.

I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that this has been done in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, and it is, with the exception of the doctor-sponsored plan in Manitoba, excluded in many contracts. It is excluded in many contracts here in Ontario, and in the doctor-sponsored plans it is a fee for benefit only and is carried out by ophthalmologists.

For the present time, it was deemed best to exclude this from our standard contracts.

Mr. Thompson: When you say that there was representation and study made of this, were optometrists asked to give their point of view to you, and did they do so?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We did not do the study, Mr. Chairman. This was done by the Hagey committee, and optometrists made their submissions to the committee and these, together with all the others, were carefully studied.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the hon. Minister need bother citing the Hagey commission with a view to convincing us; not even he was very much convinced of the validity of its report. We consider that it was a totally useless effort and a waste of time—so it cuts no ice with us.

I would like to get back to the question of oral surgery. The hon. Minister said that the point raised by my hon. friend from Scarborough West is now under consideration by representatives of the medical association and the Royal college of dental surgeons, and he expects that they will advise him in due course. The only problem is that we are dealing with the legislation now. Is this legislation in such form that the services of oral surgeons can be included or excluded at the whim of the hon. Minister? My impression of the bill, as it now stands, is that the services of oral surgeons will not be covered, but if such operations are performed by a licensed member of the medical profession, they will be covered. In other words, it is straight discrimination.

The situation could be even worse, if it is simply a matter that is left to the whim of the hon. Minister. What about this? Is this clearly stated in the bill or not? Is my interpretation wrong that the services of oral surgeons are excluded from the bill?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the interpretation of the hon. member is wrong in so far as his charge of discrimination is concerned. This is a very difficult point, and while it is not stated in the bill, the programme does not come into effect until June 1, 1966. If legislative change is required, we will have time to make it. I believe that it can be done by regulation. There is one great difference between this service and other ancillary health care services, in that dental-oral surgery is done within a hospital. If the dental-oral surgeon has the right to practise surgery within the hospital, he is actually under the direction of the chief of surgery and this puts it in a somewhat different category.

The optometrist, of course, does not practise

within a hospital, nor do those offering many of the other ancillary services.

Mr. Bryden: Nothing to break the medical guild; they keep it all under their control.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If my hon. friend would just be reasonable. After all, if you want to practise medicine, my friend, there is no law that keeps you out of medical school, but if you want to run through the back door, you cannot expect the rights and privileges of the profession.

Mr. Bryden: Are you suggesting that oral surgeons have had a quick run through the back door?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not talking about oral surgeons, Mr. Chairman; I was talking about the hon. member. He certainly is not an oral surgeon.

Mr. Bryden: What has that got to do—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He may be a linguistic surgeon, but he certainly is not an oral one.

I only want to point out, Mr. Chairman—I am trying to make it as clear to the hon. member as possible, that this is a difficult area and somewhat unique compared with some of the other services that have been mentioned. It is still being given a great deal of careful study.

Mr. Bryden: The one thing that the hon. Minister made clear in the midst of his various irrelevancies was this: What is mainly being taken care of is, that the whole thing is being kept tightly in the hands of the medical profession. That is exactly what he made clear; he stated that if an oral surgeon performs surgery within his specialty in a hospital, it is under the control of the medical profession and therefore it might be acceptable. But actually, as the bill stands—we might as well face it right now—unless it should later be amended, the bill discriminates between two groups of professionally qualified people. On the one hand there are licensed medical practitioners—those who are defined in this bill as “physicians,” the only people who count as far as the bill is concerned. If they perform work that an oral surgeon may also be qualified to do under the bill as it now stands, payment will be made for their services under a standard contract.

If an oral surgeon, who may have considerably greater competence in that specialty, performs the operation, there will be no payment for the services under a standard contract. Now let us face it: That is what the

situation is and the hon. Minister can make all the cheap gibes he wishes about me—as to whether or not I am qualified in medicine. What has that got to do with it? I am qualified to deal with this bill; I represent the public along with other hon. members. The hon. Minister of Health always forgets that they are the people for whom this legislation is allegedly designed, although it becomes clearer as the discussion proceeds that as far as the government is concerned, it is not designed for the public at all.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. Suppose a patient went to a hospital to have his teeth extracted—and, of course, the anaesthetic would be given by a medical practitioner—would that part of the operation deal with extracting of the teeth? Would the giving of the anaesthetic be covered under this bill?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it would.

Mr. S. Lewis: Because the hon. Minister has made a special point of it, sir, I am going to pursue it for a moment longer. I assure the House that it will not be at great length.

I accept, for the moment, his distinction between the osteopaths, chiropractors and optometrists on the one hand, and the oral surgeons on the other, and I would say this, Mr. Chairman, that the other distinction the hon. Minister made is less commendable, because oral surgeons perform all kinds of complex procedures within their offices. They do so at the behest of the medical profession, to take the pressure off hospital beds. They are actually asked to do so by the medical profession and there are many instances on record—they are in the medical journals—of oral surgeons literally saving patients who had been either maltreated or ineffectively treated by general practitioners, unskilled in the art of oral surgery.

I strongly suggest to the hon. Minister, that it is not only a delicate matter, but it is a very serious one and that some provision should be made to write it into the bill as it now stands. Perhaps it could be done before we come back for third reading of this bill. I think the hon. Minister recognizes, and the House recognizes, that what we really have are highly trained professional medical practitioners against whom this bill would discriminate, unless something is done at this stage.

Mr. Sopha: There was a recent case in Saskatchewan where the words "medicine chest" were interpreted to mean that the government had to pay the premiums of

Indians living off reservations. My query is in regard to these words:

Standard medical service insurance contracts shall be made available to residents without regard to financial means.

I have extracted "without regard to financial means." Does that mean that a person who is a pauper, who does not have a penny, may go to one of the carriers and say that he is entitled to be issued a contract, without payment? They can have no regard to financial means—that is what the section says.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member—if you will pardon me lapsing into the vernacular—is nit-picking—to quote my hon. friend from St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman).

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows full well that the provisions of this bill make it possible for a person who is without means, or even who is in receipt of an income that is not subject to income tax, to apply to the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health. He will immediately be covered at no cost to the individual.

Mr. Sopha: Under section 6 that is true, but what is the meaning of that phrase "financial" if it does not have reference to people who are in a very low income group? No one would think it referred to a millionaire; a millionaire can provide for his own health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if the individual, whom the hon. member mentions, went to the carrier, the carrier would refer him to the department.

Mr. Sopha: No, but it says the carrier shall supply, it is mandatory, "shall be made available." That is synonymous with "shall supply." "Shall supply to residents without regard to financial means." I just have a little urge, a little itching, that if this Act comes into force, I am going to get hold of a—maybe this will be champerty and maintenance, you would not understand those terms just as I do not understand medical terms—get hold of some fellow and bring an action against a licensed carrier, and show the court that my individual has no means, he is a pauper; and require the carrier under the terms of this section to supply a contract free. This is a very badly drawn section.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It will be supplied free, Mr. Chairman. If the hon. member believes this is a very badly drawn section or a very badly drawn Act, I can only say to you, sir, that this Act was drawn by the legislative

counsel, in whom I must admit I have far more confidence legally than I have in my hon. lawyer friends over there.

An hon. member: They do not lose them all.

Mr. Sopha: They do not try as many.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister for clarification on this point: If I have bad eyes, I now have to go to an optometrist. But someone has told me, "Now, look, if you go to an ophthalmologist you will find that you get coverage under this programme, and you will end up getting glasses prescribed for you." So then I am going to the ophthalmologist instead of the optometrist. Is this a danger in this bill?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not think it is, Mr. Chairman. The ophthalmologist knows perfectly well that he is putting himself in jeopardy and could be called before the disciplinary committee of his college, because he will be guilty of fraud charging an insurance plan for service which is not provided under the terms of the contract. The examination of the eyes for glasses is not a covered service, no matter by whom it is done.

Mr. Thompson: I thank the hon. Minister very much.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I have a little amendment to section 6. I might point out that in the British House of Commons—and I want to put this on record—which we profess to admire so much, the deputy Chairman of the whole House is from the Opposition. I just wanted to say that.

I move that section 6 be amended by striking out the word "classes" wherever it appears in the said section and substituting therefor the word "groups."

Mr. Bryden: Will the hon. member just hold that for a moment—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member if he would withhold his amendment for a few minutes, because there are a number of points under this section—and I believe that once it is formally accepted by you we can discuss only the amendment. We had another amendment in mind, but the hon. member got his in first;

that is fine. I think it is a good point he raises.

There are, however, some other points I would like to raise, which do not have to be raised by way of amendment. This section is the basic section governing the administration of medical care insurance for the subsidized groups. The administration, with respect to those groups, is placed in the hands of the Minister, and there is to be a medical services insurance division within The Department of Health in order to carry out the Minister's duties in this regard.

I am suggesting to the House, Mr. Chairman, that this will create an unnecessary duplication of administrative services and machinery for no good reason at all. As far as I can see, the only reason why this section of the bill is couched in this form is simply to be a sop to the medical profession, whose unreasonableness in some of these matters is well established.

The hon. Minister told us, I believe, on the first reading of the bill, that the medical services insurance division would be located on the same premises of those of the hospital services commission of Ontario. Obviously, the efficient way of administering this phase of this bill is through the hospital services commission. Perhaps its name could be changed to hospital and medical services insurance commission, or something like that; but we already have an elaborate administrative set-up to deal with administration of legislation of this kind—evaluating claims, paying them, and so on. Yet we have to go through the nonsense of setting up still another administrative unit to do the kind of work for which we already have a huge organization.

I believe in co-operating in all possible ways with the medical profession, and with all professions in the community, but when the request reaches the point of childishness, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should ignore it. The medical profession has worked itself into a position where it just will not consider an independent commission administering any form of medical care insurance. Under section 6, certain claims will be dealt with by a government administrative unit; because, for some reason or other, I take it the medical profession has persuaded itself that it is all right if the hon. Minister sets up a special division within his own department to perform these services, but that it would be a terrible thing if it was done in the logical way through the hospital services commission.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, I had in mind moving an amendment along this line. I will

not now take advantage of the hon. member for Sudbury, but I would suggest that the hon. Minister should eliminate the folderal from the bill at least, and provide for sound administration by providing that this phase of the programme will be administered by the commission.

Mr. Sopha: I heard the startling proposition that the bill was written by the legislative counsel. The hon. Minister, apparently at every opportunity, wants to blame this horrid statute on the legislative counsel, and I do not think it is fair to blame it on them. He should take the responsibility for it.

I think section 6 has, inherent in it, a very sinister device which should be watched with great care: That is that it is left to the regulations to provide—the regulations being under the control of the Minister at all times, of course, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council—the groups of people—I eschew the word “classes”—provide the groups of people who will be subsidized. Accordingly, it would be a nice little device if, at election time or just before an election, regulations were made under this Act enlarging the groups of people who are subsidized and raising the income limit—a nice little election bribe that could be utilized by an unscrupulous government; could be, might be.

If, as the hon. Minister tells us, this matter of health care were studied—I wish I could feel it were studied with the same intensive study that Mr. Justice Hall addressed to the thing; I know it was not, because a Royal commission was appointed and they brought in a report wrapped in a delightful Tory blue, a royal blue, as royal a blue as you will ever see, and this document was not even referred to by the hon. Prime Minister. He did not even refer to it when he made his speech on the second reading of the bill. He just cast it aside. I take it that perhaps his copy is tucked under his desk there somewhere, where he kicks it with his feet every once in a while.

I did not see the television programme. I was busy at something else. I did not see the television programme, and I do not know—perhaps somebody will tell me—whether or not, on the television programme, he referred to the report. I did not see it and I do not know whether he told the public about the report.

But presumably, leaving aside the Hagey commission, which was not a very good commission, as commissions go—I would not stack it up against the Kelly commission, for example—it was not a very good one. But presumably the Hagey commission report was

studied, and I wonder aloud, with regard to the statistical and financial studies made by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner)—one of the eminent personages on the Treasury board—why are we not able to say at this juncture what the income limits will be, or otherwise identify the people who will receive total or partial subsidy?

Why should this be left to the regulations, for a Minister of Health and the executive council to come along at some later time and raise the level to encompass more people? Then the hon. Prime Minister, having done that, gets on the television at the next election and refers to that and says, “We promised financial assistance to more groups.” He has a suitable chart, and he checks it off—and lately I am watching these devices very carefully, and I am learning new techniques on how to win elections in this province. I have won a couple of elections myself, but I am learning more. I am learning how one uses the public money to win elections, such as by entertaining foreign potentates.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. This is exactly the reason why I have to rise to my feet occasionally. I am reluctant to do so, but if we are going to start this I think even the hon. member who is making the speech will admit he is a long way from anything even remotely connected with this bill.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask the hon. Minister of Health, and I ask him most respectfully, why we cannot stipulate in section 6 with precision the groups that will receive total or partial subsidy, instead of leaving it to the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the only answer I can give is that the best advice I received was that there was no better place to put it than in the regulations. I can conceive of possibilities where we may have to change, between sessions of the Legislature, and it seems rather hard that possible hardship might accrue to groups—I defer to the hon. member's dislike for the legal word “classes”—it would be rather unfair that hardship should accrue to them just so that we might wait for another session of the Legislature.

I do not particularly like government by regulation, but there are times and there are certain types of legislation where they serve a most useful purpose. I am rather attracted to the somewhat sinister idea my hon. friend has put forth—I almost wish I had thought of it myself. I shall have to get the details from his hon. colleagues.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to think on behalf of the hon. Minister and come to his help, because I know how deeply concerned the hon. Minister is with the fact that if you have a government-sponsored scheme you may have encroachment and compulsion and everything else implied in establishing it as part of the civil service. It seems to me, sir, that to set up a medical services insurance division for 1,000,000 people and not give a rap that it is going to be under The Department of Health, as part of the civil service, is unrealistic. In other words, he could have made this independent, as suggested by the hon. member for Woodbine, under the hospital services commission. It is certainly logical. Instead, the hon. Minister is putting it in his department, and it seems to me that this, again, shows that he is being cynical when he suggests that if there is a government-sponsored scheme there are all these great dangers. He gave that charade—almost like Gilbert and Sullivan—"I hate compulsion"; yet he is denying many of the things we thought he believed in principle.

He is bringing this right under his department. Surely, this would arouse the doctors, and surely it would rouse the hon. Minister's sensitivities as a doctor, suggesting that the medical services insurance division is going to be a part of The Department of Health.

Education is compulsory and universal, and I look on health as I do on education; they are both of prime importance to the economy and the well-being not only of the nation but of the individual.

I would suggest, sir, that you are making—I want to re-emphasize this—your medical services insurance division a part of The Department of Health—it comes directly under you and is stated right in the Act. I am suggesting that this has been one of the things that the doctors and the medical association and many others feared, that there will not be independence and that there might be a Minister—it may perchance be that you may not always be the Minister of Health—we may have someone other than a doctor and our interests will not be protected as ably as they are being protected by you. Then what happens?

I should think that this would be of grave concern to us and also to you, because you may be going back to private practice at some time. For over 1,000,000 people the medical care insurance plan is going to be under The Department of Health, a civil service operation. I point this out for those reasons, apart from all the other obvious reasons such as the fact that you have an Ontario hospital

services commission set up, and I do not think that you are going to suggest to us that they are doing a bad job. We will see when the estimates come up that you will take pride in what they are doing and will resent any criticism we might make toward them.

You have a whole system set up and I ask, as the hon. member for Woodbine asked, why suddenly create a whole new bureaucracy? You have told us that you hate bureaucracy; why then follow Parkinson's law and spread it all over the place? As a Scottishman, economy should be to the fore, and for that reason—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Scotsman!

Mr. Thompson: I am from Ireland and always refer to them as Scottishmen. I thought that that would appeal to you, if nothing else did, just on the basis of economy. Why do you not use the Ontario hospital services commission?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that when I submitted this bill for—oh, pardon me!

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, section 6 provides for the provisions of the contract on application by those who qualify. There could be groups of employees—a hundred or maybe hundreds working for an employer—who would be making wages low enough to qualify under at least (b) of subsection 1, section 6. Could the employer make application to have his group covered or would his employees have to apply as individuals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This Act, Mr. Chairman, does not interfere with groups nor involve itself with groups in any way, shape or form. It provides individual contracts.

I thought I made it quite clear, during second reading, that we were going to use the human and administrative resources of the Ontario hospital services commission. It was made very clear, I thought, in my submissions to the House, that the medical services insurance division would be housed in the Ontario hospital services commission building and that we would make every use of the administrative and technical resources—human and material—of the commission. They are skilled in this and are doing this work already in very large measure, and we have no intention of setting up any duplicate machinery.

The division will be under its own directors, which it would have to be any way. The only expansion that will be required will be whatever additional personnel

are required to do the additional work imposed. Everyone is working to his full capacity now, but the equipment—the mechanical and technical equipment available—is there and we will utilize the supervisory people, many of whom are skilled in this business. Their services will be used by the medical services insurance division to the end that there will be no overlapping, no duplicating.

Mr. Bryden: Why do you not say so in the bill, then?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because I have specifically set up a division of the department where this will be completely and directly under the control of the Minister. This was done deliberately, not to hand it to the doctors or anybody else. I am not particularly worried about whether they like it or not. They have not signified any great distaste for it.

Mr. Sopha: They might hear you; be careful!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am quite happy if they do hear me, because I have told them this and no answer—

Mr. Sopha: They know you do not mean it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They know I do mean it. I do not care if I go back to practice tomorrow. I have faith, Mr. Chairman, in this government. It will be in power for as long as I will likely be practising medicine, so I will be sure that the plan will be well administered.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's actions belie his words. The bill says, and this is what we go on, that the medical services insurance division will be a division of The Department of Health. Now if, in fact, it is to be a division of the Ontario hospital services commission, why does not the bill say so?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did not say it was to be a division of the Ontario hospital services commission. I said the division of the department will be housed in the OISC building. We will utilize all the facilities there, so there will be no duplication and no overlapping, and therefore no unnecessary administrative costs.

Mr. Bryden: I heard the hon. Minister say that before, but the fact remains that this could be better integrated with the machinery of the commission if the division were subject in the first instance to the supervision of the

commission, with the Minister, and the government having ultimate authority in all matters. I would suggest that would be the logical and sensible way of doing it. Failing any other, I think the explanation I gave a few minutes ago as to the reason for this curious departure from logical administrative practices is correct.

Mr. Sopha: Why should not the medical services division be a member of the corporation? Why should it not be?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because we are carrying the total cost of those for whom we will be responsible. Therefore there would be no call for us to be involved in the pooling arrangement. This would be the main purpose for the existence of the medical carriers.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, do not tell me that.

Subsection 5: "The corporation shall," note the mandatory use of the word "shall." "The corporation shall from time to time recommend changes in the maximum subscription rates." They cannot leave the rates alone, because they are commanded by statute in this abominably drawn statute; they are commanded by the Legislature to recommend from time to time, changes in the maximum subscription rate.

Mr. MacDonald: You have to do it every time the OMA raises its fee schedule.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Every time the OMA feels it is entitled to a little more milking of the public purse, they will have to change the maximum subscription rates. Therefore I would want the medical insurance division of The Department of Health, to be a member of that corporation.

The whole attitude is summed up in this way. The chief spokesman of the insurance companies for this Legislature is saying, "We in the Tory party are not going to interfere with you. We are not going to interfere with your vested right to sell, in short, your right to make a profit. We are not going to touch you. You just go off in your corner, by yourself, and you run the insurance business, and we will give you, in true Tory tradition, a minimum of interference." So subsection 4 shies away from any interference with the God-given right of the insurance companies of this province, to run the insurance business as they see fit.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sopha moves that section 6 be amended by striking out the words "classes" wherever it appears in the said section and substituting therefor the word "groups."

Mr. Sopha: I want to say, in reference to that, just one sentence. To me and to a good many other people in this province, the word "classes," when it is used in a sociological sense, it is one of the legacies of the Family Compact and has a connotation of opprobrium. It means that people are divided into a hierarchy of classes, and it means in this section that there is a connotation of opprobrium. I want to take out that offensive word and substitute an inoffensive one, such as "groups." So let us hear what they do in reference to that.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the amendment, say "aye."

Those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of Mr. Sopha's amendment, please stand.

All opposed to Mr. Sopha's amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 53.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost, and section 6 shall become part of the bill.

On section 7:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on section 7, I look at the fact that section 7 (1) says that "any person who is unable to continue payment of his medical services insurance subscription because of a lack of income caused by unemployment, illness or disability, may within the first 30 days of such default make application to the council for assistance during the period of unemployment, illness or disability, to continue his medical services insurance contract towards the purchase of a standard contract."

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is this kind of rigidity within the Act which still concerns me. We are dealing with human beings who fall ill and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Health, a doctor himself, knows that there are cases when people fall ill and could be in a coma, when they could be worried or, for a variety of reasons, are not capable of thinking about whom they have to contact within 30 days—when they do not have relatives or they are removed from their relatives in some way. No one can take care of this bureaucratic decision that they have to be in touch within 30 days.

As I have said before, I have had cases within my own riding of sick people of

European background who are completely muddled by all the bureaucratic red tape and everything else that is involved. Of course, this bill is going to emphasize a lot of this, in the contracts, and standard contracts, the length of time, the open policy, when you are allowed to enroll, and all these other great technicalities. This is really going to be to many people a complete confusion, Mr. Chairman.

I notice this restriction of 30 days and I ask again, will there be special exigencies, that it was not the person's fault, that he can make an appeal so that he can still get under the 30 days ruling? Have you set up any kind of appeal situation for these kinds of things?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is one of the functions of the council, and I can assure the hon. member, sir, that we intend to make use of every possible means to see to it that nobody is left out. We will seek to enlist the support and assistance of municipal authorities, public health nurses, welfare authorities, social workers, doctors' offices, because we believe in the case of some certain groups mentioned in this section—people who are ill and out of work because of illness and unprotected insofar as insurance is concerned—the doctor might be the first to contact them, and recognize the difficulty and direct them towards the place where coverage can be obtained for them. Every effort will be made. This was one of the overriding considerations all through our preparation of this Act, that some system could be worked out which would make continuous coverage readily available to those who were unable to protect themselves because of unemployment or because of a host of other reasons, such as are outlined here.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Minister of Health, assuming there is a situation—let me just take a hypothetical example, say from my own riding, where someone of European background gets hit by a car. He has come over to this country and he served a length of time to establish residence; he is in a coma, in hospital for 31 days, then suddenly we find out he has not got proper coverage. What steps should he then take in order to get the coverage?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you what the administrative details are, because frankly they are not written out yet, but I would certainly urge that the department of medical services insurance be immediately contacted and given the necessary information so that the matter could be laid before the council immediately.

Mr. Thompson: This is a kind of appeal board?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Absolutely. This is one of the main functions.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I am sure the hon. Minister will make sure that everybody is aware of the bill.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 7 we are concerned with the cumbersome procedure by which people who are unable to pay because of unemployment, illness or disability, would first apply to the council, and then the council in turn would make recommendations to the Minister. We think that the order of administrative efficiency would suggest that the application should be made in the first instance to the Minister to be dealt with, that it could be dealt with expeditiously, and then that the applicant, if his application has been refused, should have an appeal to the council.

I, therefore, move that section 7 of Bill No. 136 be amended to read as follows:

Subsection 1: Any person who is unable to continue payment of his medical services insurance subscriptions because of lack of income due to unemployment, illness or disability, may, within the first 30 days of such default, make application to the Minister for assistance during the period of unemployment, illness or disability to continue his medical services insurance contract, or toward the purchase of a standard contract, and the Minister shall consider and act upon such application in accordance with the regulations.

Subsection 2: Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Minister under subsection 1 may appeal to the council, whose decision shall be final and binding.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Renwick moves that section 7 of Bill No. 136 be amended to read as follows:

Subsection 1: Any person who is unable to continue payment of his medical services insurance subscriptions because of lack of income due to unemployment, illness or disability, may, within the first 30 days of such default, make application to the Minister for assistance, during the period of unemployment, illness or disability, to continue his medical services insurance contract or towards the purchase of a standard contract, and the Minister shall consider and act upon such application in accordance with the regulations.

Subsection 2: Any person aggrieved by

a decision of the Minister under subsection 1 may appeal to the council, whose decision shall be final and binding.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment does streamline the administrative procedures a great deal. I presume that the council will only meet at regular intervals. The council, a group brought together this way, would not be in continuous session, so they might meet once a month or whatever the period might be. And at that time they would have before them all the applications, those applications will be dealt with, the recommendations made to the Minister and then the matter be settled.

It seems to me that applications directly to the Minister can be processed quickly. They would not come to the Minister as a person, but they would come to his department, and he would have responsible people there who would look into the merits of each case and would pass on them very quickly. This is a matter of routine in an office.

Then, if there is any problem here, if the Minister in his wisdom felt that a person should not be passed on, that the merits of his case were not adequate, and if the applicant felt they were, he still could appeal to the council from the decision. It just seems that this makes for quick, smooth and efficient administration.

I would urge that this amendment to the legislation be adopted.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Renwick's amendment—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, before you put the amendment, I would like to advise you, and the hon. members through you, why we did it this way. In the first instance, we considered doing it the way the hon. member proposed, except that we did not set up an appeal from the Minister's ruling by the council. After all, the council is advisory to the Minister, and it would put them in a rather difficult situation if you give them the power to overrule the Minister's ruling.

However, that apart, we did think of the possibility of more rapid action through the method the hon. member has proposed in his amendment. We decided against it because it seemed better to have the application go to the director of the division, who will be secretary of the council, and who will see that the matter is taken in hand immediately. Whereas, if it came to the Minister, there is a possibility the Minister might be out of

his office for a time and the matter neglected until he returned. An acting Minister may hesitate to take a matter of that kind under consideration, and I believe that it is in the interests of more certain protection for those who will need it, that we do it in this way.

I would, therefore, suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the method laid down in the Act is better than the proposed amendment.

Mr. Young: Then this is the intention, Mr. Chairman, that the director act in a routine fashion, and then the matter be laid before the council. If they wish to countermand any of his orders, they can do it at that point.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We envisage that within the council would be a small group with some executive power to deal with matters of this kind, those requiring quick and ready decisions. This is one of the matters which in our opinion, I repeat, merits, and must have, quick consideration and a quick decision.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, that is not what the legislation says, nevertheless. I think the hon. Minister and we agree that it is desirable that such applications should be dealt with expeditiously. It is just a matter of arriving at the administrative formula that would accomplish that.

But I do not believe, from what little I know of the law, that the council will have any power to delegate any powers given to it by this Act. This section as it stands states quite clearly that council shall consider applications, not somebody designated by the council, but the council.

I would assume that the council may meet perhaps once a month. It could very well happen that a person could make an application and wait 29 days before the council was in a position to meet and consider his application. By that time, they would have a raft of applications before them and they would have difficulty disposing of them. Even assuming they disposed of them all, the applications still would have to go to the Minister for action, so we would still have the problem of the Minister possibly being away from his office. That problem is not avoided here.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that the machinery set forth here—and we can only go on what is in the bill—is quite cumbersome, and will lead to unnecessary delay in an area where delay is most undesirable. If a person is unemployed and broke and worried about his medical insurance cover-

age, it is desirable to deal with his case as quickly as possible.

I suggest that the hon. Minister take the matter under advisement with a view, perhaps, to amending the section to make it abundantly clear that the council can delegate whatever powers and duties it has under this section to an officer of the council or to some other person. I think that this section relates to what are essentially routine applications at a very high level, and it would be very much better if some way could be worked out whereby they could be dealt with by an official within the department, and go to the higher level only in case of an appeal.

Mr. Sopha: I do not believe that this is administratively sound. Presumably there is a possibility that there will be an absolute flood of applications. I really question whether any administrative machinery can handle this efficiently. I wonder whether it will not become a case that there will be so many applications for total or partial assistance during periods of unemployment. For example, I visualize that when the lakes freeze up that there will be an absolute flood of applications from people who are working on the Great Lakes. Similarly, when the harvesting of crops is finished and the casual employees in that industry become unemployed, and those in the construction industry become unemployed, which is less seasonal than it used to be but it is still largely a seasonal industry.

We have sectors of our economy where people work for only a part of the year. A small group, and an interesting one, that Ron Haggart wrote about yesterday, were the people at the parimutuel windows at Woodbine race track who make a handsome sum over the year—an average of \$95 a week—and as soon as the last horse leaves the last starting gate in the last race and the last racing day of the year, then presumably all those people will file their applications with the council for partial assistance or full assistance, as the case may be. And really—I am espousing something now to which the hon. Minister may be more sympathetic—I can also visualize that a good many people, who should not make application, will make application. If they were responsible, good citizens, they would continue to pay their premiums out of their savings; but because it is the public purse—the trough of largesse—they feel that because Jennie Jones down the street—and I do not make my remarks applicable to any living person, a purely fictional person—makes application, and gets partial or total assistance, then they should.

I think, in order to make this work, that there ought to be a more stringent test, so that only those who are really entitled to it in justice and equity should be able to apply. One of the things—and it is inherent in this section—I fear about this Act is that public moneys are going to be paid to a lot of people who do not deserve them, who should not really apply, and who should not expect the state to come to their assistance.

It is a good old Tory principle that a man should look after his own needs; and, really, I feel that in many places in this Act you are denigrating, you are militating against that principle, and you are encouraging people to come to the public Treasury and ask for a handout. In other words, this could get as bad as some of the devices in the unemployment insurance fund, and I use that for an analogy. I am told that, every time I suggest something, the legislative counsel, as if it was the great pinnacle of all intelligence in the world, has written this statute and God is in his heaven and all is right with the world.

As a lawyer I know that hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent in legal fees in taking statutes of this government to the courts—indeed, to the Supreme Court of Canada, some of them—in order to get a final ruling on the meaning of the statutes. So I know the statutes are not as perfect as we are led to believe, yet I am put in the position of being some kind of maverick who is attacking, personally, the legislative counsel in their august robes of silk and Queen's counsel collars when, in fact, I am not. I am just pleading for a bit of rationality and an admission that this statute is really not perfect.

We have seen tonight the inflexibility of the hon. Minister of Health; he will not allow a comma to be changed; he defends the statute as if it were a matter of life and death, and his reputation, and what posterity will think about him. All I have to say is that, if the Lord preserves me for a further 40 years, I know the hon. Minister of Health will not rank with Sir William Osler or Sir Frederick Banting for having moved this statute through this House. His name will not be inscribed on any statue, because it is not really a great social advance; so I would ask the hon. Minister to reserve that section and see if there might not be a possibility of writing it in such a way so that it will obviate the possible vices I have outlined.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if the commission would consider helping a man pay his

premiums when, say, he and his wife are perhaps 66 or 67 years of age and have retired to a small town with \$50,000 in bonds and their house paid for, and who have a summer cottage and drive a nice automobile, and whose entire income is derived from the \$50,000 in bonds—which comes to \$2,500 a year? According to the proposed regulations, this man and his wife would get absolutely free medical service under the proposed regulations. Is this correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is correct, if they are not subject to income tax. This was the only definitive way we could devise to get away from, and I quote, "the iniquitous means test." I would like to say to the hon. member for Sudbury that I am not placing responsibility for this section on the legislative counsel, although they couched the entire Act in proper legal language. I shall not give them responsibility for the bill, nor for the substance of the Act, but they did write the language and, of course, I accepted it. I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that they would be the last to claim that their work was perfect.

However, I recognize much validity in what the hon. member said and, for a moment or two, it was rather refreshing to hear him talk good, sound, deep commonsense. However, we recognize, too, that there will be those who apply for assistance who probably might not deserve it. Again, fortunately, it is not my responsibility to decide merit. If the person needs it for any one of a host of reasons, the Act states that he shall get the help. Each case will be dealt with separately. I can visualize, too, the possibility of large numbers of applicants at certain times of the year; and it would be my judgment that, at these times, it would be easier for the council to deal with them because of the large numbers coming in. It is the sporadic ones which come in now and again—as my hon. friend from Yorkview, I believe it was, suggested—when the council might not be meeting, and the machinery to deal with those promptly and expeditiously, which might cause us trouble.

The director of the division will, of course, get all the facts. He will have them all well marshalled and the case thoroughly prepared to submit to the council for consideration and decision. And I can assure this House, sir, that we will make every effort to see to it that the administrative machinery is such that it can move rapidly and expeditiously.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the eloquence of the hon. member for Sudbury raised

another question here along the same line—an extension of what he was saying. He pointed out that at certain times of the year there would be a great flood of applications coming in, and we can understand that. This may mean that the council itself would have to be a full-time body, and would have to be operating 12 months of the year. Certainly there will be periods—the enrolment periods—when the large batch of applications will come. But all through the year there is bound to be a steady flow; then, at various periods, as certain industries are closing, you will get a big group coming at that time. This may well mean that the council has to be put on pretty well a full-time basis. I wonder if the hon. Minister has any advice to offer in this regard? The council, I suppose, will be paid and you will demand pretty well full-time work of it. I am wondering just what the plans of the hon. Minister are in that respect.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we do not visualize the council being employed full time. It will have nothing to do with the routine applications coming in. They will be dealt with as routine matters by the director of the division. The council has nothing to do with them. They will be dealt with according to the terms of the legislation. It is the unusual cases—such as the unemployed person, or the person referred to by the hon. leader of the Opposition, who happens to have been caught, for reasons quite beyond his control, and finds himself without coverage—which will demand and require special consideration. The council will deal with these, but the routine applicant will not go through the council at all. He will go directly to the director.

Mr. Young: Does the hon. Minister then consider that the applications will be coming in this way—as a flood at certain times, as certain industries close; and that the routine ones will be coming in between the registration periods; and that the council can deal with these on a part-time basis?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This would be our expectation; but again we will have to be guided by experience.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I can see what is going to happen now, and I just want to say, by way of interpolation, that on Saturday I have been invited to address a medical convention in my home town. They gave me the topic, “The advantages of a government-operated, universal, comprehensive scheme of medical care insurance.” They asked me to speak on

that topic. They gave me only 40 minutes; I do not know how I am going to be able to compress it all into that limited time.

But what is going to happen is that a member like myself—and I can say this, there are not many of the press here—who has an office downtown, is going to be flooded with people. They say that too many lawyers are in politics. The advantage of a lawyer-member is that he has an office where they can find him. They will be coming in and will say, “I have applied for partial assistance for my medical care insurance and I have been refused. John Smith, down the street, he gets it and he makes \$2,000 a year more than I do.”

We really will be the ombudsmen that my friend from Downsview (Mr. Singer) was speaking about today.

I can see myself a year from now, sir, I will come back here and say, “I was correct.” I will be engaged in a veritable deluge of correspondence with this medical insurance council, about refusal of assistance to people in their medical care premiums. I rue that, because already I am a branch of the workmen’s compensation board, without pay and without reward and without thanks, as far as as I can see. They refused to set up an office in my community and I see hundreds of people a year who have problems with workmen’s compensation. Here you are adding another problem to members who are already pressed with problems. I listened to that nonsense from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests today about the duties of a member.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Riverdale say “aye.”

All opposed say “nay.”

In my opinion the “nays” have it.

Section 7 agreed to.

Sections 8 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 11:

Mr. Sopha: How will the superintendent know whether the carrier is or is not operating in the public interest? I mean is this corporation the agent to inform him?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It might well be, Mr. Chairman. The complaint may come from us directly, from The Department of Health. It may come from subscribers. It may come from the profession, from any source. A complaint may come to the superintendent or to the department from any source, and if in our judgment the complaint is such that it

merits being drawn to the attention of the superintendent of insurance, it will be his responsibility to act upon it. Information may come to him per se, out of his own involvement with the insurance carrier. I do not know just how much, or how close involvement they have, but the information may come from any one of a number of sources.

Mr. Sopha: Well, why did you not give more disciplinary powers to the corporation to regulate the people first?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They have got them.

Mr. Sopha: It says "pass bylaws governing the qualification, classification and regulation of its members" in section (c).

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The regulations deal with any matter relating to its technical operation.

Mr. Sopha: Would that include disciplinary powers?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know that this was specifically talked of, but I would take it, from my interpretation of this clause, that this could well lie within the sphere of their influence.

Mr. Thompson: My question, through you, sir, to the hon. Minister, is really tied to section 9, but it is still the same thing. I am wondering, under section 9 (3) and then section 10, whether you might have a situation where there were areas in the province where you would not be able to buy this standard contract from any carrier. If you read 9 (3), it says "a licensed carrier," notwithstanding subsection (1). I will not bother reading it. The hon. Minister, I imagine, is thoroughly informed about it. My point is that you might get a limitation of coverage to people in some particular region. Have you considered that the people would not have a choice?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have not specifically considered this, Mr. Chairman, because we believe that the province is well covered by carriers of both kinds, the non-profit plans and the indemnity carriers. There are again, a large number operating and applications can be submitted by mail. They too will carry on, I would expect, a very vigorous programme of advertising, just as the government will and I would think that surely some application forms, through newspapers, magazines, or the various other media of communication would reach almost every part of the province. Failing this, of course—again making use of community authorities, muni-

cipal authorities and all others most likely to come in contact with people—I think that most of the people can be well advised of what is available to them.

Mr. Sopha: I quarrel with subsection 2 because I am not satisfied, in all deference to legislative counsel, that those six lines they have used, which they could have compressed into three lines—I am not satisfied that the judge of the high court may deal with the case on its merits. I am afraid that language may be construed by a judge of the high court to mean that the onus is upon the appellant to show him that there was a denial of natural justice in the cancellation of the licence. I wish the language were clear, that they may have a review in the high court, on such an issue that the trial judge reviews the case on its merits and has the prerogative to substitute his own judgment for that of the superintendent. The verbiage used is obscure. We have that type of statute. One that comes readily to mind is The Funeral Directors Act and the appeal from that board from that Act—I know because I have had experience before them—is that the appellant has to show on the face of the transcript of evidence, some error, some denial of natural justice. Then we go to the other extreme, where there is no appeal at all.

This seems to me to be somewhere in the middle, and I particularly question those words, "who upon cause shown may make an order directing the superintendent." I am afraid that a judge of the high court is going to say, "You have to show me where this body went wrong, where the superintendent went wrong, where he was guilty of a denial of natural justice." I wish the language said, "Who may review the decision upon its merits and may make such order as he deems proper."

I ask the hon. Minister of Health, will he go back to the legal advisers and ask them if that might not be an employment of better verbiage, if that is what he wants?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. member's objection is not covered by the last two words: "or may make such other order as he deems proper." As a layman quite ignorant of the law, it would seem to me that this would give the judge the right and authority to make any order, or to render any decision he chose. However, I must admit some ignorance.

Mr. Sopha: In interpreting that conjunctively with "who upon cause shown," and the judge is saying to counsel that "you have to show me before I can make another order,

a denial of natural justice," I think that this is not an appeal on the merits at all. What I am getting at is that I want the judge in the high court to have the prerogative to hear the case on the facts and to substitute without any restraint at all, his decision for that of the superintendent. After all, in the case of a cancellation of a licence, it has been many times said that a judge sitting in court is just as qualified to render a decision with regard to cancellations, as a bureaucrat, an administrative official. There is no difference between them. If that is what is meant, I am merely pleading that the language make it clear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member grant me this, that we pass this now and I shall undertake to have this thoroughly screened, bearing in mind the suggestions he has made? I am quite incompetent to argue this because this sounds to me like a purely legal matter, quite beyond my ability.

Mr. Sopha: I am flexible, but my friend, the hon. member for Downsview is recalcitrant.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by this section. We have suddenly again discovered the superintendent of insurance.

Now, I do not know if the hon. Minister of Health was here when we debated the estimates of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), but some of us have been pretty unhappy about the conduct of that office over many years. We do not think it has been anything more than a rubber stamp. There has never been any power given to that office to control anything, there has been no power to fix rates. There has been no real investigative power given to that branch, and suddenly the superintendent of insurance is being given power to suspend or cancel licences if a carrier is not operating in the public interest.

It occurs to me, and it worries me very much, it occurs to me that the superintendent is suddenly going to be given a type of responsibility that he has never had before. He probably does not have a staff to investigate in relation to the matters which are going to come to his concern and he is being given really no terms of reference. What he may think is not in the public interest may be that they do not use the right colour stationery, they might not have the proper offices, they may have their policy printed on too many pages. Who knows what is in the public interest?

I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Health what investigations or what liaison he had with his colleague, the hon. Attorney General, insofar as the use of the superintendent of insurance in this regard before this section was written into his Act. That is point number one.

The second point is: What is meant by "in the public interest"? Surely if you are giving, again to a nameless, faceless civil servant—and let us face it, that is what he is, he is not someone whom we can identify here as we can identify my hon. friend, the Minister of Health, and my hon. friend, the Attorney General, he is a civil servant who is tucked away somewhere in the back offices, called the superintendent. You are saying, "Mr. Superintendent, is this or is this not in the public interest?" What does the hon. Minister mean by the public interest? What does the carrier mean?

Let us be fair to these carriers. Is the carrier suddenly going to be faced with the sort of decision that we see from the liquor licence board: "Your licence is refused for good and abundant reasons; yours very truly, signed, chairman." Or: "Your licence Mr. Carrier, is suspended because it is not in the public interest that you carry on any longer." Or is there going to be some compulsion upon the superintendent to say: "It is not in the public interest because you are not paying your claims or because you are breaking a statute"; or because you are doing something? I get very worried, and I think we should all concern ourselves very seriously, with giving powers to civil servants over whom the Legislature has no control, powers to take people out of business for a matter that is or is not in the public interest.

What does the hon. Minister mean by saying, "It is in the public interest"?

Second, and equally important, the point that I mentioned first: What new arrangements have been made to improve the office of the superintendent of insurance so that he will be able to cope with this? On the past record of performance of that office, I am not satisfied it can cope at all.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I may say that we had liaison with The Department of the Attorney General through the superintendent of insurance, who represented the hon. Attorney General in all our discussions and deliberations in the preparation of this bill.

Again, I cannot argue too vigorously with my hon. friend because some of these things are points of law with which again, I repeat, it is quite beyond my power to cope. But I

believe—I am just checking this now—I believe that the superintendent has power to cancel licences already inherent in the law that he administers. However, I will get this verified. Then, of course, in subsection 2, the company or corporation whose licence has been cancelled does have an appeal to the supreme court, although the hon. member for Sudbury has raised some questions which are obviously in his mind concerning that section.

What is in the public interest? The first thing that I can think of is that, if a carrier licensed under this Act should say to the subscriber, "I cannot sell you a standard contract," this, of course, is completely and diametrically contrary to the Act. Or if he should do certain things that he is not allowed to do; if, for instance, he should write something into the standard contract which is completely forbidden. He must not bring anything into the standard contract. He can sell whatever additional provisions he cares to, but they must be attached as riders and not written into the contract.

Mr. Singer: I am with my hon. friend up to that point. If the carrier is in obvious breach of the statute, there should be power, that is fine.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These are the things that we are most concerned about being not in the public interest.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have just been given The Insurance Act, chapter 190, section 10:

The duty of determining the right of any insurer in Ontario to be licensed under this Act, devolves upon the superintendent, subject to appeal as hereinafter provided, but nothing in this section affects the right of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the Minister to suspend or cancel any licence in the exercise of his authority under this Act.

Apparently the power to cancel rests with the Minister, who in this case would be the Attorney General.

Mr. Singer: "In the exercise of his authority under this Act"; I did not hear the words, "if they deem it in the public interest."

"The authority under the Act," and that is a very different thing than being what somebody believes, particularly the superintendent believes, is in the public interest; very different.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The appeal as laid down:

The applicant for licence who deems himself aggrieved by the decision of the superintendent may appeal therefrom to the court of appeal.

Not to the supreme court.

The practice and procedure upon and in relation to the appeal shall be the same as from an appeal from a judgment of a judge of the supreme court in an action.

Mr. Singer: Could I interrupt my hon. friend at that point? Perhaps I am getting a little too technical and legal, but if I could address my remarks to the hon. Attorney General.

At this point it seems to me, and the hon. Minister of Health just read the section, it seems to me that the power to revoke lies not with the superintendent but lies with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, who is at least politically responsible and the superintendent is not. It lies with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to the extent of powers given in the Act.

I am open to correction, but I do not think the words, "in the public interest," are a part of the contemplation of the terms of The Insurance Act. This is where I get very concerned about it, because you are doing two things that are very different. You are giving the power to cancel to the superintendent, who is a civil servant, not to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, who is at least politically responsible. You are using the words, "in the public interest," which I do not think are in The Insurance Act. If I am wrong in that, perhaps my friend, the hon. Attorney General could elucidate.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I would like first of all to support the hon. Minister of Health in his explanation and to confirm that the Act was reviewed by the superintendent of insurance. I personally had the opportunity to scan it, of course, when it was being considered as legislation and I was aware of the clause which we are discussing, section 10.

I think the hon. Minister very capably defined what might be a definition of what is in the public interest or what is not in the public interest. It came rather as a surprise to me to hear the hon. member for Downsview complaining about the power being given to superintendents. If I recall the tenor of his remarks not too long ago, he was complaining that the superintendent of insurance did not have power enough in our Insurance Act.

Mr. Singer: If he is going to have any power, he is going to have power to fix rates.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is true that the superintendent of insurance under this Act may cancel the licence of the carrier of the insurance. There is an appeal, as the section reads:

—to the supreme court which may direct and may, upon cause, make an order directing the superintendent to remove the suspension or withdraw the cancellation.

I would simply say that while there is ministerial responsibility in The Insurance Act and different procedures here, there is ample safeguard and this, I think, makes for an administrative procedure which does not need, when there is this safeguard, to come up to the Minister to be dealt with in that situation.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. gentleman why there should not be a further appeal to the court of appeal? Supposing an insurance company had \$3 million in premiums; it is a pretty serious thing for them to have their licence cancelled. Why should they not have the right to appeal to the court of appeal? Why should they be at the whim of a judge whose wife, perhaps, shouted at him as he was going out the door in the morning and he was in no mood to listen to the pleas of counsel? He says that he does not want to be bothered with this and affirms the order of the superintendent. Why should they be stopped short at the door of the court of appeal? I have been in court sometimes when I have said to the judge, "I can appeal to the court of appeal"; and they are offended because I say it. I said to one recently, "The court of appeal is a respectable body; what is wrong with my saying I will go to the court of appeal? I will be in good company with them." What is the fear of legislative counsel of the court of appeal? Why do they deny access to the court? Those judges get paid \$25,000 a year and the chief justice gets more, to hear cases, and I cannot think of anything more serious than the cancellation of a licence of an insurance company that has \$2 million or \$3 million of premiums in force, to bring to the court of appeal and, indeed, right on to the top—to the Supreme Court of Canada. It is serious enough. Why wrap it up in this obscurantism, of "cause being shown." If I were writing this—I will be presumptuous—if I were writing this, subsection 2 would say this:

Any carrier whose licence under this Act is suspended, may appeal from the suspension to the court of appeal.

In the criminal code, as my hon. friend said, an accused person who is convicted has the right of appeal to the court of appeal. It does not say what the court of appeal has to do; it does not say that cause has to be shown or stipulate any of the conditions for granting relief. It just says, "may appeal to the court of appeal" against his conviction. That would be the simple language that I would employ here: "—may appeal therefrom to the court of appeal." We do not, as my hon. friend knows, have to stipulate the Supreme Court of Canada, because there are provisions for an appeal from the court of appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. I would not deny these insurance companies—somebody will get the impression that we are against insurance companies, when we are not.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting discussion. However, I think the time has come when we might rise. We will consider this question. The point the hon. member has made will be considered in order that we may examine this section and see whether it really does achieve what we want. I notice that it has been carefully drawn, and despite the thought of the hon. member for Sudbury that there are individual judges who with any degree of regularity at all, would be affected in their judgment by what their wives said to them when they left the house—if we were to adopt that argument I do not know where we would ever have a final court of appeal. Inevitably one must go to a man—unless we could build a computer—who would not be affected. However, we will commence with section 10 when we resume this discussion.

I move that the committee rise and report that it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume the discussion of this bill, and in the afternoon we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, continued	3883
Recess, 12.30 o'clock	3902

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. W. G. Noden (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I want to thank you for permission to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this House, a national educational award that was granted last Friday in Ottawa.

The Henry Marshall Tory award was presented by the Canadian association for adult education at its annual meeting to the Quetico conference and training centre, a residential adult education centre in north-western Ontario. The Quetico centre is at Kawene, 100 miles west of the Lakehead, near the entrance of Quetico provincial park.

The Tory award is presented to organizations in recognition of distinguished achievement in adult education in Canada. It is awarded in honour of Dr. Tory, a founder of four Canadian universities and the first full-time director of the national research council. The award is the first one to be granted during the past three years.

The Quetico centre is dedicated to the economic and cultural growth of northwestern Ontario. Its programme includes courses for management, officers of community and labour organizations, artists, craftsmen, the unemployed and Indians. Thank you.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I ask your permission and the indulgence of hon. members to make an announcement of considerable interest to the municipalities and their ratepayers located in the eastern Niagara region, more specifically in the counties of Lincoln and Welland. The hon. members of the Legislature will recall that some weeks ago, while introducing the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs, I announced that the department hoped to undertake a series of comprehensive studies of municipal and

intermunicipal problems and relationships in certain sections of the province, which have been experiencing during the past few years extensive urban growth and development where there appeared to be a growing concern with the complexity and urgency of the resulting municipal problems, and, more particularly, the basic question whether the existing structure of local government in these areas could be expected to deal adequately with both present and future needs.

One of the regions then mentioned was the eastern Niagara region where, within the counties of Lincoln and Welland, there are now three rapidly growing cities of St. Catharines, Niagara Falls and Welland, with the town of Port Colborne due to be elevated to the status of a city on January 1, 1966, together with five other towns, three villages and 14 townships and the two administrative counties, with a total population of about 300,000 people. Some two years ago these municipalities, in recognition of growing concern with the problems that I have mentioned, formed an intermunicipal research committee, which resulted in the production by Dr. Henry Mayo, senior professor of political science at the University of Western Ontario, of a preliminary report strongly recommending the undertaking of a full-scale review of municipal and intermunicipal relationships in this important section of the province, which would be of great assistance to both the municipalities and the government of the province in the consideration of any possible changes in the existing structure.

As a result of a number of meetings and consultations with representatives of all the municipalities in the area, including a meeting over which I presided in Niagara Falls on April 28, 1965—which was attended by representatives of nearly all the municipalities concerned—I am now satisfied that there is widespread local support for the undertaking and that a decision to go ahead with the project is now justified. I am glad to be able to announce that I have been able to secure the services of Dr. Mayo, himself, as chief commissioner, and I propose to appoint as assistant commissioner, Mr. C. Frank Moore, QC, a veteran municipal lawyer, who, owing to his experience at one time as Crown

attorney for the county of York, subsequently, as the head of the legal department of the township of North York and as solicitor for the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto until his retirement in 1963, is highly qualified, in my opinion, to make a substantial contribution, in the light of his legal knowledge and administrative experience, to the work of the commission.

Professor Mayo is the author of various books, including, *An Introduction to Democratic Theory*, published by the Oxford University Press, New York, 1961. He has written many articles on local government and in 1955 and 1956 was the technical advisor to the Royal commission on metropolitan development in Alberta. He was also a member of the Canadian council on urban and regional research. Dr. Mayo already has a substantial knowledge of the specific problems of this particular area and has made many valuable contributions in his speeches and articles to an understanding of what may be called regional government problems of the type which appear to be developing in this and other areas of the province.

The commission will be assisted by an adequate research staff, specially assigned to the project, headed by Mr. F. H. Finnis, MBE, who served for four years as a municipal research associate with the Canadian tax foundation and more recently has acted as research director and secretary of the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto.

Both the terms of reference and the procedure to be adopted in the Niagara region review will be similar to those which have been followed with my approval in the Ottawa, Eastview and Carleton county local government review which was organized approximately a year ago and is expected to complete its work and bring in a report in the near future.

The commission will also work in close co-operation with the existing Niagara peninsula intermunicipal committee which was, to a large extent, responsible for the stimulation of local interest in the project. This committee comprises one representative from each of the two county councils and one representative from each of the three cities. The arrangements for meeting the cost of the project will be similar to those made in the Ottawa and Carleton county review, under which the total cost will be temporarily financed by The Department of Municipal Affairs, and at the conclusion of the survey the municipalities will be required to reimburse the province for 50 per cent of the cost, which amount they will share among

themselves in any manner they may consider equitable.

It is estimated that on the basis of the experience gained in the Ottawa and Carleton county review, the proposed review will be completed by the end of August, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 47th order. The committee of the whole House; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

On section 10:

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has had an opportunity to consider overnight, or with the morning coffee, our suggestion to amend this section?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, in respect to section 10, when the debate was adjourned yesterday the question had been raised in the matter of appeal by the hon. member for Sudbury. The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), I believe, was somewhat concerned with the use of the expression "in the public interest."

I was actually prepared to answer the concern of the hon. member at the time, when the debate adjourned. I would like to deal with it now, if I might.

On the question of appeal, which was raised by the hon. member for Sudbury: I think I should draw his attention to the Act on the statutes of Ontario known as The Judges' Orders Enforcement Act, which is chapter 196 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario. That statute provides in section 3—that is the last section in the Act, incidentally:

An appeal lies from an order made by a judge as persona designata to the court of appeal.

—and the section proceeds:

(a) if the right of appeal is given by the statute under which the judge acted—that does not apply here:

or (b) if no such right of appeal is given, then by leave of the judge who made the order, or by leave of the court of appeal.

—so that The Judges' Orders Enforcement Act does provide for a right of appeal where the original appeal is to a judge as persona designata, by leave of the judge or by leave of the court of appeal.

My submission is that in section 10 of Bill 136 the designation there is to a judge of the supreme court, I would submit that is *persona designata*. If there is any question on the opinion that it is not an appeal to a judge as *persona designata*, then I would refer the hon. member to The Judicature Act and to section 26 thereof, which reads:

Except where it is otherwise provided by statute, subject to the rules regulating the terms and conditions on which appeals may be brought, an appeal lies to the court of appeal from any judgment, order or decision of a judge of the high court in chambers that finally disposes of any cause or matter.

So, on the one hand, if it is *persona designata* you have The Judges' Orders Enforcement Act; on the other hand, if it is not, and the hon. member feels it is not, then he has section 26 of The Judicature Act, which provides a right of appeal.

I think that should effectively dispose of any concern that there is not the fullest right of being able to carry the matter on up to the highest court in the land.

On the question of public interest, I wish the hon. member for Downsview were here. I think I should say to him that this is the formula, this is the language, which we use now in numerous Acts; that expression is a very common one. I should just like to make reference to it in a number of cases.

The Private Investigators Act, in section 14—these are Acts which have been passed by this Legislature and most of them fairly recently—says:

The registrar may, after giving the licensee an opportunity to be heard, suspend or cancel licence where, in the opinion of the registrar to do so is in the public interest.

That is The Private Investigators Act, the recent one.

Again in section 8:

The registrar shall issue a licence or renewal of a licence where, in the opinion of the registrar, the proposed licensing is not against the public interest.

Another use of the same expression.

The Collection Agencies Act, which was debated by the members of this Legislature, and I am sure the hon. member for Downsview took part in that debate, says in section 4:

The registrar may, after giving the licensee an opportunity to be heard, suspend or cancel licence where in the opinion

a term or condition upon which the licence was granted or where in his opinion to do so is in the public interest.

Actually, we use the term "in the public interest" and also the expression "in his opinion."

In The Mortgage Brokers Registration Act, in section 3:

Sec. 3, ss 5: The registrar shall grant registration or renewal of registration to an applicant where the proposed registration is not against the public interest.

In The Ontario Energy Board Act, section 39:

Where, after the hearing, the board is of the opinion that the construction of the proposed line or station is in the public interest, it may make an order granting leave to construct the line or station.

The Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, section 5 (7):

The registrar may, after giving the registrant an opportunity to be heard, suspend or cancel a registration for the breach or term of condition on which the registration was granted, or where in his opinion to do so is in the public interest.

In The Securities Act, and this, I think, shall be my last example. Section 6:

The director, after giving the registrant an opportunity to be heard, shall suspend or cancel any registration where in his opinion such action is in the public interest. But where the granting of an opportunity to be heard would in his opinion be prejudicial to the public interest, he may suspend any registration, etc.

The expression is used twice in the same section: "prejudicial to the public interest" and "in the public interest."

Mr. Sopha: But we had to suspend the director.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: One final example: The Used Car Dealers Act, section 4:

The registrar may grant registration or renewal of registration to an applicant where the proposed registration is not against the public interest.

Now all these Acts are fairly recent.

The hon. member who raised the point surely, if he is not aware, should have been aware; and I am sure he perused these Acts carefully. I merely take this occasion to point out that it is an expression that has been used frequently in much of our recent legislation, and I think that surely he must have had his tongue in his cheek when he took the time

of the House to debate the meaning of the expression, "in the public interest."

I might further say, with respect to section 10, that the language of section 10, subsection 2, is almost word for word with the language of section 11 of The Nurses Act, which is chapter 90 of the Statutes of Ontario, 1961-62. If you look at section 10 of the bill which is before you, Bill 136, and subsection 2 thereof, you might compare it with this language which is section 11 of The Nurses Act:

If the council refuses or neglects to register a person, a person aggrieved may apply—

and this is the language that is so similar:

—to a judge of the supreme court who, upon due cause shown, may make an order directing the council to grant the registration, renew the registration, remove the suspension or withdraw the cancellation, as the case may be, or may make such other order as is warranted by the fact—

You will see that the language is very similar to that of subsection 2 of section 10; again I simply point out that this is an Act, The Nurses Act, on our statute books, using language which is on all-fours with that of section 10, subsection 2, of the bill under discussion.

I trust that will clear up the points which have been raised. I think, therefore, that no amendment should be necessary to section 10.

Mr. Sopha: I would ask your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to make an additional comment. I did not raise anything about the public interest, or ask for the definition of it, which I know to be a common enough expression in the statutes. What I am concerned about is this matter of appeals. It does appear to me, and I am convinced beyond all peradventure, that the law officers of the Crown have so got their backs up about the criticism coming from the Opposition that they have become absolutely inflexible about any change. Remarkably, the hon. Attorney General gets up this morning and tells us that there are two possible interpretations to subsection 2; that to me is deliberate obscurantism. That is inviting litigation, inviting arguments by people who have to make use of this section.

I take it that one will argue that a supreme court judge is *persona designata*, though I always thought that one of the characteristics of a person acting *persona designata*, was the use of the article, "the." When they say "the county court judge," he is an identifiable person. There is only one person who can

fit that description, "the county court judge." When you say you use the indefinite article, the "supreme court judge," then you are referring to, I think it is, 24 people—the chief justice and the 23 puisne judges. Accordingly it is not held to be *persona designata*.

The hon. Attorney General, having dealt with that branch, refers to The Judicature Act and the section with which I am, and have been, familiar, and says that an appeal may lie from a judge in chambers. How do I know that, in the first application that is brought under this section, the person sitting in chambers will not take the position that it is a matter that ought to come on in weekly court? And accordingly, if it is to be heard in weekly court, then that section of The Judicature Act does not apply.

If the hon. Attorney General, to measure him by his words, is concerned about granting an appeal to the court of appeal from the order of the superintendent, then why not say so in simple language? Why not go directly to the court of appeal? It is sufficiently serious to exercise the talents of three men instead of one, and the hon. Attorney General well knows that if this comes on in chambers or in weekly court, the applicant is faced with perhaps a morning or a day in which 20, 30 or 40 other matters are being dealt with in chambers or in weekly court.

It becomes questionable therefore, whether the judge sitting in chambers or in weekly court has the time to apply himself to the serious problems that might arise under this subsection.

All we are asking for over here are two things, commonsense and justice. I think it is eminently good commonsense that such a serious exercise of powers as is granted by this Legislature to the superintendent ought to be reviewed promptly by judges in the highest court of judicature in Ontario, that is to say, the court of appeal.

I have become aware over the last few years that the civil service, the bureaucracy, does not like the courts. This government, and the bureaucracy which serves it, show evidence that they want to keep away from the courts. They are not married to the idea of granting easy appeals to the courts. They do not like to be in the courts. Indeed, in the last few years in the legal bills committee we have seen example after example of statutes coming in, the stimulus coming from the bureaucracy, to give them the privilege of not appearing in the courts as witnesses. They do not even like to go, and we have seen this phase come in that they cannot be subpoenaed as witnesses and produce any

documents unless the Minister gives his permission. The McRuer commission is hearing representations from many sectors about easy appeals, and almost all of the representations to the commission say that there ought to be easy appeals to the courts from the administrative decisions, except in respect of two or three boards—the labour relations board and the workmen's compensation board are two of the ones most frequently mentioned.

I really question that the hon. Attorney General, the chief law officer of the Crown in the province, should get up and deliberately point to obscure language in a subsection of an Act that this Legislature is asked to pass. We are the lawmakers. You would not know it, that the 108 that sit here, are the lawmakers and our word is final. There is no body superior to us in this province. We are not, and I emphasize—at least I am not, and I speak for myself; I am not subject to the whims of the law officers of the Crown.

I have my democratic rights, and indeed they are of very high order. Having been sent here by 80,000 people, I have my right to make my observations about what this supreme law-making body should do and what it should state in the statutes of this province. I regret that the chief law officer of the Crown gets up in this House and points to a section, makes an explanation, which invites litigation and expense and inconvenience and annoyance and frustration in regard to the interpretation of a simple principle. If you believe in appeal, then say so. Put it in two lines, instead of putting it in six. If you want an appeal on the merits, say so. Do not use obscure language, like "upon cause shown." I do not even know what that means.

If a client came in to me, the president of Excelsior Life Insurance, if there is such a company, and said to me: "Sophia what does that mean?" I would have to tell him: "Well, it may mean this and may mean a second thing, and it may mean a third thing. It will depend who we get in weekly court."

I would have to tell him if we got Mr. Justice Gale, the chief justice of the high court, then he would be of a temperament, because he has shown it, that he would be willing to review the exercise of discretion of the superintendent most readily. That is Mr. Justice Gale's intellectual predilection. He believes in reviewing the bureaucracy. But I would have to tell him, if we got Mr. Justice X, and I will not give a name, he would be most reluctant to review it. He might say to us, you have to show me some place where there is a flagrant miscarriage of justice here.

You have to show me where the superintendent went wrong. You have to show a bias on his part. You have to show a failure to adjudicate on the issue.

Of course, you are unable to do it. You cannot do it. You do not know the considerations upon which the superintendent decided, because he does not say so. He does not have to say so, this statute does not make him say so.

As I say, I do not know what those words mean; but I say finally, if you want a review on the merits of the decision, that is to say, the taking of evidence afresh, then say so in the statute and give a free rein to the judge in the high court, though I interpolate that I would not even allow the appeal to the judge of the high court. I would go directly to the court of appeal, as we do from the municipal board. The municipal board decides many weighty and important matters. We do not fool around with a puisne judge of the high court. We go directly from the municipal board to the court of appeal. Why not here?

Say a company has \$7 million in premiums in force. Along comes the superintendent and says, you are out of business. It is going to end up in the Supreme Court of Canada anyway. Why have the intermediate step of the judge of the high court dealing with it? Why not save a little time and money and effort on the part of counsel and the executives of the insurance company and go directly to the court of appeal? That is my brief.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I must suggest that the hon. member seems inclined to misinterpret any statements that are made for clarification of this section. What I was trying to point out to the House was that there was ample provision for appeal, either under The Judges' Orders Enforcement Act or under The Judicature Act, either way that one might care to move.

I do not like to refer to a judge of the supreme court as a puisne judge of the supreme court. I think the judges of the supreme court are not deserving of that adjective.

Mr. Sopha: Well, it is a term of—I spelled it out, puisne.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Oh, I thought you were calling—

Mr. Sopha: No, puisne, referring to a judge.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I must apologize to the hon. member. I guess your pronunciation and mine—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): How do you pronounce it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Well, he pronounces it correctly now. However, the point I would like to make is that you can go on to the court of appeal, and I shall try to be brief, Mr. Chairman, a judge of the supreme court—if I might get the hon. member's attention, too, as well as that of the House, Mr. Chairman.

Not every case would go to the court of appeal and to suggest that such would happen is straining certainty and making a situation which I think is unlikely to occur. If the judge of the supreme court should declare the cancellation to be wrongful that, I would think, would put an end to it. I doubt if the superintendent would appeal every case to the court of appeal. I reject the suggestion that the section should provide for an appeal immediately to the court of appeal. There are some statutes which do so, but I think in a situation of this kind the appeal to the judge of the supreme court and having made it amply clear that you can go on to the court of appeal should surely be sufficient.

I would like to refer again to section 11 of The Nurses Act which perhaps is not of the same stature as the question of the cancellation of the licence of an insurance carrier, but the language is:

—the person may apply to a judge of the supreme court who, upon due cause shown—

Now surely that language is not so difficult to understand; that if an appealing person shows cause, as the language is used here, they make an order for the registration to be restored, and so on.

I cannot think of any more simple, straightforward, quick procedure for allowing a person to reach a review of a superintendent's decision than is laid down in section 10 of this Act.

Section 10 agreed to.

On section 11:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, under section 11, I would be very interested to hear why the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) decided on \$100.

I was inquiring from one of my colleagues who is learned in the law as to what kind of people would get a fine of \$100 and for what kind of crime. I was informed that some poor soul who went out and lifted a can of fish from a store could come up before the

court and could be fined \$100; for impaired driving the fine could be \$100—no matter what your financial situation is—and when you think of the enormous wealth through the profits that some of these carriers have been making, with their 28 per cent retention fee, I question, sir, who decided on the \$100? Could the hon. Minister tell us who raised this as the maximum—why should it not be \$500?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell exactly who suggested it, but I presume it was the law officers who were guiding us in drawing this Act. I would draw your attention, sir, to the fact that this is \$100 per day for each day on which the carrier continues to carry on business. In addition to this, I am quite certain that this is a case where the superintendent of insurance would decide that this carrier was not acting in the public interest and he would very promptly lose his licence, which is about the most severe penalty that could be imposed upon him.

Mr. Thompson: To follow up on this, Mr. Chairman, if he loses his licence, what becomes the situation for all the people who have paid premiums in order that they might be provided with coverage?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is covered in another section of the Act. They must be advised of their rights under the Act to transfer to another carrier and they must be refunded pro rata, the premium that they have been charged.

Section 11 agreed to.

On section 12:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I wonder why this section 12 does not go on to say:

—and the person, servant or agent of the corporation which so refuses shall be liable to a term of imprisonment, of not more than six months.

The Summary Convictions Act provides that your citizen, John Jones, is liable to a maximum fine of, I think, \$500 and/or six months' imprisonment. That is to say, he can be both fined and imprisoned. Why a special privilege to corporations? Of course, that harks back to the special place that corporations have had in our society. We must not put the director of a corporation in jail, although I think as a result of the Windfall probe, some are going to find themselves there. But why should they not—if they deliberately refuse when they ought to issue a contract—why should they not go to jail

or be liable to go to jail, so that they will read this section and say, "If I refuse to sell a contract to Mary Smith here, I am liable to go to jail"? If an ordinary citizen can go to jail, why not a person acting for a corporation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is impossible to put a corporation in jail. I do not know; I would have to depend on the hon. Attorney General to advise us as to whether an officer of a corporation can go to jail, but I would point out that, here again, the stringent penalty is not the \$500—and we seriously considered making it \$5,000 or \$25,000, in the light of the fact that most of these bodies are corporate bodies with large resources. The stringent penalty is that the right to do business can, and would be very likely, taken away from them under those conditions. If a carrier were found to be breaching the law as laid out in section 12, I am quite certain, sir, that I would consider it my responsibility to request the superintendent of insurance to withdraw this corporation's licence.

As far as its relationship to The Summary Convictions Act is concerned, I am afraid I must defer to the hon. Attorney General for an explanation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, briefly, the hon. member for Sudbury is again stretching language when he says in wild terms that the ordinary citizen goes to jail for this sort of thing. The ordinary citizen does not go to jail for refusing to sell a piece of merchandise or refusing to enter into a contract. An officer or director of a corporation can be put in jail and is put in jail very often, under our jurisprudence, for theft or fraud where citizens are deprived of property or their rights; but refusal to enter into a contract is not a criminal offence in the sense that it calls for a person to lose his freedom and be thrown in jail. The penalty here, I suggest, as the hon. Minister of Health has pointed out, is ample and effective.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why we raise this is because of The Air Pollution Act and the fact that the government is too timid to say toughly and firmly, "Start cleaning up and stop fouling the air." When we asked last year about it, there was one firm, apparently, that had been fined, and I hope that the hon. Minister will indeed mean what he says, that he will indeed be very tough with these people, not only from the point of view of the fine, but far more important from the point of view of cancelling their licences, if this is abused.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to agree with the representations made by my hon. friends on the Liberal benches, except for one thing and that is that the whole section is just window-dressing anyway. I doubt if there will ever be a charge laid or a conviction registered under the section, as long as this Act is in force—and I hope it will not be for very long.

What is being represented to the public is that all insurance companies must have available standards contracts and standard co-insurance contracts. This is what the bill purports to say.

Anyone who has tried to buy renewable term insurance from a life insurance company that does not feel like selling it, knows how effective such availability is. They all have it available, but they will get their agents to tie you up in knots and take you through long, long harangues about the virtues of some other flossy type of policy with all sorts of fine print, so that the average purchasers will usually give up. Either he will buy what they want to palm off on him or he will try to go somewhere else.

I doubt if a case would ever arise where a prospective purchaser of insurance would get a clear-cut refusal, either in writing or with witnesses present, which I think would be necessary if a charge was going to stand up in court. He would just get the old run-around, if they did not want to sell the standard contract or the standard co-insurance contract. If they would rather promote some other type of contract which mainly confused the issue for the consumer and led him to believe that he was getting benefits which he probably was not getting, they could easily do it, there is nothing in the law that could stop them. Let us forget the myth that this section in the bill will, in fact, require a private carrier to sell one of these contracts if he decides he does not want to sell it. By the time the insurance agent gets through befogging the issue, the prospective customer will not know what has been offered to him or what has been refused.

Section 12 agreed to.

On section 13:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have two comments on section 13, both of them are questions.

Why is it that the Act does not provide any penalty for a carrier who attempts to charge a subscription in excess of the applicable maximum subscription for the contract? It seems to me that of all places where a penalty should be imposed, it is in this

section. Nowhere else in the Act do I see any penalty or any effective sanction to make certain that carriers keep within the maximum subscription rate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Section 10, subsection 1.

Mr. Renwick: Apart from the suspension and cancellation of the licence.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a pretty heavy penalty. That is pretty drastic.

Mr. Bryden: Would you contemplate a less drastic penalty being available?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This might be worth thinking about.

Mr. Renwick: My other question is one that has concerned me and I do not think it has been raised before: the difference between two persons who go to get a standard insurance contract—who go to the same carrier and apply for a standard insurance contract. One of them is old and ill; the other one is young and well; is that carrier obligated to issue the contract at the identical subscription rate or is there going to be a differential in the subscription charged for a standard contract by a licensed carrier depending upon the physical health of the applicant, his age, or any other factors?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If I understand my hon. friend correctly, Mr. Chairman, here again I would point out that premium rates now prevailing will apply, in the case of standard contracts, to people for whom there is no reason to charge the maximum premium. The maximum premium will only apply to those who, because of age or state of past or present health, are considered high insurance risks. This is the very important feature of this bill: It does not interfere with the rates being now charged.

I think I read into the record yesterday, sir, the experiences met with in Alberta where this has been in effect. It has been their finding, specifically documented, that fewer than 15 per cent of the people applying came under the maximum premium rate. We will find that this will obtain to a far lesser degree in Ontario because, as I already pointed out, a very large percentage of those in the group, who will be totally or partially supported by government, will come in this high-cost risk group. Therefore the number of high-cost risks left to be spread over all of the insurance base will be relatively low. I think this should answer the question for the hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: If I understand this correctly, then the issuance of standard medical insurance contracts is going to have no bearing whatsoever on the group insurance principle. The principle of this bill has nothing to do with group insurance; it is purely an individual application for an insurance coverage and so long as the carrier keeps within the maximum rate that is imposed, or which is prescribed, he can charge any number of variable rates despite the fact that provision is made for Medical Carriers Incorporated to have a pooling arrangement.

I was obviously labouring under a misapprehension because it was my understanding that with the number of licensed carriers who are going to be issuing policies, with the ability of those licensed carriers to have a pooling arrangement, the people in the province of Ontario, regardless of their age, physical or mental infirmities, were going to at least have the benefit under this scheme of being considered as members of a group; and that therefore the rate which any individual person was going to have to pay was going to be a rate similar to that which any other person in the province would pay, and would not be related in any way to his age, or physical or mental infirmity.

The reason this concerns me, of course, is that it is the very people who, because of age, or physical or mental infirmity, are going to have more difficulty in paying their premiums who, under this bill, are going to be the persons who are going to have to pay higher rates than persons who have no mental or physical disability. I would like the hon. Minister to comment, because it obviously escaped my attention until just recently that the group principle is completely denied in the plan this government is putting forward.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course, Mr. Chairman, the group principle cannot apply in this plan because this does apply to individuals seeking insurance coverage. The difference between the cost of the group coverage and individual coverage is very largely eaten up in the much higher administrative costs dependent upon doing business in this way. It was never intended, nor has it ever been inferred or suggested by anything that we on this side of the House have said, that these individual contracts would be looked upon as a group. We have stated that the present insurance industry principle shall apply, that the industry can rate the applicant or subscriber as it will; but they can never charge a subscriber more than a maximum premium approved by government.

Of course, the high-risk cases can, and might well be, charged the maximum rate. Experience indicates that. But the pooling arrangement will make it possible that this rate will be less than it would otherwise be if there were no pooling arrangements.

The insurance actuaries to whom I have spoken have outlined their thinking in this regard. They believe that in Ontario, with the government having taken up the group whom we will support, either in whole or in part, one bad risk will occur for every 17 good risks; and the intention now is that ten cents of each good risk premium will be put into the pool against the high costs for those who are bad insurance risks. In this way, it will be possible to keep the maximum premium down to the lowest possible level. In other words, \$1.70 per month from good risks can be applied to the financing of bad risks. But at no time have we suggested that they would be looked upon or treated as a group, because this is administratively impossible under this system.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think the confusion in my thinking must have arisen because of the provisions throughout the bill for enrolment periods. I had assumed that enrolment periods meant that, for stated periods of time, groups of people were going to be admitted as eligible persons to make application for standard insurance contracts; and, because they were coming in by way of groups, that therefore they would have all the benefits of a group insurance arrangement. This would mean that, regardless of their age, or physical or mental infirmity, each person would be entitled to the same subscription rate for a standard medical insurance contract from a licensed carrier.

If what the hon. Minister has stated is true, that the differential will depend entirely on the insurability of that risk as long as it keeps within the maximum subscription rate, then there cannot conceivably be any reason for having open enrolment periods and closed enrolment periods. There should certainly therefore be no reason for penalizing a person who does not apply during an open enrolment period by having him subjected to a three-month delay period.

It does not seem to me that the principle which the hon. Minister has stated is consistent in any way with an open enrolment period. I think that the government should seriously consider deleting the open enrolment period if they are going to allow the differential in the premiums which are going to be charged by the licensed carrier, depend-

ing on the state of health of the applicant, or the age of the applicant.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the open enrolment period bears absolutely no relationship to the premium, nor to the grouping, nor to anything else. Just because an open enrolment period is set, no waiting period is actually being presented as an inducement to people to become insured during this open enrolment period.

The penalty clause, if you will, the waiting period—if one chooses not to come in during the open enrolment period—obtains, for instance, in hospital insurance now, where there is no open enrolment period. One can join as a pay-direct at any time, but one is subject to a three-month waiting period, during which one pays his regular premium but does not get the advantage of any benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the difference between group premiums and individual premiums, as stated, rests with the much lower administrative costs; a group, insurance-wise, is quite different, as I am sure my hon. friend knows better than I, to a number of people coming in as individual contractors and seeking individual contracts during an open enrolment period. Of course we expect that there will be numbers of people, but they will not be centrally grouped where there is a central body collecting the premium and turning it over to the insurance carrier, all in one lump. This is the difference between the group, insurance-wise, and the group of whom my hon. friend made mention.

Again I must point out, sir, that the bill does not interfere with premiums or premium structures obtaining now. The bill gives us the power to set a maximum premium on which no carrier can charge a subscriber, but it does not interfere with the prepaid competitive pricing such as obtains at the present time, and I gave certain examples that are actually in practice. I gave some figures during second reading, which were in vogue in the province of Alberta. I regret that I have not got them here but they are recorded in *Hansard*. I did give figures that now actually obtain in the province of Alberta. They are no different from what they were before the government-supported plan went into operation there, and from the experience in other places there is no reason to believe that any different set of circumstances will obtain here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question of open enrolment periods, I

would suggest that it is not we but the hon. Minister who is a little confused on the principle of an open enrolment period.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the open enrolment question does not come in the next section—

Mr. Bryden: Very well, Mr. Chairman, although it is related to—all right, I am quite willing to leave it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there is one further point that emerges and I must say that, together with my friend, the hon. member for Riverdale, I am beginning to get a clear picture of the administrative monstrosity that we are being presented with here.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it underlines another point. I think it is really ridiculous, almost irresponsible, that the Opposition and the public of this province should be asked to buy a pig in a poke. After all these years of study the hon. Minister—

Mr. Bryden: So-called—

Mr. MacDonald: “So-called” is right—I was going to dignify it with the term “study” for a moment—“procrastination” might be more appropriate.

After all these years of so-called study, the hon. Minister comes before this House and is not yet in a position to state what this maximum figure is going to be. Now what is indicated to us is that the 16 out of 17—if I may take the hon. Minister's figure—1 had risk out of 17—the 16 out of 17 will buy their insurance as they do now and they will allegedly be getting the benefits of competitive rates, but the seventeenth, the person who is sustaining all of the consequences and results of illness, because of a basic infirmity, either physical or mental, or because of old age, is the person who is going to continue to take the rap.

The whole principle, it seems to me, of the insurance that we are moving toward is the principle that you should pool your risks, that a person who is unfortunate enough to suffer all the other consequences of ill health, is not going to have added to that the added burden of an extra payment; it is going to be borne by his fellow citizens in keeping with the Christian principle that “I am my brother's keeper,” if one can conceive of Christian principles being established through insurance. But here the hon. Minister tells us quite flatfootedly—and I had not quite realized this—that these people who need insurance most because of the fact that

they have an infirmity, are the very people who are going to have to pay the rap for an excessive insurance. But how excessive—and I get back to my main point—we do not know.

The Minister has the affrontery to come into the House to ask us to accept this. He is going to leave it in good faith to the insurance actuaries to come up with a figure, which, I judge now, is certainly going to be in the range of \$180 or conceivably even more.

I make this point once again—it is not a new one in this debate, either at second reading or at the committee stage—but I think it is preposterous that the public of this province or the Opposition should have to consider and to pass final judgment on a bill in which a key factor dealing with the people whose need for insurance is greatest, is being withheld by the government. I refuse to believe that a government that has seriously been studying health insurance for as long as this government said it has, would not be in a position to present us with the maximum figure that is going to be put in the legislation and now the regulations.

An hon. member: It must be even higher than \$180.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly—you are only speculating, but I do not blame you.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to underline this strongly as well, and I have said it before when this debate started.

Let me mention what is happening in British Columbia. Perhaps it would be a little easier to mention what has happened in Saskatchewan where there is a premium of \$24; and the hon. Minister is talking of \$180—or something. But let me say this—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think it is only fair that the hon. leader of the Opposition point out that there is a very grave difference between this magical figure that they quote from Saskatchewan—\$24. That is the \$24 that the subscriber puts out immediately from his own pocket, but he is paying for the rest through taxes. Let us make this eminently clear.

Mr. Thompson: Let me make this eminently clear, that we are being asked to pay taxes for not only medical schools, but for a variety of health services, and we are emphasizing—and I want to make this very clear—full, complete health programmes without this sort of patchwork approach that you are taking. At times I see the hon. Minister—

and I hate to say this—as Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. At one point he says that he is against compulsion and the next moment he says that he is for it—but I will not go into that further.

Again, on this situation of wanting to know what the premiums are and what the cost is, we are on third reading and for some reason the hon. Minister is silent on this. He says that he has given six years' study to this but surely the pocket book costs are the most important thing to the people of this province; but he is withholding telling us anything about it. Either he has not studied it sufficiently—if so, admit it, or else say what other reason he might have for withholding it.

Look at Premier Bennett. He said very clearly that the premiums under the scheme that they are proposing will range from \$30 a year for a single person with no taxable income, to \$150 for a family with a taxable income of more than \$1,000. They are getting some concrete things on this and this is what we are asking of the hon. Minister. I see no reason why we cannot get an answer.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already told the House during second reading, what the rates are on which would be based the coverage provided through the government. I have also pointed out to you that the Act states very specifically that one of the responsibilities of the council is to recommend maximum premiums, the first maximum premium and all succeeding maximum premiums. This bill has not yet become law and we have not the authority to set up the medical services insurance council and they cannot give us recommendations, but the premium structure on which our programme will be based—bearing in mind that 45 per cent of our people who the government will look after, are in the high cost bracket of \$72 for a single person—is as follows: \$144 for a family of two and \$180 for a family of three; and for those who have not taxable income, this will be provided for them at no cost; those who have a taxable income of \$70 will pay \$10 and the government will pay the difference; those with a taxable income of \$300 will pay \$43 premium and the government will pay the rest, and so on up the scale. We have the table laid out and these are the figures on which the government's programme is based, but I have no idea whether this is the maximum that the council will recommend to us. It may be less; it may be more. I do not know yet, but the cost on which the government programme is based is set out here. We have nothing to hide. Let me make that perfectly clear to you.

My hon. friend from York South speaks about the bad risks taking all the rap. Let us remember that one bad risk for every 17 who are good risks would be a small minority. Let us remember, too, that a great many of the high insurance risks are now swallowed up in groups and this will continue because a group cannot be changed. The insurance carrier cannot, under the terms of any group contract I know of, withdraw bad risks. Many of them, as my hon. friends know very well, are carried over into retirement, as long as the actively employed group remains with the carrier. I think this is something that the labour movement has built into all of their contracts, built in very wisely over the years.

That the bad risk, as my hon. friend said—and I think I quote him correctly—will take the rap, is not a fact. This is part of the pooling, as I have just pointed out. Ten cents a month will come out of every good premium, every person who pays a premium into any of the—if my hon. friend would just wait a minute, it is rather distracting to hear that nattering—

Mr. Bryden: You gave no assurance of that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If my hon. friend would just listen. As I have already pointed out, the pooling will be built on the base of all insurance contracts and the ten cents per month will come out of every healthy risk and be put into the pool to help mitigate this so-called "rap" my hon. friend speaks about which will be suffered by the bad risk. And let us remember that that bad risk cannot get insurance today, or, if he can, as I stated—and these words which I used previously were turned to my disadvantage—what I actually said was that I am quite certain that insurance carriers will tailor any contract to meet the needs and wants of any individual. I did not say, as I was accused, that the government is going to do that.

Insurance carriers will tailor-make a plan, I am quite certain, to fit the needs and wants of any individual in any area that can be insured. So it is in the health field, but there are great numbers, by and large, who cannot get medical services insurance by virtue of their age, their state of health, or for various other reasons. Now this will be available to them, and it will be available at less cost than it would be now if they were to have it tailor-made because the risk of their high cost will be spread across the whole of the broad insurance base, with the exception of the group covered by the government.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister says that I have misunderstood, and conceivably I have misunderstood what he said. I find it very difficult to follow his line of reasoning because it appears to change. The hon. Minister did state this, and if I am wrong I hope he will correct me—the maximum rates will be fixed for individuals who are seeking coverage and who are high risks. Now presumably these people are going to be paying more than a person who is a good risk and who is also seeking individual coverage.

If I may illustrate my point with figures for the moment. A person who is in good health and seeks coverage, conceivably can get it for \$150 or \$160. But if he is a bad risk, he is maybe going to get it at a maximum. The maximum may be \$185, it may be \$200. All you are saying is that without the pooling arrangement, the maximum might have been \$250. But they have pooled the risks and they have got it down some.

That still leaves him taking a rap. He is taking a rap of \$200 instead of \$250, when if he did not have the misfortune of having ill-health he could get it for \$150. So my contention that this man is going to be taking the rap, in violation of the basic sharing of risks, particularly to meet the needs of those whose need is greatest, those who have poor health—and often when they have poor health, they have the least means to be able to buy insurance.

So my case is valid, except that all the hon. Minister is saying is that it might be even worse, he might have to pay \$250, and these very considerate insurance companies are going to have a pooling arrangement that will bring the potential premium of \$250 down to \$180 or \$200, and he should feel lucky that he is only having to pay \$180 or \$200. Now, this is a line of argument which I suggest to the hon. Minister is not valid in terms of the kind of insurance coverage that most countries and most provinces are seeking at this time rather than this patchwork.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister gave a figure yesterday in reply to a question I had raised in respect to the Alberta situation and suggested these figures might well apply in Ontario, although they will vary here to some extent.

This morning he has given us a figure of 10 cents, a figure which the insurance companies will set aside for the bad risks. Now, certainly if the insurance companies have arrived at a figure of 10 cents, then they must have based that upon some sort of actuarial—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend is reading something into my remarks that was not there and was not intended. I stated that, in our discussions with the actuaries, they explained the operation of the pooling in this way, and the 10 cent figure was the figure they used. This was not, I repeat, any decision or conclusion of the insurance carriers.

Mr. Young: I appreciate that information, and the 10 cents was simply an illustration.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: An illustration!

Mr. Young: A figure such as the \$180, or whatever others were being pulled out of the air here to talk about—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, the \$180 is not a figure pulled out of the air. It is a firm figure.

Mr. Young: The \$180, I understand, is a firm figure as far as the assistance part is concerned, but we have been using that as a possible other maximum. The hon. member for York South used \$200 and \$250 just a moment ago. The 10 cents is in that same category. That is my point.

I think this House has had a shock this morning. At least the members in the Opposition benches have had it when it was driven home to us that the group principle was not going to apply here. I just want to add my voice of protest, because I can see that the older people, the people who have the physical infirmities of age, are the people who are going to be hardest hit. This has been talked about and illustrated.

This group will come, I suppose, in three main groups. The one group which will be covered entirely, we do not have to worry about them. Second, those who will be covered in part, who will have taxable incomes up to the \$1,200 mark, or I suppose if they are older, \$1,000, or whatever it may be.

Now, the people in that category are going to have very great difficulty in meeting their own part of the insurance premium, and I think many of those people will go without the insurance rather than try to meet the financial obligation there.

The other group will be just above this maximum, many of them on pensions and low incomes, because of illness or other reasons will be just above the \$1,200 taxable income and again—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member uncover the mike? I am sorry, I could

not hear the hon. member because the mike was covered.

Mr. Young: I am sorry. The third group would be those who will be just above the \$1,200 taxable amount who have low incomes because of their infirmities, and so on. These are people who would find it very difficult to maintain the premium, whether it is \$180, \$200 or whatever it might be. So they, too, will be inclined to say, "Well, we'll take a chance on it as we have had to go without insurance for years past."

I think, Mr. Chairman, this aspect of this insurance is a desperately serious one for these people. They are going to pay more, and many of them are going to go without just because of financial difficulty. Even though the policy may be there available to them in law, it is not available because of a financial barrier. So again I urge upon the hon. Minister that the group principle be introduced here and that something be done to bring the premium for the standard policy into uniformity so that everybody in the province helps to bear the burden of those who may be sick, infirm or aged.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough North.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): I would just like to underline a couple of the things that the hon. Minister has said on this very point.

First, it has been mentioned that the group principle would not apply. In effect, perhaps it does not, but I think my hon. friends should know, for instance, that to get an individual contract now, say, from PSI, paying direct as an individual contract, you pay \$209 a year. That is regardless of your condition of health, whether you happen to be what might be called a good risk or a bad risk. Certainly the suggested maximum which has been mentioned is much less than this.

Mr. Bryden: How do you know that?

Mr. Wells: It has been mentioned, and I do not know what it is going to be. We do not know what it is going to be, but in all likelihood it will be less than this \$209; so, in effect, there is going to be a reduction for all people in what they are going to be able to get an individual contract for.

As has been stated, it is only those who are in the bad risk category who probably will pay the maximum; and it has been stated by the hon. member for York South that these are the people who can least afford it, that these are the people who are on low

income perhaps, are aged and so forth. This is probably so; a lot of these people will be in this category. But I would say, Mr. Chairman, that these people, most of these people in this bad risk category that he has talked about, will be getting their insurance for no premium at all; because all this group will fall into the category whose need is greatest and therefore will get their insurance in Ontario for no premium; they will fall into that category which obtains insurance from the medical services insurance division, and I think that the hon. members of this House should remember that in no other province in Canada will they be able to get this—only in Ontario.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, let me re-emphasize that this certainly comes as a shock to us; this situation where, if you suffer from bad health in some way, you are a poor risk. We assumed that, under a group programme, at least there would be the principle which the hon. Minister himself enunciated. He said that there would be pooling, so that the healthy would be able to ease the costs for those who were sick. But then there is the qualification that those who have ill-health may have to pay the maximum, while those who are healthier, get away with less; they do not have to pay the maximum.

The 1951 sickness survey showed that those who were of the lower income—and when I talk about a lower income, I am not talking about charity cases, or the class that you are talking about; I am talking about the fellow who is a truck driver or who gets about \$5,000—were going to have to pay the whole shot. He does not want to be a charity case. But because his wife may be sick—and let me say that sickness surely should not be a stigma, it can hit any of us—but because of this situation he is going to have to pay more. And I am suggesting that he is going to have to pay something which may be impossible for him to get full adequate coverage.

I think you have been fooling us on this situation, or else we have been fooled ourselves by it; because we had felt, when you said that there was a pooling system, that this meant the healthy helped those who are not healthy. I had hoped you would have followed that principle to cover the whole of the province on this, and make it completely comprehensive. However, you do not see that; you extend your principle only a certain amount.

But let me say this: This, to me, is a show of indifference towards those who are ill.

You are putting up financial barriers for them in comparison to those who are healthy. This is meant to be a health programme; and I suggest, if it is a health programme, you should be particularly concerned that those who have ill health should have as easy a facility to get treatment as do those who are healthy. Yet by your very remarks you are saying that the person who is in ill health and whom we term a bad risk—and what a horrible thing, to be referring to citizens of this province as a bad risk; to me, it is a revolting term—must pay more.

Mr. Sopha: It is an insurance term.

Mr. Thompson: It is an insurance term but it is also utterly abhorrent.

And then there is this other situation where you show this great faith for the insurance companies. Our hon. friend over here said it: Let us look at the record again of the insurance companies. Have you ever read some of the clauses that they have had written in fine print in some of their policies? I speak as an insurance agent, and I have seen some of the situations.

Pierre Berton listed a number in *Maclean's* magazine where, under one policy, a fellow was told that if you are confined to home then you will get sickness benefits. So the fellow gets out in his wheelchair and pushes himself around the block, and then the technical boys come in. They are interested in technicalities, not health. They say, "You went outside your home, you weren't confined to your home, so you are through." And these are the kind of companies in which you are putting your trust, and saying, "They will advise us about how much it will be; I have to wait for their advice on it."

It is a shocking situation, particularly when we learn about the fact of you standing up and saying there will be a principle of pooling, so that the healthy will help to pool for those who are ill; and then we learn that there is a loophole. This thing is like a sieve, a leaky bucket, when you examine it.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Bryden: Here comes the voice of the insurance companies.

Mr. Cowling: Yes. I am rather shocked at the hon. leader of the Opposition referring to this term "bad risk" because, as an insurance agent, he must have certain people applying to him for insurance almost every day who, in his opinion, would be bad risks.

I know we have; we have certain people who drive cars, for example, whom we just do not want to insure because they are bad risks. The same thing applies in the health field. There are certain people, I agree—

Mr. Bryden: They are sick people.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member spoke yesterday, and was on his feet almost all day and all night. Now, for heaven's sake, shut up for a minute and give somebody else a chance. The hon. member just talked all day long; he talked on every subject that came up. I have the floor and I would like to talk, if the hon. member does not mind; then he can go on for the rest of the day and the night.

Getting back to the insurance situation, which is something I know a little bit about, the hon. member for Sudbury has had an awful lot to say, too; he has been on his feet most of the week—

Mr. Sopha: I will be on them a good deal more before this is over.

Mr. Cowling: —hollering and shouting about goodness knows what.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for High Park has nothing to say, especially when he is speaking.

Mr. Cowling: Why does the hon. member not just shut up for a little while and learn? You know, it is an amazing thing, Mr. Chairman, how the Opposition constantly asks questions of all the Ministers concerning estimates; if they would just listen instead of opening their mouths all the time, they would learn something and they would have the questions answered; but they just have to talk all the time.

An hon. member: Talk all the time and say nothing.

Mr. Cowling: That is right, and say nothing. It is a principle of the insurance business, and most of the citizens in our province have something to do with the insurance business, whether they like it or not; it is not a big bad bogey, you know, it is a great business; they provide a wonderful service for the people.

Certain people—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: Just a minute, just a minute. There are certain people, and it is not their

fault, many people, who have some disability over which they have no control; but, as far as the insurance industry is concerned, they are not in the same health category as someone who has never had an illness. And their rates are predicated on this; they have to be. The normal healthy person is not in the same premium category as someone who has a disability; that is just common sense. To say that you do not like the term "bad risk" really is beside the point because, as they say in our business, we have bad risks. The lawyers get lots of bad risks, too. Everybody gets them. But I just wanted to comment on that particular point. Certain people qualify for regular premium rates because they are normal and healthy; and others, who have a certain disability—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cowling: What a mouth. He just never stops. Just never stops. Well, I am going to stop now, Mr. Chairman.

And try to say something the next time you get up, will you? Just say one thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak again as an insurance man. I would like to say that, frankly, I have had people come to me who are bad risks from the point of view of their health, through no fault of their own. This is nothing they could do anything about because, in effect, anyone, no matter what their initiative, or what their energy or anything else, can get bad health.

I can recall one case, and I am just going to exemplify what I am trying to say by this one case. A woman came to me and told me she would like to get coverage; she had been told by a doctor that she had to take a certain kind of treatment and get prescribed drugs, and I tried to find out if there was any way she could get it in her income bracket—which, I may say, was higher than that where you will get subsidies. I could not find it. And I am ashamed that we, as a government, have not recognized that we should take this out of profit making. We decide this fellow might not be ill for a while, so it is worthwhile signing him up to give him coverage for we may make some money out of him. Let us take it out of that kind of area and say that the health of our people is important. We have advances in medical research, we have magnificent medical facilities; let us bring it down so that, on an insurance basis, where it is not a bad risk at all—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Thompson: —but on the basis of providing help to people.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well sir, once again I have to say that we have returned to debating the basic principles of the bill, which were debated on second reading and I am not anxious to raise these points of order, but if we are to conduct the business of the House, I think we must pay attention to the rules. What the hon. member was discussing was very fully debated. He is now talking about a broad health programme, and if he is to say this all again, I would then have to, I feel, make my speech again. This has already been decided by the House, so I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that we follow the rules and adhere to the sections with which we are dealing.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about section 13, because until a few minutes ago, I did not realize that there were going to be different types of contracts. Certainly we elect no one in this particular section. I had no idea at all that the people who are, to use the insurance phrase, "bad risks," are going to have to pay more. What we might call normal risks—I realize full well that the hon. member for High Park said that in the automobile business we have good risks and bad risks. But in this particular instance, we are talking about living and dying, and as far as I am concerned, I think it should not be the insurance companies who could say whether a certain family is a good or a bad risk; it should be this government. Surely all people can be looked upon as good risks. We are trying to do what we can for them, no matter which government is in power, and I think that these premiums should all be the same, whether they are so-called "good" or "bad risks." I do not think that it is good enough for people either on this side of the House or the other, to compare this with the automobile insurance industry, or the finance insurance industry. These are people who tomorrow, if they do not get proper medical attention, may die because of the lack of it; and if there is a financial burden placed in their steps so that they cannot buy this coverage, then they become afraid to go to the doctors, because they know they cannot pay the bill. As a result there may be a tragedy in the family, and it is absolutely astounding to me that there should be any

difference in the premium whatsoever, as far as families in Ontario are concerned, when we are going to have a government-sponsored Medicare programme.

There is just one thing more that I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, I strongly suggest to the hon. Minister of Health, that when he is looking at the premiums, or the maximum premium, or the minimum, whatever it may be, that he does not take the figures of PSI or the figures given by the insurance industry, but rather that he go to some of our local co-ops who are providing medical care to thousands of people in this province, at much cheaper rates than PSI. As far as I am concerned, there are thousands, yes, thousands of doctors in this province, who are doing nothing but fleecing the PSI, and I can quote case after case, where the maximum bill is put in by doctors in this province, simply because PSI allows so much for a certain operation, or a certain call, whatever it may be.

I strongly suggest to the hon. Minister of Health that he go to the local co-ops who are working as a non-profit business and service to the community. In my own particular area, for example, the Bruce county co-op is providing the same service for \$135 per annum for which PSI now charges \$209. I suggest that there is profit in there somewhere and I hope that the hon. Minister will look most attentively into these co-ops, which I regard as giving the most satisfactory service in this province, at a much cheaper rate than either the insurance industry or PSI.

I would also recommend to the hon. Minister of Health that he have a representative of these co-ops on the council—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: —who, I am sure, will give not only sound advice, but much cheaper advice, than members of the medical profession or the insurance industry.

Section 13 agreed to.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks—

Mr. Chairman: Is this something more on 13?

Mr. Trotter: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine is first on section 14.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we now come to the question of enrolment periods, limitation of benefits and waiting periods. I think

it should be noted first of all, Mr. Chairman, that all this faldral about enrolment periods, waiting periods and so on, is totally unnecessary in a universal plan. If everyone is covered then there is no need for enrolment periods, waiting periods, etcetera. When we have partial, half-baked plans and programmes, however, it is necessary to guard against adverse selection. In other words, if some people are in and some are out, then steps have to be taken, there is no doubt about it, to ensure that the people who come in do not happen to be all the people who are sick—the bad risks, as we have been calling them—while the people who are well and not likely to call on the service stay out. This obviously has to be done. It is an undesirable thing to have to do, but it does have to be done, there is no doubt about it.

However, the more I sit and listen to the discussion here, the more concerned I am about the way the government is wrapping this bill up for the insurance companies. I take it from the answers that the hon. Minister has given to a good many other questions relating to intentions under this legislation, that he is not in a position yet to announce any firm intentions, because he has not got the word from the insurance companies, who are certainly going to be in the driver's seat when this legislation comes into force.

We can see the pattern unfolding itself, Mr. Chairman. In section 14, provision is made with respect to enrolment periods. I wanted to say something about enrolment periods under 13, when the matter came up obliquely, and you suggested I wait and say it here.

An enrolment period, I would suggest to the hon. Minister, is a method of putting people into a group, who do not fall into a natural group. One way of eliminating adverse selection, of course, is to enrol an entire group. Then you get the good risks and the bad risks in the group. The risks are spread and a genuine insurance principle applies. Of course, there are some people, a great many people, who do not belong to any groups that can apply as a group for insurance. A way of dealing with them is the open enrolment period. For a certain period of time, all these people can make application and, in effect, they become a group that has applied in a certain period of time; thus you get the same spreading of risks.

I have agreed that under this type of legislation it is necessary to guard against adverse selection. But the open enrolment period, if

that is the method you want to choose, should be sufficient by itself. We do not then have to build several more walls around the insurance companies to make sure that they hardly ever have to part with their money. But this bill is loaded in every direction. We not only have the remarkable principle that has now come to light—although I must say I was not as surprised as some of my colleagues professed to be when I heard about it. I figured that principle would be in the bill.

But we have the remarkable proposition that there will be differential premiums, not on the basis of a person's income—I am in favour of differential premiums related to income—but on the basis of the state of his health. It will be possible to charge the sick higher premiums than those who are well or whose health is good.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): A premium the residents can afford to pay.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You say you heard that it will be possible to charge a higher premium for the bad risks?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, indeed, we heard it!

You see, this is another method of guarding against adverse selection. One method is enrolment periods, another is differential premium, but apparently we are going to get both. The insurance companies are going to be well looked after. They are going to get both of these methods for protecting themselves, but that is not all they are going to get. To a considerable extent, an extent that we cannot determine on the basis of the legislation that is before us, it may be that they are also going to be allowed to impose waiting periods in some situations. In fact, in one situation they will be required to impose a waiting period, which I will refer to in a moment. I now refer specifically to subsection 3 of section 14, which provides that a standard contract issued under this section:

(a) shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition, save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations.

Here again we are in the situation where we are asked to buy a pig in a poke. We do not know what exceptions will be prescribed by the regulations. I am sure it is useless to ask the hon. Minister because he will say that

the insurance companies have not handed down the word yet, but I would submit to the hon. Minister that there is no need at all for that saving clause. The insurance companies are already well protected by the provision for enrolment period and by this tragic situation under which they will apparently be allowed to charge differential premiums. So let us not put butter on both sides of their bread and on the edges as well.

Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no need for this clause saying, "save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations." At least let us lay it down that a standard contract issued under section 14 and with the wide latitude permitted under section 13, shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition, period. I submit that is fair and reasonable and necessary to protect the public.

I would like to call attention to clause (c) of subsection 3 which says:

That a standard contract shall—
not "may," but "shall":

—provide an eight-month waiting period and limitation of benefits with respect to pregnancy or resulting childbirth or miscarriage, save for such exceptions as are prescribed by the regulations.

Not only is there the possibility, and I would judge from what I have heard so far, but the probability, of waiting periods and limitations of benefits being imposed or being permitted by regulations, but it is also proposed that we should have a waiting period of eight months in the case of pregnancies specifically prescribed. An insurance company will not even have the option to say, if it should decide in its infinite goodness and mercy to do so, that it will waive that unnecessary waiting period. I say it is unnecessary because of the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the hon. Minister that he can at least make this minor concession. He has looked after the interests of the insurance companies extremely well in this Legislature; now let him give minor consideration to the public, the people who will have to pay the freight, or I am afraid the people who, in many cases, will be priced out of the market because they will fall between two stools. They will not fall into the hon. Minister's charity category, and on the other hand they will not be able to afford the extremely high freight that insurance companies will be able to charge under this bill.

Therefore, to give the hon. Minister an

opportunity to rectify the situation and to save him the trouble of redrafting the subsection himself, I move, Mr. Chairman:

That subsection 3 of section 14 of Bill 136 be amended:

(a) By striking out all the words after the word "condition" in the third line of clause A;

(b) By striking out clause B.

The effect of that, Mr. Chairman—if this should be adopted, as I hope it will be—would be that subsection 3 would read quite simply, as follows:

A standard contract issued under this section shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I move an amendment to that amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bryden moves:

That subsection 3 of section 14 of Bill 136 be amended, by striking out all the words after the word "condition" in the third line of clause A, and by striking out clause B.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment, if I may.

Mr. Chairman: Not until we decide whether these are going to be struck out.

Mr. Sopha: I want to deal with subsections 1 and 2, which my hon. friend does not deal with at all.

Mr. Chairman: We will deal with this and then the member can go on.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us keep to the rules. When this motion is defeated, the whole section passes. If it is passed, fine; but if it is defeated, the section automatically carries. You cannot keep changing the rules just as circumstances permit—

Mr. Chairman: Wait a minute—then his amendment dealing with the first part of the bill should come first.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if it would accommodate my hon. friend and facilitate matters, and perhaps accommodate you, I would be happy to incorporate his amendment as part of mine, if he would permit me to do so. I am not entirely in agreement with it, but I think it gets to the point. We could make it all one amendment.

Mr. Chairman, continuing with the amendment that I was moving:

And that subsections 1 and 2 of section 14 be amended by striking out the words "during an open enrolment period" in subsection 1, and the words "after the expiration of an open enrolment period" in subsection 2 thereof.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine will withdraw his?

Mr. Bryden: No, I would ask that it all be made one amendment.

Mr. Sopha: Speaking very briefly to the amendment, sir, I am happy to say it shows the splendid co-operation of the two Opposition parties and their unity in principle against this terrible statute.

I also want to add that since we have begun to deal with insurance companies and their participation in this plan, I want to say that I was one of those who was conscious, in the Opposition, of the tremendous risks that we take, because we have seen in this province, in the defeat of the leader of the Liberal Party at the last election, the tremendous power of insurance companies.

I am aware that they are so powerful that I could be destroyed. They could destroy me, if they wished to. When you are talking about insurance companies you are also talking about banks and trust companies, because they are all part of one group.

This section opens up a very interesting loophole, but I want to point out that in subsection 1 if the husband has not applied for a standard contract, his wife may apply for one if she is working. Then I take it—and I see nothing in the way as a bar—if the wife becomes pregnant she may quit work and then apply for assistance under section 7. And there is nothing in section 7 to prevent the wife—the wife of a husband who has not applied, he is head of the family but he has not applied for a standard contract. She applies for one, then she gets pregnant, then she quits work and Sopha is working 90 hours a week to help subsidize the premiums for that family. This is one of the loopholes that I point out for the hon. Minister's attention.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member mind repeating that; I just did not get the force of the example.

Mr. Sopha: All right. The husband is the head of the family, as defined in section 1 (h). He has not applied, he simply does not apply

for a contract. His wife is working. Under section 14 she is entitled to have a standard contract issued to her, subject to the terms. Then she becomes pregnant and she quits working. Then she is entitled to apply under section 7 because she becomes "any person who is unable to continue payment on her medical services insurance subscriptions." She applies for a subsidy, presumably—I do not see any inhibition against granting it—and it ends up that the husband, who has not applied is working, he is earning an income, and the government, the state, the people are subsidizing that family in payment of their subscription.

Now I would like to hear where the thesis goes wrong. It is one of the loopholes in this—I repeat the phrase—badly drawn statute.

I want to say something about open enrolment contracts and this matter of bad risks. I want to say that Mr. Justice Hall in his report emphasized that the prime concern in respect of health care of our people, is making available to the people the skill and knowledge and the body of learning of the medical sciences. In fact, he put payment—the matter of premium and price—he put it in a junior and subsidiary position. He said, "The problem we face in Canada is making available good health care to people." Accordingly, then, as my hon. leader has said, the term "bad risk" is not only a very abhorrent one but it is one that completely obscures the social purpose that we are trying to effect in passing a statute to provide medical and health care for our people. We simply cannot talk in terms of bad risks as we would in regard to fire insurance and the operation of a motor car. Therefore, I find the whole concept of open enrolment periods to be totally objectionable.

Why should not an individual, as in the case of life insurance, be able to go down to the office where they sell the standard contracts, or invite the salesman over to his house, and enrol on the very day that he wishes to have made available to him protection against illness?

Accordingly, I moved, or rather the hon. member for Woodbine very kindly incorporated, an amendment to take out of this section the concept of open enrolment periods. And I say that what we want to do is make available to our people health care. That is the prime consideration; that is what the Opposition is trying to effect through this statute and that is why we are trying to assist you. We are actually trying to assist you, although the words get rather bitter and acrimonious at times, especially when we

think of the tremendous influence on the hon. Minister of Health that the insurance companies have. And he is such a defender of the insurance companies and so considerate of their convenience that one almost suspects—I see these people in my mind's eye, the directors of an insurance company, they are sitting up in York club and looking over this statute and saying, "Oh, we don't like that part; call Matt up and have him change that."

The open enrolment period is purely for the convenience of the insurance companies; it is for their convenience alone. I would be willing to listen with great patience to some way in which the open enrolment period is for the benefit of the public, for the benefit of the applicant for health insurance.

To extend my remarks a little bit: I always thought that the one group of people to whom we wanted to extend health care was pregnant women. After all, the greatest asset we have in this country is our youth. We want more babies, we want more healthy babies, we are mightily concerned about the future generation of Canadians, that they will be virile and healthy people to carry on the great work that is encompassed in this country. Therefore, I object most strenuously to that sub-paragraph (b) of section 3 because to me the very people I would want enrolled in a health plan would be women who are one month pregnant, so that I could feel assured that—

An hon. member: One hour.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, one hour, indeed; one hour pregnant, if it can be measured. The period of gestation, of course, is a very shifting thing. But I want to feel, and I am sure the public wants to feel the assurance that a woman who is pregnant, and especially a woman who is pregnant with the first child, is getting proper medical care from the very onset of her pregnancy through to the time that she is delivered of the child. That is our wealth, that is our wealth! And I always felt that no matter how much money a person amasses he can never accumulate any greater store of wealth than healthy children.

That, sir, is what I want to see in this country—great numbers of healthy children. Therefore, I would invite the hon. Minister seriously to consider adopting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Woodbine, as well as the removal of this convenience for the insurance companies, the open enrolment period.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to add one brief comment—and not only on this vague phrase, “save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations.” I protest as strongly as I can that, after all the other protections given the insurance industry, we are asked to buy this further “pig in a poke”—leaving those behind the scenes to dictate further limitations on the coverage. On this particular issue of pregnancy I find it almost unbelievable that a Minister of the Crown, who is a medical doctor, should come into this House and present that kind of a bill, with such a limitation in establishing medical insurance coverage in this province. Indeed I am a little puzzled, I would almost be tempted to ask him some rather technical questions.

Has he ever come up with any assured formula so that he can give a scientific guarantee as to when a woman is 25 days

or 35 days pregnant? How is he going to calculate this very nice and tricky little problem when, horrors of horrors, or delight of delights, the young lady discovers of a morning that the whooziness that has been her problem for the last few weeks is not some mysterious illness, but is pregnancy! What are you going to do about this? It is really ludicrous, that a medical doctor should bring this in.

An hon. member: The Minister of Labour will come into the picture.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly. But, Mr. Chairman, it is even worse than that!

Mr. Chairman: Have you nearly completed?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not finished, sir.

It being 12.30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 9, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, continued	3905
Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	3915
A certain dispute between the Toronto electric commissioners and Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees, bill respecting, Mr. Robarts, first reading	3939
Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	3941
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts agreed to	3944

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

House in committee; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

On section 14:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I will have to play this by ear because I do not seem to be able to get my notes sorted out here.

When the House adjourned I was querying the hon. Minister (Mr. Dymond) with regard to section 14 and with particular reference to this waiting period of eight months in the event of pregnancy. I had said quite frankly to the hon. Minister that I was surprised; indeed I went so far as to say I thought he should be ashamed of himself as a medical doctor, to bring in a bill that would have this kind of a clause in it. My first question to him was, since we have to be rather specific here: On what basis, in light of his past experience as a doctor, can he give the House assurance as to when exactly one month of pregnancy has been concluded so that it can be said with a certainty that the person is not going to get coverage under the Act?

That in itself, it seems to me, is bad enough; but what makes it even worse: Let us assume, for example, that a young couple were to enrol in accordance with the Act during one of the enrolment periods, and because they had conformed with the Act their coverage would be immediate. And then they discovered that unbeknownst to themselves the woman in question was pregnant; indeed that she was, shall we say, 35 days pregnant. Then she is excluded from coverage for the remainder of that pregnancy.

My question to the hon. Minister is: How can he justify this kind of thing; and secondly, the specific and more detailed question is: How—and I put this seriously because there may be an air of levity about it—can he with any assurance be specific, how

is he going to avoid endless legal arguments as to whether or not one month or 28 days or 32 days of pregnancy have been completed to determine whether or not the person was eligible to coverage under the Act?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Let us keep our thoughts—

Mr. MacDonald: Our thoughts are dealing with a bill which is a little confused, and on this point a little unclear. As a matter of fact, I think it can be said with assurance that there is many a mistake made in this area, I suspect that half the hon. members in this House might be a mistake. I am almost convinced the hon. member for Simcoe East is one of them.

There is going to be a legal point to decide at some stage because the law is specific: After one month of pregnancy then there will be no coverage and there will have to be an eight-month waiting period.

Would the hon. Minister, in his capacity as a medical doctor, care to reply to my question?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, in studying this matter, sir, we found that it is customary in all insurance contracts to state either a waiting period of ten months, nine months, eight months; in the case of pregnancy. I think it is quite readily understandable that the insurance principle is not in determining when pregnancy occurs, nor is the insurance principle concerned in the matter of providing the care. The insurance principle is only in making provision for prepayment of this care, and if the insurance principle is going to obtain, and if premiums are going to be kept at a realistic level at all, then certain safeguards must be built into all of the contracts, and one of them has relationship to pregnancy.

Actually, it is a relatively short time ago that pregnancy became an insured service under any insurance contracts and I think it was first accepted by Blue Cross. I must disagree with the hon. member who said no,

because this is fact and history will prove this. After all, health care insurance is itself not very old in this country, but it is relatively recently that pregnancy was added as a routine benefit under any contract. It is readily understandable that if one becomes insured under a contract and the contract immediately has to pay out a fee for pregnancy, which is a fairly sizeable fee in relationship to the monthly premium, the insurance principle could no longer obtain and the whole purpose of the scheme would be defeated.

We chose eight months because this is halfway between them. Of course no one can determine with any great degree of accuracy, albeit some of my colleagues say they can, when pregnancy occurred. It is usually accepted that it is a ten lunar months proposition, or nine calendar months, but this is quite by the way. This is a provision in practically every insurance contract that I know. Indeed, the group coverage under most of the non-profit plans, and I am out of touch with practice at the present time, but I do know that, while I was practising, group coverage under the non-profit plans established a waiting period for pregnancy and I believe it still obtains. I do know that it obtains in every individual contract. Again I repeat I know of none that provides coverage of pregnancy as an immediately insured service.

Now there is some question about the last clause in this: "Save for such exceptions as prescribed by the regulations." There are certain complications of pregnancy which can be fatal and must be dealt with vigorously. They are usually quite costly undertakings and these are covered, or will be covered, under the regulations, so that the subscriber will not suffer in cases of this kind.

While I am on my feet, sir, I will deal with the questions raised by the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) and accepted by my hon. friend from Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) while discussing the open enrolment period. How on earth, sir, the hon. members of the Opposition can claim that this open period could work for the advantage of the insurance companies is quite beyond me.

The opposite obtains. This is an incentive to enrol as many people as possible. The incentive is that they will be immediately covered for all services except pregnancy, and certain other limitations and certain exceptions which are obtainable in all cases. But the open enrolment period could possibly put a great flood of high cost cases on the insurance companies' rolls. They would be

quite happy without them, I am quite certain of that. Any insurance scheme would be happy without these immediate costs and oftentimes those who need it most are the most ready—and this is a good thing—to apply for the benefits that are available to them. So they are more prone to rush into a scheme of this kind. This is what we want, because this is why we are establishing the plan, albeit some of my hon. friends seem to think that we are not concerned about the health or care of the people. This bill is to work to the advantage of the people, and we have tried to keep it in every way possible this way.

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not and cannot be considered to be any advantage to the insurance carriers whatsoever.

The question also came up about the exceptions which were covered by regulation and these are laid down in the Act—exceptions which we shall cover by regulation—and they are found in schedule A on page 15. The exceptions are outlined there, the limitations as prescribed by the regulations. The exceptions as well are outlined here for all of us to see.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Surely not, Mr. Chairman! If the exceptions prescribed by regulation have not been prescribed as yet, they are not anywhere for anyone to see at this moment. They may exist in the mind of the hon. Minister, I do not know; if they do I wish he would tell us—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am trying to tell the hon. member that it is listed on page 15, schedule A, the limitations as prescribed by regulation and the exceptions. The exceptions that will be prescribed by regulation are listed in this schedule, on pages 15 and 16.

Mr. Bryden: If they are listed here—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My friend, the hon. member for Sudbury mentioned a hypothetical case which came under this section, where the wife of a man who was looked upon by the interpretation section as the head of a family and neglected, or failed, or refused, to provide coverage for himself or his family. Under the terms of certain contracts he would not be eligible to apply for a family contract, but we have specifically written this in to

protect her interest and to protect the interest of the family in the event that she did enrol and then, because of pregnancy or any other reason, fell out of work. Now it is not at all likely—I think the hon. member said a month after applying she found that she was pregnant—it is not at all likely that she would just pay a month's premium, we would expect at least that the premium would be quarterly and she would be insured for at least a quarter. However, if she did become unemployed and a contract was sought for her, then we would look at her husband's situation because he is looked upon by law as the head of the family. This, I would take it, would be his responsibility. If he were eligible for either total or partial support, this would be extended to them immediately.

I have to repeat, sir, that our concern, in spite of what all our hon. friends opposite think, is for our people, to make as sure as it is possible within the terms of this Act that we have set up provisions for prepayment of health care. We have never presumed, sir, to say within the terms of this bill that we were making available good health care. This is the important consideration, but I pointed out again, sir, that governments cannot provide health care unless they are going to go into the business of practising medicine and practising health care. We are, under this bill, trying to make it possible for all of our people, either by themselves or with the support of public funds, to ensure that the catastrophic costs of health care will not economically cripple them and so prove further detriment to their health. The bill does not provide for health care but it does provide for payment for health care, as I am quite sure is clear to our hon. friends.

I cannot see, sir, where the amendments proposed by the hon. members are going to improve this bill in any way. These amendments to section 14 at least. They are certainly going to make it far more difficult of operation and therefore I would say that the amendments should not be upheld, particularly in paragraph 2 of section 14. Again, the hon. member proposed the striking out of certain words. This paragraph is to make it possible for one who has been a dependant under a family contract on reaching the age of 21 to go over into a self-pay contract without any loss of benefit or without any waiting period and it is quite essential that this section stand as it is. Otherwise I think it would work to the harm of those young people.

Mr. Bryden: I want to follow up directly on comments that the hon. Minister made,

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the saving clause in clause (a) of subsection 3, "save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations."

I ask the hon. Minister to reconsider the explanation that he gave, because it is completely off the beam. He suggests to us that what is referred to here in the phrase, "the exceptions prescribed by the regulation" are the limitations referred to in the schedule. If they are already in the schedule, there is no need for them to be stated in regulations, but I suggest to him that he is confusing two totally different things.

The schedule sets forth the basic terms of a standard medical services insurance contract. It provides that there will be certain limitations on certain subjects as prescribed by regulation. That reference is to the definition in regulations of the exact nature of those particular limitations. And the power to enact regulations relating to that point is covered by clause (c) of section 28, which says "there will be power to prescribe limitations on benefits under standard contracts." That is one thing. But we have here another thing, which is that exceptions to the general prohibition of waiting periods and limitations may be prescribed by the regulations. That is governed by clause (e) of section 28, in which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is given power to prescribe these exceptions. They are not set forth in the Act, they are not anywhere at the moment before us.

All we know for sure is that subsection 3 as it stands, provides that there shall be an eight-month waiting period in relation to pregnancy, save for exceptions mentioned in regulations, which are not set forth. Also it provides that there shall not be a waiting period or a limitation of benefit except as prescribed by regulation. This is exactly what we are complaining about. We say that in relation to an open enrolment period, there is no need to have any waiting period or limitation of benefits at all. This clause appears at first sight to eliminate them, apart from pregnancy; but then we have this gaping loophole about regulations. I suggest to the hon. Minister that it has nothing to do with the matter of limitations as prescribed by the regulations set forth in the schedule. This refers to the power of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make regulations permitting waiting periods or limitation of benefits under certain circumstances, undisclosed to us at this moment.

We think the saving clause should be struck out altogether. If the hon. Minister is convinced that it is necessary, then I think he

should be prepared to indicate the kind of exceptions that are likely to be made as a result of this power.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as a hypothetical example, suppose we should find on experience that this waiting period for pregnancy is not necessary—

Mr. Bryden: I am not talking about pregnancy.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, but I am just suggesting that, should we find on experience that this waiting period we have written into legislation is not actually necessary, then the plan is not going to suffer if we make it an immediate benefit to those who enrol under the open enrolment period. If we have the right by regulations to deal with things of this kind, then we can extend that additional benefit to the subscribers, because we have found that the limitations were not necessary.

The limitations mentioned in schedule A are outlined but they are not spelled out. For instance, limitation—annual health examination. Well, what limitation? The regulations will spell that out, the regulations will say that the contract will be in effect for one year, after which time one annual routine health examination will be available to every member insured. Baby-care will be spelled out in the regulations. For instance, these are some regulations we have already considered and decided upon, that ten well-baby-care visits will be permitted in the first five years of life and that psychotherapy will be provided 25 hours per year after the contract has been in force for one year, to each individual, and a total of 50 hours to a family. Under exceptions—for instance, laboratory services—we know that the laboratory services will be limited to a total of \$25 per covered person in the contract here. This is the sort of thing that will be spelled out definitely under the regulations.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I appear to be having some difficulty in making myself clear to the hon. Minister, but I will take another try at it. I would like first of all to get the pregnancy question removed so that we will not get the issues confused that way. As far as we are concerned, we are against clause B altogether. We do not think it should be in there, but if it is to be in there, then we go along with the saving clause that would provide at least the possibility that it could be made less onerous than it now is in the bill.

However, that is not what I am talking about. I am talking only about clause A, “save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations.” I put it to the hon. Minister once again, that under that clause, and the related clause E, of section 28, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has a wide-open power to make exceptions from the general prohibition in 3 (a) and not at all related to defining the limitations under the schedule. I agree it has power to define those limitations, too, but that is not the point I am getting at. The point I am getting at is that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, if he saw fit in his wisdom to do so, could, for all practical purposes, nullify 3 (a).

He could certainly reduce its import greatly. He could provide that there may be waiting periods in some cases; that there may be limitations on benefits with respect to pre-existing conditions, and so on, not only those set forth in the schedule, but any pre-existing conditions. I do not think there is any doubt in the world that that is what the statute means. I suggest that the power is unnecessary and should not be there. If it is to be there, then we should have an explanation which we have not had yet, as to exactly what the government has in mind.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Well, sir, I was very encouraged in one aspect of this, that the hon. Minister suggested that the reason for this—“save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations”—in clause A and clause B, in connection with pregnancy, save for such exceptions as are prescribed by the regulations, he suggested to us that these will only be used to ease the situation and permit more people to have the advantage of medical insurance. Am I correct in that, sir?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is our general thinking.

Mr. Thompson: And it will not be used to raise further barriers for people? Your exceptions will be used to widen the opening for people?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Most assuredly that is the intent, sir. But it is just impossible to foresee every possibility in advance; we want to be in a position where we can make available to the people all the benefits possible.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the hon. Minister has this on record, and that we can have his assurance that, instead of raising further barriers, he is going to see that these regulations are interpreted to

widen the opportunities for people. Because, sir, after this amendment is voted on, and there is a suspicion in my mind that perhaps the amendment will not win in this Legislature, and section 14 will no longer be discussed, I would like, with your indulgence, to raise two other questions.

Again I am thinking of gaps in the legislation. I notice, with respect to dependants that the definition of dependant is "up to the age of 21." I am thinking, sir, of people after they are 21—assuming they had some physical infirmity, or, for some reason, mental retardation, or a number of things, or are going to school. On your basis of a maximum age of 21, they are no longer dependants; they have to move out and pay for their own insurance. Under the income tax, and perhaps I can be corrected on this, even though a person is over 21, if the family is still looking after him, this can be deducted from income tax. I am wondering why you set so rigidly on the age of 21, when there will be many cases, particularly with illness—for reasons of illness of some kind or other—where people will be dependants after they are 21. Why do you then say that at the age of 21 they have to move out and get their own insurance?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, under The Income Tax Act, as I understand it, by and large, the dependant ceases to be a dependant upon reaching age 21. I will grant you that exemptions can be claimed under certain circumstances, some of which the hon. member has mentioned. But, in this case, we will cover the child or the dependant until 21; if, after that time, he is attending an institution of higher learning, or is specifically infirm, or for some reason or another is not self-supporting, he will be eligible under the government scheme to get complete coverage, either at no cost or by partial assistance.

Mr. Thompson: I wonder—not being a lawyer—I raise this just because it sounds rather peculiar to me; under section one, we have this terminology:

The dependant spouse is entitled to have a standard contract issued to him.

It seems to me it would be "to her."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They tell me, Mr. Chairman, that "him" is the legal language. It is a sexless sort of thing. One of the middle sex.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I was concerned just what the hon. Minister considered a marriage at one point.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I have a number of comments on this section, because it is one of the most important sections in the bill. I would like to return, first of all, to the discussion you had with my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine. If you look at subclause (a) of subsection 3, you will find, in that section, a provision that there can be a limitation placed in a standard contract because of a pre-existing condition in the applicant; and there is a specific provision in the regulations, as my colleague has pointed out, under clause (e) of section 28, which permits the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to establish limitations in standard contracts because of existing conditions.

In the course of the debate this morning, we were able to establish with the hon. Minister that the hon. Minister's intention is within the framework of the maximum subscription rates which are to be established by the government, that there will be differentials because of the varying physical conditions and ages of the persons who apply. We consider that this is inequitable and wrong.

Is this section, sir, in addition to the question of varying rates, also providing that there will be differentials in the coverage, depending on whether or not certain classes of people have pre-existing conditions? I ask because, if so, it is a direct refutation of the principle of the bill which the government has attempted to put before us, which is set out in section 5, that standard medical services insurance contracts shall be made available without regard to age, physical, or mental infirmity.

It is perfectly clear to me, under this bill, and I think it must be to every member of this House, that under that clause of subsection 3 of section 14, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may decide that a standard contract issued to a particular person or a particular group of people, as distinct from other groups within the community, is going to have a limitation because of a pre-existing condition. It is not going to be a general limitation applicable to all people in the province, because the government has already indicated that it is going to exclude certain ailments generally across the province as pre-existing conditions—for example, refraction for eye care. But this leaves open the possibility that there are going to be distinctions within the groups of people in the community who are applying for standard medical insurance contracts; and the provision for the exceptions prescribed by regulations is directly contrary to the principle of the bill which this government has placed

before this House. Now that is the first point.

On the second point, on the question of pregnancy, we simply support the amendment as proposed because pregnancy, in our view, is not a disease in our community. It is a youthful and very convenient occurrence in our society. We think it should be covered. It should not have anything to do with whether it is eight months, two months, six months, or any other number of months. We think a person should be covered, if they have a standard medical insurance contract, regardless of when they make application for it.

The third question to which I would like to return is the question of the exclusion by the government of what, today, in insurance language, is a modern, up-to-date principle, namely, the principle of group insurance. Let us assume for the moment that the government is justified in some way—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. May I suggest to you, sir, that the discussion of group insurance is completely out of order, in that this was dealt with. That would be a principle of the bill and it was definitely excluded when the bill was presented in this House for second reading. This bill has to do with individual contracts, and it has been specifically repeated that it will not interfere with group coverage in any way.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to agree with the Minister. You are out of order.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister talked about pooling, and I assume we are doing that when we are talking about groups.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Specifically with pooling. Pooling is not grouping.

Mr. Thompson: Then let us talk about pooling, for I presume it is a collective agreement.

Mr. Renwick: I would like to address my remarks, then, to the question of enrolment periods. Enrolment periods, as I understand it, are going to be series of times, fixed by the government, during which residents in the province of Ontario may make application to these carriers under this Act for insurance coverage.

That means that, from time to time, there are going to be group admittances to the field of people who are covered by these standard contracts under this bill. By admitting groups from time to time into this scheme, why will the government not provide that the

premiums to be paid by all persons in the province, coming from time to time within these groups during the enrolment period, should be the identical premium, without making differentials between classes of citizens within the community? The hon. Minister must agree that there is something ridiculous about this section because, in subsection 2, the hon. Minister is quite prepared to admit, without any enrolment period, every newcomer to the province; because every person—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no! Not at all.

Mr. Renwick: Just a moment. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister will listen to me before he contradicts me; if you read subsection 2, it provides two things. It says:

Every dependant who becomes 21 years of age—

That is class number one; and in the second line:

—and every person who qualifies as a resident.

If this does not refer to persons who are both 21, and both residents, there are two classes of persons provided in subsection 2; and, without any enrolment period of any kind, the hon. Minister is quite prepared to admit that the large number of people who in each year will become aged 21 in our society, and the large number of people who will become residents in our society in any year, do not have to have any enrolment period of any kind. They can become insured simply by complying with the provisions of that subsection. And yet for everyone else in the province of Ontario, the government tells us that there are not all that many of them, yet for anybody else who wants to become qualified under this section 14 they must either apply during an enrolment period or they must suffer this penalty of three months.

Surely the hon. Minister cannot make any valid distinction between people in the community who are here, who are living here, who are resident and over the age of 21, people who become 21 years of age, and people who come into this province as recent arrivals and become residents in the province. In the case of the two classes there is no requirement whatsoever that there be any enrolment period; but for everyone else, whatever the number of people involved the hon. Minister has imposed an enrolment period.

The hon. Minister says this has nothing to do with group insurance. If it is purely then an administrative convenience for the medical

carriers to absorb these groups of people, then I would suggest that he wipe it out completely, because the administrative convenience will be defeated by the provisions of subsection 2 under which the carriers are going to have to regularly, day in and day out throughout the year, deal with the very large classes of people comprised in the ones who are recent comers to the province and those who reach the age of 21.

Speaking again on the question of the enrolment period. If it is to the hon. Minister a matter of convenience, I think it is perfectly clear that it is serving no useful purpose. If, however, it is in some way related to the influx by way of groups into the insurance coverage throughout the province, and if there is the pooling arrangement in the province, then I think that the people of the province of Ontario are entitled to the advantage of group insurance, group insurance coverage, meaning that you spread the risk over a large group and you charge the same rate to all the people who are included in that group.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order!

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have already suggested that the matter of group insurance is not inherent in this bill. It is specifically stated that this bill relates to individual contracts as a principle and the principle of group insurance is not involved in it. Therefore, I submit to you, sir, that it is completely out of order to discuss it at this time.

Mr. Chairman: I have already said that.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling on it. As I understand what the Minister is putting forward in this bill—and it is very difficult for us in the Opposition to get this clear because the Minister has refused to give us any concrete examples of how various people are going to be covered under this plan in the province of Ontario, despite the fact that there are going to be wide and varying distinctions between the classes of people within our province. You have to bear with us, because if we have not got the information the only way that we can get the information is to ask the hon. Minister for the information.

Let us accept what the hon. Minister says, that he has introduced a plan into this Legislature which will provide the minimum disruption to the insurance industry in this province. We agree that is exactly what he

has done. Because he has based it on individual contracts, he has got a pooling arrangement; and he has differential premiums depending on the risk that the insurance carrier assesses is applicable to that particular person.

By analogy, what the hon. Minister has done is to take the most antiquated form of insurance and provide a bill which permits that system to continue. The antiquated form of insurance is directly comparable to automobile insurance. Automobile insurance is on the same basis, individual contracts, classifications within groups, differential premiums and an assigned risk plan. There is no group insurance implied in automobile insurance in any way, and every modern and up-to-date insurance company which is attempting to meet the problems of insurance in our society is dealing on a group principle. It is not dealing on the antiquated basis of automobile insurance which is rapidly pricing itself out of this market entirely.

Mr. Chairman: We are not dealing with group insurance.

Mr. Renwick: I accept what the hon. Minister says, but let us do away with this enrolment period unless the hon. Minister can concretely state why it has any merit whatsoever.

Let us amend clause (a) subsection 3 of section 14 by removing this power of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to provide exceptions by way of regulation which will prohibit some classes of persons within our society from being insured under standard contracts because of pre-existing physical condition.

Can the Minister please answer at least one or two, or three of those questions?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, again I have to point out that a clear reading of the bill would help the hon. member to understand the folly of what he has just said.

First of all, sir, may I repeat that the open enrolment period will accrue to the advantage of those who enrol under it. Again, I repeat that, while there will be numbers, and we hope there will always be numbers, joining the plan at an open enrolment period because of the added advantage, because of the inducement of no waiting period—with one exception—there will also be numbers of applicants, individual applicants, coming in that do not constitute a group, as is inherent in the belief of people in the insurance industry. A group, again I repeat, is a group controlled or under the direction of a central organization, if you will, where one premium

is collected by that central agency and submitted to the insurance carrier by the central agency. The insurance carrier has no billing to do. This is a group in so far as insurance is concerned, as I am quite certain the hon. member knows.

Then to put on paragraph (2) the interpretation he has just put on it makes it perfectly patent to me, Mr. Chairman, that he has not read this paragraph.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order; the Minister has the floor for the moment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This paragraph says that:

Every dependant who becomes 21 years of age—

Inherent in this is the fact that this dependant has been covered up until reaching 21 years of age under the family coverage. In order that he can switch to an individual coverage because he now has become of age, and in order to ensure that he will not lose benefits because all his waiting period has been honoured already, he can move over to an individual contract without any loss and without any waiting periods:

(3) (a) Save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations.

One exception that I can note in the list at the present time is, for instance, the laboratory which I mentioned. Regulations which we have prepared and which we shall submit for approval, suggest that at the beginning of the programme at least, there will be an exception for payment of any laboratory service over \$25 per contract year per covered person.

It may well be that experience will indicate to us that this can be broadened and, if we are tied down by putting this in legislation we must wait for a year before we can give the insured parties the advantage of additional coverage. I think that this could work a hardship upon them.

My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition spoke on several occasions already about the possible case that is on the borderline, and it is probably some dear old soul who, because of infirmity or forgetfulness or something of that kind, has neglected to do something and finds himself out of benefit. If we have to stick firmly to the legislation, we would have to say that to re-enrol a person would require a waiting period of three months in the event of the person dropping the coverage and not being able to come back in again under the enrolment period.

But we can make such a case an exception under the regulations. I think this is all to the good and I have given that assurance to the House. Of course, I recognize that this does not need to be accepted and it is not very good legislation. I assure you that so long as this government is in power the regulations will be used to help the people, certainly not to militate against them nor to withdraw benefits that might rightfully be theirs.

My hon. friend from Riverdale spoke about 21-year-old residents, a matter which I have mentioned. If a 21-year-old resident wants to come in under the plan at any time other than during an enrolment period, he will have to undergo a three-month waiting period. If he has recovered, as I have already said, and wants to switch over to his own contract, then he does not have to go through the waiting period again, no matter what time he comes in.

In the case of the newcomer, as you go further on in the bill you will find that it is necessary to establish residency by being in the province 90 days. I would have to ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) about that, but I believe the period of time recognized as necessary to become a resident of the province is 90 days, so that that person cannot enrol until he has established residency and cannot come in without any waiting period. If they happen to establish residency at a time concurrent with an open enrolment period, then they will have immediate coverage, but that might be luck. Every new resident is not likely to strike it as lucky as that and they, therefore, will also have a waiting period.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I have answered the questions as I noted them, from the hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, a question on the last remarks of the hon. Minister. My understanding is that to become a resident, you have to be here for 90 days, but once you have established residence in this province under subsection 2, you can apply for a standard contract without any waiting period and regardless of whether it happens to coincide with an enrolment period or not.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, I did not get that question. Would you mind repeating it, please?

Mr. Renwick: If a person qualifies as a resident of the province, I understand that under subsection 2 of section 14, he can apply for a standard contract without any further waiting period. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, a resident who qualifies can become—do you mean a new-comer, after he has been here 90 days and having established residency over that period, can apply outside of an open enrolment period?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am advised that this is so, that this person has already been 90 days here without coverage.

Mr. Bryden: He never had a chance to get coverage.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a general comment before we leave. The hon. Minister chastises us for not reading the bill and he has just indicated that he did not know his own bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think that on a point of order I might be permitted to say that this is the first clause of the bill and we have gone quite a way from it. I am not able to give a snap answer.

Mr. MacDonald: The point I want to make is this: the hon. Minister, for example, got up earlier on his little political podium and said that any time he uses a regulation it will be to broaden the scope and make more health services available. Quite frankly, in his geniality, the hon. leader of the Opposition got led into the verbal quagmire, because he accepted the hon. Minister's explanation as being a valid one, with reference, for example, to this phraseology: "save for the exceptions prescribed by the regulations." Let me draw this to your attention, Mr. Chairman: Clause 3 (a) says:

That a standard contract issued under this section shall not provide any waiting period.

There cannot be any waiting period. That is the nub of it—"save for the exceptions"—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Pardon, Mr. Chairman, that is not the nub of it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, have I got the floor or is he going to be able to take it when he pleases?

Mr. Chairman: Go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: Okay, but if he is going to keep bouncing in, Mr. Chairman, Minister or otherwise—

Mr. Chairman: Go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: My point is simply this: that the essence of this clause as stated is that it shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation so that the only conceivable purpose of a regulation will be to put some limitations in there to make it less favourable.

There is no other conceivable purpose of this section because it starts out by saying that there shall be no waiting period because of pre-existing conditions. We have all been led up the garden path dozens of times on explanations and we are gradually getting clarification of just how incredible this bill is.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member must have been reading Shakespeare when he said, "The devil can quote the scriptures to his own ends."

If the hon. member wanted to be eminently fair, sir, he would have read the whole of that subsection 3 (a) as follows:

Shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition.

That is the nub of the paragraph, and not to take out of context that it "shall not provide any waiting period save for the—"

Mr. MacDonald: You are missing my point!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, now I have to throw back at the hon. member the words he threw at me.

The nub of the paragraph is in reading the full thing and keeping the full matter in proper context and in proper perspective, sir. The regulations will, I can assure you—and I am quite certain that I can speak for this government—be used to the benefit and advantage of the people who are covered under this programme.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the nub of my argument has been missed by the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not at all.

Mr. MacDonald: It is as simple as that. Let me try to make this very, very clear. The clause we are talking about says:

The standard contract issued under this section shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefit with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity of condition.

In other words, the paragraph starts by saying that coverage is complete. Now what

conceivable purpose for a regulation can there be, other than to reduce the coverage? You cannot add to complete coverage that is already complete and this is the point that we are trying to make. The hon. Minister either cannot grasp it or will not grasp it—I am not sure which.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the last thing I want to do is to get sidetracked into having verbal battles with my allies to my left here. May I say that I am grasping at any straw that I can get from the hon. Minister of Health, and I want to get on the record everything I can where he is talking about extraordinary exceptions. I truly agree with the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party in connection with section 1, because it seems to me that the hon. Minister is misinterpreting this, and I will accept that in a way he has beguiled me a bit on that one.

As yet, I have no clarification of what the exceptions are on section B. I have read page 15 that the hon. Minister referred to us, but I am still bewildered about the whole thing and I am hoping that what the hon. Minister is saying is that these exceptions will be for the benefit of the people.

On section A, I do not see how the exceptions could be to anything except to the detriment of the people. As the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party said, I agree that it might be interpreted for the benefit of the people.

Let me say on exceptions, sir, the hon. Minister has referred again to the fact that the leader of the Opposition has raised certain exceptions or particular situations. I talked about children over 21 who would be continuing at school, and so on. And he has said that when these situations arise, "you can count on the fact that we will do everything to be understanding and to be able to work through exceptions on this."

I want to say to the hon. Minister that from my own experience with him he has shown humanity in connection with cases that I have brought to him from my own riding, but I object strongly that I have to bring a number of these cases, and I have said that in this House. I had written to the hon. Minister at one point about a poor family who had a microcephalic child—I think I have the correct term—and they were desperate. The only way it appeared that we could arrange for this child to get institutional treatment was that they should come to me and I should write to the hon. Minister.

I did this and he was very sympathetic and the thing was cleared up. This family

was very lucky that they happened to know that they could come to me, for unlike the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers), who says that he encompasses all the gripes and protests and everything else of all the people, I suggest humbly that there are people who have very many protests but they are as yet not acquainted with the whole democratic procedure of coming to a member, otherwise I would be completely at sea with this. I wish I could cover all of their needs, but I cannot.

What I am really arguing is—and I am sure the hon. Minister would be the first to say this—that when you have exceptions and you have not spelled out regulations, have not spelled out what the exceptions are but we will leave it up to the benign kindness of the Minister.

There may a case when it is not a Minister, and political patronage and everything else enters into the picture. I am not accusing this hon. Minister of that. I can say that he has dealt with me just as fairly as he has with other members, no matter what their particular stripe of politics. But it is dangerous, and I think it is bad legislation, where you say that there will be exceptions and to say, "Believe me, in my great humanity, I will look after all of them." That is bad legislation, and we should have had this spelled out more. With due respect to the hon. Minister, this is bad legislation.

I want to endorse what was said previously, both by the New Democratic Party and my own members, that this aspect of more or less segregating pregnancy as though it is something that we should abhor sounds as if the hon. Minister—with his attitude toward women—had read too much of John Knox or something in his early days, or "The Scarlet Letter" or something. We need to have more young people being developed; and one of the problems we have is that we have been relying, if I may say so, on immigration too much, and not on natural births.

And let me say again—a point which I do not think has been mentioned—that surely for young married couples, this is the time when financial circumstances become really burdensome; and this is the time when I would think the hon. Minister, a man of humanity, would want to help them as they start out raising a family. Instead of that, we have these bureaucratic, detailed restrictions, eight months and so on. The hon. Minister never gave us a definite answer about how you establish eight months, and all that other red tape and technicalities.

For a man who stood in this House—and I do not think you would get better at the Stratford festival—and said, “I detest compulsion”—it was a magnificent performance—he has laced this with all kinds of red tape. I hate to say it, but I am almost compelled to say that the hon. Minister in this bill—I will not say he is compelling young people to hold back from having children—but there is certainly an inference there.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, may I help the hon. leader of the Opposition in understanding at least one of his questions. In this very moral and chaste community in which we live, that young family will have no problem if they buy their insurance the day they are married.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member might have been more fortunate in having the financial circumstances to buy insurance and many other things. There are many young families who start out with very little.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, perhaps for a moment or two we could get back to section 14 and the proposed amendment. Ever since this bill came into committee, the hon. Minister in his usual factious way has been hurling across the floor the accusation that we over here have not read the bill. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that it is now abundantly clear that the only difference between him and us is that he has read the bill, and we have read it and understand it. It is quite clear that he does not understand his own bill or else he is simply being evasive in his answers. He finally had to admit, his advisers got it through to him ultimately, that the interpretation by the hon. member for Riverdale, with regard to newcomers to the province, was correct.

It appears impossible to get across to him the true meaning of clause (a) of subsection 3. I am not going to belabour that point any further, Mr. Chairman. But the explanation that the hon. Minister has given repeatedly of the clause is clearly, patently wrong. It puts us in a very difficult position when we have explanations from the hon. Minister which bear no relation to the plain words in front of us. It is unfortunate but I guess we will have to put up with it. It merely indicates once again what totally inadequate preparation was involved before this bill was presented.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Bryden's amendment, say “aye.”

All opposed, say “nay.”

In my opinion the “nays” have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of Mr. Bryden's amendment, please stand.

All those opposed to Mr. Bryden's amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the “ayes” are 20; the “nays” 44.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost, and section 14 is included in the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The fifty-fifth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. E. Johnston in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I have had my own waiting period, pregnant or otherwise, and I have relished the opportunity of entering the debate on the estimates of The Department of Health. I would like to make some minor preliminary observations before moving into the main substance of my remarks.

I am going to make some restrained commendatory remarks on the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dymond's) opening statement, in three particulars.

I should first like to congratulate him on his proposal for PKU. I think it is a wise and forthright proposal. I was pleased to hear of the response to his letter from the various administrators of general hospitals throughout the province. I trust that using the facilities of the public health branch will, in fact, work effectively. It is my profound hope that not a single child slips through the screening apparatus; and that, of course, is the danger which remains in his voluntary approach to the testing for PKU. But we shall see what happens and watch the results of the experiment for the next year or two.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the hon. Minister on his announcements regarding the so-called war on alcohol.

I will say to him that it is about time that such an announcement has been made in this House. The Chairman who preceded us in the debate on committee of the whole has spoken many times about the preoccupation with research at the expense of treatment. That is a preoccupation which harasses this department in one branch after another; and it is good, indeed, that we have finally moved to the treatment rationale.

I am less impressed by the suggestion that we are going to spend \$18 million over ten years. When viewed from the perspective, it is not a terribly formidable sum. Nonetheless, again we have taken a step, and the hon. Minister is to be congratulated.

Third, Mr. Chairman, I was particularly pleased to see that portion of the hon. Minister's remarks—I think it was four to five pages—in which he made reference to earlier debate in which both of us had engaged during the Throne speech, on February 8 of this year. He attempted to lay some of my fears at rest. I want to suggest to him that those fears, in my mind, have intensified over the intervening period. The observations I offered then, that were tentative and not fully thought through, have now conceived in my mind. I am pleased to say that what I therefore hope to do this afternoon is to set up a precise, strong and thoughtful confrontation on the whole mental health apparatus in the province of Ontario.

Quite logically, Mr. Chairman, I am going to take as my starting point, the Ontario hospital at 999 Queen Street, Toronto, but I am not going to belabour it. I can appreciate full well the agitation and anger that necessarily characterizes the feelings of hon. members on this side of the House, because the situation at Toronto OH has languished for decades, to the point where some people, inevitably, have been done damage—damage, ironically enough, in the absence of treatment.

I want to suggest to you that instead of hon. members on this side of the House indulging in that repetitive process of description, as to Toronto Ontario hospital, one paragraph from the report of the superintendent in his annual report of 1963, summed it up beautifully, and I quote:

In 1962 hopes were raised that new construction would be authorized to replace obsolete buildings. In 1963 such hopes were aborted. The majority of our patients continue to sleep, eat, work and play in quarters which were considered advanced in the 19th century but in no way fulfil the requirements of modern psychiatry.

Thus spoke the superintendent of the Ontario hospital at Toronto, in his annual report in 1963, and I ask, Mr. Chairman, what more can one possibly say? The situation is intolerable.

With relentless repetition we flog this institutional syndrome that the hon. Minister has evolved. One month it is 999 Queen. The next month it is the hospital school at Smiths Falls. One year it is the London Ontario hospital, the next year it is the Orillia hospital school. I can recall earlier in this session raising the problems at the Toronto Ontario hospital. Last year there was the grand jury report. Nothing new can come to bear. Nothing new, that is, Mr. Chairman, until the hon. members of this Legislature ultimately reach a breaking point. Until the hon. Minister of Health drives them to the breaking point, and this is precisely what he has done.

The breaking point comes when we are forced to recognize that the crisis at 999 and Smiths Falls and similar institutions, is far more profound than the mere surface despair. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that force of logic makes it inevitable that we view those institutions merely as symptomatic of a crisis destructively eating away at the heart of the entire Ontario hospital system.

So, I submit, it becomes necessary to view that system as a whole, and to view it as a whole on the floor of this Legislature. That is my objective this afternoon.

I am going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, and try to document thoroughly, four major crises besetting the Ontario hospital system, the last of which necessarily leads to a challenge of the entire mental health pattern which is presently emerging in the province of Ontario.

Let me admit at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that my views are necessarily those of a layman, based on a good deal of book and article reading over the last few months, in an effort to develop some grasp. I look forward to the hon. Minister's comments. But lest the hon. members of this House feel that my familiarity is purely that of reading, I want to say that in order to develop a better comprehension, I visited at some length within the last two months the superintendents of Toronto Ontario hospital; New Toronto Ontario hospital; Whitby Ontario hospital; London Ontario hospital; Kingston Ontario hospital; Hamilton Ontario hospital; and St. Thomas Ontario hospital. Necessarily for much of what I want to suggest this afternoon, I am indebted to them for whatever illumination may exist.

First then, Mr. Chairman, the initial and perhaps most fundamental crisis. I can put it in very simple words: The government of Ontario is systematically, premeditatedly, consciously, starving the Ontario hospitals in this province. I suggest that it is absolutely futile to suggest adequate treatment under such appalling financial circumstances. It is an incredible indictment of government pretensions, pretensions which in fact amount to total indifference.

Mr. Chairman, a very interesting thing has happened in the press of the last few weeks and in this Legislature. There has been much talk that the per capita per diem in the province of Ontario in Ontario hospitals is \$8 a day. I wish that it were \$8 a day! That figure is a figure of the imagination. It is a product of hyperbole. Any revelation of the average per capita per diem in Ontario hospitals, Mr. Chairman, jolts the intellect. It is frankly embarrassing to lay them on the floor of this House, because \$8 a day is, as I say, an inflated figure.

What I want to do at this stage of the debate, Mr. Chairman—because I think it is important that all hon. members of the Legislature know—is to read into the record of this House every per capita per diem of Ontario hospitals in this province: to read into the record of this House the average per capita per diem so that we know once and for all that with which we are dealing.

Let me say as a preface, Mr. Chairman, that these figures were not easy to come by. If the hon. members take a moment to read the annual report of The Department of Health they will find, peculiarly enough, that they are not there. If they read the annual report of the mental health branch they will find, peculiarly enough, that they are not there. If they read past annual reports of Ontario hospitals they will find, oddly enough, that they are not there. I suggest to the hon. Minister that these are, in fact, public figures. We are not dealing with privileged documents and they should be available to the people of Ontario.

I have before me, as I said, the net per capita per diem payments in every Ontario hospital for the year April 1, 1963 to March 31, 1964. I think that is a representative year, and I have been given to understand on good authority that the difference in the past two years may be roughly 10 cents per capita per diem. Now, let me read the figures for the interest of the hon. members:

Aurora Ontario hospital, \$4.71; Brockville Ontario hospital, \$6.24; Cedar Springs, \$8.12; Cobourg, \$5.05; Goderich, \$13.28; Hamilton,

\$6.67; Kingston, \$7.39; London, \$7.10; New Toronto, \$6.68; North Bay, \$6.67; Orillia, \$5.82; Owen Sound, \$27.60; Penetang, \$6.38; Port Arthur, \$7.35; St. Thomas, \$6.34; Smiths Falls, \$5.82; Thistletown, \$39.48—let me interject that that begins to approximate it—Toronto, \$7.55; Whitby, \$6.55; Woodstock, \$7.39; the children's psychiatric institute, \$31.75; the Toronto psychiatric hospital, \$34.32. And an average per capita per diem across the province of Ontario of \$6.96.

Now, I ask the hon. members of the Legislature to contemplate that figure for a moment: \$6.96. That is why I said the \$8 was a piece of inflated hyperbole. Would it were, I repeat, \$8. It is \$6.96, and I look back to a speech that the hon. Minister of Health made in August, 1964, at the Canadian national exhibition when, after summarizing the mental health apparatus in the province of Ontario, including the mental hospitals, he said, and I quote:

I have tried to report these accomplishments to you—not boastfully, although I think we might be forgiven a little boasting—but factually so you may know that the mentally disturbed in Ontario are not forgotten or neglected.

Are not forgotten or neglected? Per capita per diem of \$6.96 a day! Such graciousness and humility on the part of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, at \$6.96 a day! It must have been his sense of humour; it must have been a sort of ribald Scottish joke to suggest an absence of neglect in terms of \$6.96 a day.

What does that figure represent? Let us make a few comparisons; and I want to do it because, again, the comparisons have been couched in equal vagaries.

From the Ontario hospital services commission's report for the same period of time, 1963, I would like to read the per capita per diem costs into the record:

General hospitals—group A—\$27.54; fully four times as much as we spend on Ontario hospitals. Group B, \$23.65; group C, \$19.97; convalescent hospitals, \$15.89; chronic care hospitals, \$12.05.

In other words, even convalescent care and chronic care spend between two and two and a half times as much per diem per capita as the Ontario hospitals.

And another observation: The Ontario welfare council survey of nursing homes, which was reported in the newspapers today, also demonstrates that in the majority of cases, nursing homes across the province of Ontario provide a per capita per diem greater than that in Ontario hospitals.

Let us compare a little further, because I think these comparisons are both valid and interesting. It may be of interest to the hon. members to know that there is only one training school in the entire province of Ontario which receives a lesser per capita per diem. The average spent on training schools is in excess of that spent on mental hospitals. The average spent on reformatories is in excess of that spent on mental hospitals. The average spent on industrial farms is much in excess of that spent on mental hospitals; and of the 45 to 50 county and district jails in the province of Ontario, only four have a per capita per diem of less than what we spend on Ontario hospitals. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that in some communities it is preferable to go to jail.

In Brockville you would receive treatment rated at \$6.24 a day if you were in the Ontario hospital, but if you were fortunate enough to be in jail you get \$9.85 a day worth of treatment. In St. Thomas you would be looked after at the rate of \$6.34 in hospital; in jail you would be looked after at the rate of \$9.02; and in Whitby hospital at \$6.55, and jail is \$12.17.

I quite appreciate that an effort at deflecting the argument can be made based on patient volume and on geographic situation. I say to the hon. Minister opposite that at this absolute bottom rate of \$6.96 a day, mental hospitals could not even adequately provide for the domiciliary and geriatric care, the nursing care, in a civilized society, let alone make a pretension at acute and continued treatment.

Indeed, you know, Mr. Chairman, the ironic fact is that the hon. Minister himself realizes it. He realizes it in legislation and regulations passed by his own government. Under The Homes for Special Care Act last year, within the regulations the sum of \$6.50 was set aside per diem per capita. Mr. Chairman, no one pretends that those people covered under The Homes for Special Care Act need the kind of intensive treatment required by patients in Ontario mental hospitals. Perhaps I can put it most appropriately by quoting into the record of this House the extraordinary observation of Dr. Paul Christie, superintendent of the Toronto Ontario hospital, in his most recent annual report, and I quote:

A general hospital which pretended to give comprehensive active treatment, including medical services, for about \$8 per patient per day would be rightly assessed as operating on a medieval concept. Such rates are charged by mediocre nursing homes which make no pretension to treat-

ment at all. Sooner or later the community as a whole must confront this grave discrimination against the victims of illnesses which accounts for nearly half of all hospital bed accommodation. Meanwhile, a report such as this can only seem scandalously hypocritical in any pretension which it implies as an account of an adequate treatment programme.

There is a jolting and sobering condemnation of the system if ever one was uttered, delivered by a superintendent of an Ontario hospital. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the per capita per diem expenditures that I have read into the record and the comparisons that are available to be made are a devastating commentary and proof of the government's attitude toward mental health, which can be summed up very easily as "pennies for the mind."

That is the first major crisis, Mr. Chairman, with which I wanted to deal.

Let me address myself to the second major crisis, which is harassing and undermining morale, and adequate treatment in one Ontario hospital after another in the province until they are rendered insufficient institutions.

There is a serious and continuing attrition of senior staff. I cannot put that strongly enough; and I am not now talking about the normal scandals in the newspapers of the attendants and some of the nursing aides. I am now talking about the crucial staff indispensable to hospital operations. If the hon. members of the House will grant me the indulgence, I will read into the record from one Ontario hospital after another what they feel their staff needs to be and what those staff needs actually are, and I think I faithfully interpret the information granted to me by the superintendents of the hospitals.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, this information is not privileged either. The American psychiatric association, the national institute for mental health, the world health organization and many others have established psychiatric-psychological social worker-patient ratios for Ontario hospitals, and those are the ratios the superintendents themselves reflected in assessing their needs.

1. St. Thomas Ontario hospital—1,850 beds, the highest bed content of its kind in the province. There are six pavilions at St. Thomas with three floors each, 18 wards and an outpatient department. St. Thomas should have a minimum of 19 psychiatrists, by the standard of the American psychiatric association, or any standard. What is the situation? For several years, St. Thomas Ontario hospital has steadily been losing staff. In 1958 there

were 19 psychiatrists, the optimum number; in 1962 there were 15 psychiatrists and two part-time; in 1963 there were 14, and two part-time; in 1964 there were 13 and one part-time of whom two were administrative, so that in effect, you have 11 practising psychiatrists for a steady population of 1,850 patients or more, plus a greatly increased admission rate and no staff relief in sight.

I further suggest to this Legislature that St. Thomas Ontario hospital by all standards and by the standards of its superintendent, should have between 35 and 40 social workers. St. Thomas Ontario hospital, Mr. Chairman, has two—I repeat, two—qualified social workers. Unfortunately, it had to retain its three best psychiatric nurses for a social work role, so it has a total complement of five, out of an ideal staff situation of 38.

Let it be said that the numbers I have given reflect an honest clinical team formula, the ratio between psychiatrists, social workers and psychologists. And on that ratio, Mr. Chairman, there should be in St. Thomas Ontario hospital 19 or 20 psychologists. At the moment there are four.

Under nursing, Mr. Chairman, at the St. Thomas OH, there are only 40 or 50 actual registered nurses. All the others are nurses' aides; you cannot get nurses to go to St. Thomas.

Under attendants, there are presently about 240; the requirement is for 300 to do an effective job. I ask the hon. members of this House to relate an inpatient ratio of 1,850 to that number of attendants—and remember to divide the attendants by three, for eight-hour shifts.

As for occupational therapists, Mr. Chairman, there was a little chuckle between the superintendent and this member—the need is so desperate it could not be estimated.

Let us take New Toronto Ontario hospital. Built for 650 beds, New Toronto presently has 860 patients and five major units. New Toronto requires for each unit a minimum complement of three psychiatrists, making a total of 16. There are, at New Toronto, only 11 psychiatrists of whom two are on the administrative end, one is on the research end and so, in fact, you have eight practising psychiatrists in a hospital where there should be a complement of 15. Indeed, the superintendent of that Ontario hospital told me that he had a smaller medical team in 1965 than he had ever had in the history of his superintendency at New Toronto OH, and yet, Mr. Chairman, and I emphasize this, the hospital admitting and discharging rate has doubled over the same six-year period.

Again, accepting the clinical team formula, there is a serious shortage of social workers and psychologists. And under the category of nurses I thought a rather interesting fact emerged. For the year 1965, the New Toronto Ontario hospital requested a total nursing complement—again related to minimum standards—of 231. Those minimum standards were for admission and intensive treatment, for continuing treatment, for medical and surgical services, and for geriatric services. Two hundred and thirty-one, Mr. Chairman. The mental health branch was able to provide 159. They were cut back 72 nurses—cut back something like 30 per cent—probably on financial grounds. And again, I ask the hon. members of this House to contemplate the staff-patient ratio which results.

Now let me turn for just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to the London Ontario hospital. It has a rated capacity of 780 patients and there are presently a complement of 1,120. There is some more of the overcrowding to which the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) earlier made reference. Of course, there are going to be new buildings at London and I suggest strongly to the hon. members of this Legislature that they should visit London OH. It has a fascinating plan that is available. There are going to be some 650 new beds and some 400 old beds for a total complement of about 1,000. For each team in each unit, it is the opinion of the hospital that they would require two psychiatrists, two social workers, and one psychologist—which means a total of 19 psychiatrists including two administrative heads.

On July 1, 1965, Mr. Chairman, there will be nine practising psychiatrists of whom two will have totally administrative duties, making the effective ratio in London, seven out of a required 17. There is absolutely no relief in sight at the moment and the outpatient department is particularly harassed. The total patient case load in the OPD in 1963 was over 1,000, and all they had was two full-time psychiatrists, although admittedly there were many part time from the community. But let it be said that one cannot always count on part-time personnel. The situation in regard to social workers, psychologists and nursing staff is exceedingly critical.

Whitby Ontario hospital, Mr. Chairman, has 1,500 beds—Whitby established on a cottage basis, a rather interesting hangover from earlier approaches to psychiatric needs in the early part of the century—16 cottages with 50 or 60 beds each. It is interesting to note that the treatment objectives established at that time could not even be realized in 1965.

Let me read a little description from the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* of 1912 about what was then called the "Whitby Asylum":

The mentally afflicted of Ontario are to enjoy every advantage, and nothing is to be left undone that may add to their chances of recovery. One of the most potent factors in the development of the body is found in environment. That this is equally true of the mind is recognized by those who have planned the new asylum at Whitby. Instead of one central insane asylum, there will be several hospital buildings in which patients will be treated as their condition may demand. There will be, in addition, cottages where patients may be placed who are only temporarily afflicted or who are convalescing.

In this way, people who are suffering from slight mental trouble, who would shrink from entering an insane asylum, can be treated in the admission hospital building and avoid the horror of close proximity to those who are violently insane. The cottages, or convalescent homes will be eight in number and will be built as nearly as possible like summer residences. Each cottage will provide room for 50 patients.

The interesting thing about Whitby, Mr. Chairman, is that this government has defaulted even on the plan set up in the year 1912; this government has defaulted on the minimum staff complement necessary to prosecute a mental health programme of substance at Whitby Ontario hospital. Again, what are the requirements? For each large ward, Mr. Chairman, of which there are five, a clinic team comprised of three psychiatrists, three social workers, two psychologists and one occupational therapist, is necessary. And let it be said that that encompasses 300 patients in each ward, so it is hardly a lavish outpouring of professional expertise.

And what is the situation? Instead of 15 psychiatrists, there are nine full time. There are some part time—I believe, three—but the superintendent was quick to point out to me that one of them is only in two half-days a week, and that again it is hard to figure on part-time people. Instead of 15 social workers, there are five—one per unit of 300. Instead of ten psychologists, there is one, hired two months ago—the first psychologist they have had in Whitby Ontario hospital for a year.

As far as the outpatient department is concerned, Mr. Chairman, it does not even have

a social worker, and only one psychiatrist of the total psychiatric complement. And it is noteworthy that the case load at the outpatient department at Whitby is falling rapidly, and the needs in the community are thereby being necessarily neglected, because there is simply not the staff complement to do the job. It has the same pattern as all the other Ontario hospitals. The admission rate is rising rapidly—it is up to 1,200 patients a year; it has a nursing shortage; there is only one graduate RN per shift at Whitby. And I suggest to the hon. Minister that he had best be prepared for a situation analogous to that of Toronto OH—of 250 male attendants only two are RNs. The situation is bad, and deteriorating.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just to continue this recitation for the record of the House—I appreciate that there is a lot of detail here, but I think it important to build a substantive case and to document it for what I have to say later on—I want to mention Hamilton's Ontario hospital.

Mr. Chairman, with my good and worthy colleagues from Hamilton, I find it difficult to conceive how the staff at Hamilton survive the ordeal of working within that hospital. The needs are urgent and overwhelming. Let me put it on the table.

There are 1,700 beds in Hamilton; it had 2,000 admissions in 1965—that is the estimate, it may be an underestimate—which is the highest in the entire province. There are four overall units of between 400 and 500 patients in each. And the minimum requirement for each unit, according to Dr. Senn and I am sure he will corroborate what I say, is one certified psychiatric head, two psychiatrists at the diplomate level, and two psychiatrists in training. That is five per unit. And again it is merely a ratio of one per 100; it is not an extravagant number.

Well, Mr. Chairman, Ontario hospital at Hamilton, on this date in 1965, has three psychiatrists per unit, 12 instead of 20; and one of the units—and I emphasize this—one of the units, with from 400 to 500 patients, does not even have a certified medical head; that is of this date. They are wallowing in numbers of professionals. On July 1, 1965, something like three weeks from now, this rosy picture of 12 out of 20 presently prevailing changes; four of the psychiatrists are leaving with only one replacement coming. So, on July 1, 1965, the psychiatric complement at Hamilton OH will be nine out of a required 20; indeed nine out of a required 22, because you need a superintendent and an assistant superintendent.

If the hon. Minister says to me, as I know he will later on, and I shall deal with it shortly, that psychiatrists are hard to come by—I remind him of the fact that, in the not-too-distant past, there were 20 psychiatrists at Hamilton OH; and in the not-too-distant past there were full complements at London and at Whitby, and at others I have mentioned.

That is the psychiatric case load at Hamilton. As to the social workers, Dr. Senn could not even estimate the required number, it has been so long since he had any meaningful number. Presently, at Hamilton Ontario hospital, there are four social workers for 1,700 patients. As for psychologists—I should like to meet this human being, Mr. Chairman—there is one psychologist at Hamilton for the entire inpatient capacity of 1,700.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the pressures on the staff must necessarily be unbearable. I suggest that the situation at Hamilton Ontario hospital is more critical than any other Ontario hospital in the province. And when I asked the superintendent about nurses, I was treated with a wry smile and the observation that Hamilton has not even had a nursing application in the last several months.

I hope you, Mr. Chairman, will allow me a general overall reflection. Confining my analysis purely to the five Ontario hospitals dealt with thus far, the present or imminent shortage of full-time qualified psychiatrists is 44; and if we use the American psychiatric association ratio it means that, somewhere in those five hospitals, there are between 4,000 and 5,000 patients lacking adequate treatment. That accounts, I suggest, for the validity of the public opinion that the Ontario hospital offers inferior services. And I just make these reflections on the five involved, Mr. Chairman.

Lest the hon. Minister say later on that the part-time psychiatric picture redeems things, I want to point out to the House—and I want to point it out as strongly as I can—that many of the present full-time personnel to whom I refer include large numbers who are supposedly doing more training than serving. That is obviously not valid; in fact even the trainees are undertaking total full-time work loads.

Mr. Chairman, so much for the analysis of staff, profession, and senior staff complement at the various Ontario hospitals in the province of Ontario. It becomes important then to account for this intense crisis of top-level staff which threatens the adequate functioning of the total OH system. The visits raised

many answers, and let me just offer a few to the House on this occasion.

First—and obviously, the impossibly low per capita per diem impedes the advance and experimentation, even in the areas of industrial therapy which are so important in rehabilitative terms—the lack of money allows for a contracting set-up.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the entire salary schedule from top to bottom is haywire; it breeds insecurity, it breeds frustration, it breeds a heavy turnover, it necessarily breeds despair. Everywhere it is the same story. The salaries are crucial in many instances; the Ontario hospitals simply cannot compete. At Whitby Ontario hospital, competition is with Toronto, with Ajax, with General Motors at Oshawa. In Kingston Ontario hospital, the recently negotiated civil service agreement cutting down holidays to two weeks for the first three years, meant that, in addition to every nurse receiving less than she would receive at the general hospitals in the community, her vacation time is also less. So why come to an Ontario hospital? Staff hirings have come to a virtual halt.

Then, Mr. Chairman, just to go further, for all the psychiatric and psychological and social worker team, private practice in private agencies in the community is always more lucrative. You have a rather interesting situation in the city of Hamilton. The newly appointed head of the community psychiatric centre in Hamilton, partly city-financed, a man—and I have no doubt that he has an immense capacity and is excellent in his field—but a man who will never supervise more than three or four or five people at any time, in the development of that clinic, was hired at a starting salary much in excess of any superintendent in any Ontario hospital in this province. And I might say that, of the Toronto Ontario hospital, the views of Dr. Davidson are necessarily typical of those throughout.

As for New Toronto—so that I may move from the general to the particular, Mr. Chairman, let me give some concrete examples. This House will probably be interested. Three of them:

First, there was recently at New Toronto, a PhD psychologist. From 1962 to 1963, he was paid in the vicinity of \$8,000 a year. He did inestimably good work at New Toronto, and he is now with the Toronto board of education, at \$15,000 a year.

Second, Dr. Moorhouse had an MA in nursing education from Columbia. Tremendous progress was made in that field. Earnings in 1962 for this nursing MA were in the

vicinity of \$4,000 a year. She is now with the University of Toronto, at almost double that figure.

Third, Dr. Moorhouse had at New Toronto Ontario hospital, a PhD in social work from Columbia University, the only one in the province of Ontario. He was paid approximately \$5,500 a year. He is now with the University of Ottawa.

In one concrete example after another, attrition of staff can be demonstrated by relationship to salaries and to conditions and to facilities. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that the public service of the province demands a certain dedication, but I suggest to the hon. Minister that it does not demand self-imposed austerity. You have no right to ask the senior staff in the Ontario hospitals in this province, to be philanthropists first and professionals second. But that is precisely what you are doing.

To take the explanation just a little further, Mr. Chairman, the development of psychiatric wings in general hospitals will cause even further attrition, I suggest, because the delectable prospect of a combination of hospital and private practice is vastly more attractive than the public service. So the competition develops not only with the United States, but also internally; and it will have deleterious effect on the staff complement. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that the medical care insurance bill, which is presently before debate in this House, will further add to that contraction of staff by confirming, as it does, a difference in the fee-supported and the tax-supported services. It is much more desirable in the minds of many professionals to work in the fee-supported circles.

Another very peculiar fact became manifest, Mr. Chairman, as I inquired about the contraction of staff in this desperately critical situation—a very curious fact. It appears that at the psychiatric level at least, the problem exists of the dominance of university-affiliated hospitals. Apparently, under new certification requirements, dictated by the Royal college of physicians and surgeons, training can be taken only at designated university-affiliated hospitals and this is likely to decimate the staff even further at Whitby and at St. Thomas and at Hamilton.

Mr. Chairman, if I may give a word of explanation. Until recently, students could take two years of their four-year training at any Ontario hospital—the first and the fourth year. In ten years, Mr. Chairman, Hamilton Ontario hospital, for instance, never missed a certification. Not once. But now the

students are down to one year's training and soon they will probably be down to no years of training, in any non-university affiliated hospital. It means that those hospitals I have mentioned, Whitby, St. Thomas, Hamilton, will necessarily suffer an even greater and more critical reduction of staff. I say to the hon. Minister, and I hope he will give an answer later on, I simply do not understand the folly of it. It may be salutary in the long run, but why is it not possible to build some kind of bridge, until the time that McMaster has a full-time medical school? What happens to St. Thomas? And what happens to Whitby in the interim? Certainly, for the people in the hospitals themselves, there are no immediately evident answers.

Mr. Chairman, as has often been pointed out in this House, the conditions in the hospital equally militate against the attraction of staff. St. Thomas Ontario hospital is 65 acres of geographic isolation. There is no incentive to move to St. Thomas for purposes of employment. I suspect that this is partly the case at Smiths Falls as well. I do not know whether it relates to Mitchell Hepburn, or whether it relates to this hon. Minister of Health, but something has to be done about the geographic isolation and the consequences thereof at St. Thomas Ontario hospital.

Let it be said that it also has to be done for Kingston Ontario hospital. Kingston catchment area is nine counties in this province and of course Kingston can take people all the way north from Petawawa, despite the fact that they are in much closer proximity to North Bay. Yet by the very nature of the geographic boundaries relating to these Ontario hospitals, there develops in the public mind a sense of isolation which must be overcome.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, similarly, the overcrowding must be overcome. I say to the hon. Minister opposite, that I do not appreciate the epithet "snake pit," as applied to Toronto Ontario hospital. I think it is in exceedingly poor taste, but I do say to him that I can understand hon. members being driven to a certain degree of incalculable frustration, in finding adjectives to describe conditions that prevail.

Toronto is overcrowded. New Toronto should have 650 beds and has 860; London should have 780, it has 1,120. When I was in London Ontario hospital, I walked through wards where there was a capacity of 35 beds, and there were 73 people on the ward. I saw large numbers of beds in corridors. This still exists at London Ontario hospital. I noticed that the supply of facilities was

exceedingly poor. It is hardly conducive to enthusiastic employment.

I also add the footnote that London OH is rebuilding, although 400 beds will still remain in the old wing. London Ontario hospital is admittedly rebuilding, Mr. Chairman, but we have as yet no concrete, authoritative evidence of what is to happen in some of the other institutions in the province.

Look at New Toronto. The hon. Minister spoke earlier this week, I think, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of New Toronto Ontario hospital, now called, I believe, the Lakeshore psychiatric hospital. Rechristened. It was built in 1890, Mr. Chairman, and in the 75 intervening years not a single new building nor extension has been added, except let me say, a new power house in 1934, for whatever reason. And it is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the staff in hospitals like New Toronto, spend as much time trying to establish a proper psychiatric milieu, in buildings designed a century ago, as they do on the practice of clinical concepts of medicine. We impose on our staff the necessity for a degree of adaptability and creativity and adjustment, which newer buildings and better facilities would not impose.

That leads to another point, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is a very important point. At precisely the stage in the evolution of knowledge about mental health, at precisely the moment when we develop a revolutionary use of drugs, or psycho-pharmaceuticals—which made it possible to shift the emphasis dramatically from the custodial to active treatment, at precisely that moment over the last ten years, our hospital senior staff is steadily contracting, so that two things result. You can now treat more patients than ever before, because of this revolutionary breakthrough; but there simply are not any senior physicians and clinical teams to provide adequate treatment. Second, the teams themselves are overwhelmed and abused by the kind of staff-case ratio which exists. It is intimidating, not to say positively demoralizing. And perhaps I may make one incidental aside at this point, Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister will obviously say there is a basic shortage of psychiatrists and there is a basic shortage of all the ancillary staff, and, Mr. Chairman, it is of course incumbent on us on this side to be honest and forthright; he is right about that—but let me add these observations; and I am going to add them, rather more strongly and I hope more thoughtfully, in the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare. In the area of social

workers and psychologists and welfare workers and other career lines in the social service field, nothing, but nothing, is being done in an intelligent way by this government.

There is not a single manpower survey available, there is not a single study of requirements available, there is no evaluation of case load and distinction of career lines available, there is nothing given by this government which would boost that ancillary staff position; indeed, there is no overall plan of any kind whatsoever. And it is criminal, Mr. Chairman, that such should be allowed to exist. The burden of responsibility lies on the shoulders of the two hon. Ministers sitting almost adjacent across from you.

Although it is more severe in the area of ancillary work staff, it is, of course, equally severe in psychiatry. Across Canada we should be graduating 240 psychiatrists per year; we are graduating at the moment 119. And I have no doubt that the Ontario figures are representative of the national trend. But I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that at least the Ontario psychiatric association has set up a subcommittee to study manpower needs, which is more than we in this House have had evidence that the government has done. At least, Mr. Chairman, they are conscious of the need and will try to cultivate it through the medical schools, which is more than we have evidence that the government has done. I know about some of the bursaries and about some of the financial inducements, but I think later on in these estimates, under a sub-branch, we can develop those themes a little.

I would also point out that in that grandiose, that revolutionary, scheme of \$114 million for medical schools and ancillary personnel back in October, there was never any specific contribution for the field of psychiatry. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that if the hon. Minister believes, as he is so often on record as believing, that mental health is "Ontario's No. 1 health problem" then his reactions and his responses as a responsible Minister vibrate hollowly indeed.

That is the second major crisis and, I think, some of its reasons, Mr. Chairman.

The third major crisis paralyzing and impeding the Ontario hospital system is the soaring rates of readmission and the reasons for it. In 1960, Mr. Chairman, the readmission average across the province of Ontario hospitals was 38 per cent. In 1961 it was 39 per cent. In 1962 it was 42 per cent. A steady, inexorable rise. And one of the superintendents, Mr. Chairman, gave me the figures of readmission for six major Ontario hospitals for

the month of March, 1965, and I do not think it can be any more timely. Let me read them. First admission, then readmission and the percentage:

Whitby Ontario hospital: first admissions 63, readmissions 57, percentage 48 per cent.

Toronto: first admissions 66, readmissions 101, readmission percentage 60 per cent.

New Toronto: 58 first admissions, 44 readmissions, percentage 43 per cent.

London: 36 first admissions, readmissions 24, percentage 40 per cent.

Hamilton: 115 first admissions, readmissions 77, percentage 40 per cent.

St. Thomas: first admissions 42, readmissions 35, percentage of readmissions 45 per cent.

The total percentage of readmission across the board, 46 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, that is an exceedingly high and worrying figure.

It is particularly worrying when, as I intend to show in a moment's time, it can be totally avoided. There is no excuse for it whatsoever, and the complete responsibility lies on this government in the person of the Minister of Health. The trend upwards does not parallel trends in other jurisdictions. I was very interested in this. There was an upward trend until roughly 1961 or 1962, but while it had started to go down in some of the other jurisdictions, it continues to go up in Ontario mental hospitals and there are three separate reasons advanced for that rise.

The first reason is this, Mr. Chairman, put very baldly: premature discharge due to overcrowding and the relentless demand for new beds. I think that is probably true of the Ontario hospital in Toronto. Dr. Christie, in a recent article, pointed out that the rate has risen in Toronto Ontario hospital from 28 per cent in 1953 to 49 per cent in 1963. And in his article, "The Swinging Door"—a fascinating piece, a mixture of analysis and poetry; I commend it to the hon. members of this House; it is reprinted in the *Canadian Psychiatric Journal*, January-February, 1965—Dr. Christie had this to say:

Patients are more and more briefly, although one hopes no less cordially, processed through a sequence of diagnostic and therapeutic steps, which is ever more compressed and at times perfunctory, and returned to their original and widely various social situations with least possible delay to make room for the next in line. Readmission rates throughout the world have risen in the same period but scrutiny of individual cases during the past year or two

reveal that in this particular centre, at any rate, the negative features of incomplete assessment and treatment leading to premature discharge and unnecessarily early relapse and readmission are operating to an ominously increasing extent.

Now I quote from Dr. Christie's annual report:

As predicted last year, the readmission rate has continued to rise and is approximately half of all admissions. Many psychiatric disorders are relapsing. However, as stated on many previous occasions, the rate of readmission to this hospital is known—

I repeat:

—is known increasingly to reflect inadequacies of initial treatment with premature discharge forced by the pressure for beds.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that is again an absolutely intolerable situation. I know it is nice that we can all sit here in our self-impressed capacities as members of the Legislature, and absorb with equanimity phrases like "psychiatric disorders are relapsing." But I say to the hon. Minister opposite that it is time that the equanimity of the government was jolted, because all we are doing is systematically damaging people who can in fact recuperate in much shorter periods of time. It can no longer be tolerated.

The second reason for premature discharge, Mr. Chairman, is due, in the opinion of some—and I shall just say this in passing—to the astonishing effect of new drugs. At times a seeming transformation can mislead psychiatric opinion, apparently. You get an early discharge and an early readmission and, frankly, only one or two of the superintendents felt that to be an explanation so I shall not labour the point. I shall merely advance it to make this approach a little more all-embracing.

But the third fundamental reason—and make no mistake about it—is that in almost all cases the readmission is due to a tragic lack or total absence of after-care in the province of Ontario. Of all the Ontario hospitals I visited, only Toronto had any intensive community follow-up, only Toronto had solely ten per cent of its outpatients who were formerly inpatients, unlike the others where the outpatient department was harassed by near-relapsing inpatient returnees. And let me say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the things I learned in my reading, however partial, was that outpatient departments should not be used for patients seeking readmission, certainly not in any reasonable mental health picture, because all you have then is a

never-ending circle from the inpatient to the outpatient and back again. Toronto, at least, has a proper percentage, but it not reflected in other hospitals in the province.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the sad truth is, and the blatant truth, is that the Ontario hospitals simply do not know the meaning of after-care, simply cannot know the meaning of after-care. The staff inundation is such that hospitals cannot possibly cope with any further responsibility. So the discharged fend for themselves; people with acute and serious mental illness are put into the community to fend for themselves despite the critical factors of readjustment. Let me quote what the national institute of mental health in the United States is on record as saying:

The most difficult period we have in treating the psychiatric patient, especially one who has suffered a serious illness that has resulted in a period of time in a hospital, is the period immediately following his discharge during which he must relocate himself in society and work.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is a well-known and documented fact that the highest incidence of psychiatric relapse begins soon after leaving the hospital. Fifty per cent within the first three to four months, and yet after-care is frighteningly neglected in Ontario.

Let me tell you what I learned, Mr. Chairman. One of the superintendents told me that the patients were necessarily left to chance or to individual positions. "We tell them to write if they are in trouble," he said. And it was quite a natural observation to make. Another superintendent, Dr. Senn at Hamilton Ontario hospital, said that about all he was able to do was to say to the patient, "If you feel you are not well, come back to see me." That is a pathetic but unavoidable commentary on the system of rehabilitation after mental institutionalization in the province of Ontario. Dr. Senn is the first to recognize the importance of home placement, of job counselling, of vocational training or readjustment in the community. He is the first to recognize the need for social workers, for public health nurses, for general practitioners to follow their patients, but there simply is no apparatus of after-care because there is simply no staff to have that apparatus of after-care. Thus do readmission rates rise.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Except at the Lakehead.

Mr. S. Lewis: Except at the Lakehead, says the hon. Minister from Port Arthur. I am in a beneficent and charitable mood. Having not

visited the hospital at the Lakehead, I will accept his feeling.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is where Dr. Senn started his work with mental health. He is one of the most knowledgeable men in Ontario in the field of mental health.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that my friend, the hon. member for Parkdale read into the records a quote from Dr. Pratten, superintendent of Kingston Ontario hospital, writing in, I think it was, the 1964 issue of *Canada's Mental Health*, if I recall. I want to repeat one part of that quote because I think it was important.

Dr. Pratten pointed out that all of our mental patients are now being discharged, or that 75 per cent of them rather are being discharged within three months, and then he said:

But this, it seems to me, is a disservice to our patients. Hospital outpatient, community psychiatric, medical, social work and rehabilitation services are not sufficiently developed or sufficiently integrated with psychiatric hospitals to provide adequate after-care which the patient needs.

The combined tragedy and folly of this non-existent after-care dilemma lies in the extraordinary evidence of success where follow up is an integral part of a continuous treatment programme.

Let me give this Legislature some specific examples, because I do not want to seem to be setting out theories which cannot be corroborated in fact, and I have spent some considerable time in trying, in truth, to document it.

First, Mr. Chairman, there is a very famous study in the United States ranging across five states, a cross-section of 600 patients divided into a control group and an aftercare group. The states involved were Colorado, Kentucky, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and in each state the study lasted ten months. What were its findings? Let me put them on the record of this House.

The rehospitalization rate during the study of the control group was 35 per cent; the rehospitalization rate during the study of the after-care group was 15 per cent.

I quote from the findings:

The study suggests that after-care programmes can cut rehospitalization rates by half.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this House to think of it for a moment; cutting rehospitalization rates

in half with our present records, soaring records, of readmissions. But there were further findings:

The analysis of the five states noted that where rehospitalization did take place during the period of the study, for the control group patients the average was 36 days' stay in hospital; for the after-care patients the average was 10 days' stay in hospital.

So that in the instance of after-care you had a reduction in four weeks of hospital stay when the policy was followed.

Now the costs of after-care services—and I cannot stress this strongly enough—the costs of after-care services were extraordinarily inexpensive when compared to the regular hospital per diem rate, the average in every instance was 10 per cent of the hospital inpatient costs.

That means, Mr. Chairman, I submit, that in the province of Ontario we could run an after-care programme at 70 cents to \$1 per patient per day, that is all, under the hopelessly limited grants presently dispensed.

Generally speaking the after-care approach is not difficult. It involves a social worker or public health nurse or a general practitioner, occasionally a psychiatrist. There is always considerable use of drugs, but work with families and job counsellings lead to success, and with halfway houses and after-care clinics immense things can be achieved in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go further. There was a New York state survey provided by Dr. Donald Carmichael, and it reflected the establishment of convalescent clinics and day hospitals well staffed to provide the bridge from the crisis episodes after discharge. And quoting from Dr. Carmichael's survey, it indicates:

The follow-up of over 90 patients one to two years after leaving the day centre, showed a rehospitalization rate of one out of three, as compared with 90 per cent or 100 per cent who would have been rehospitalized in the absence of the centre. About 40 per cent were supporting themselves in whole or in part.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I point out that it is easy for the hon. Minister of Health to sit sanguine and self-assured in the face of presently prevailing trends. But the fact is that patient after patient in the Ontario hospitals relapse after discharge. The fact is that our readmission rates rise, the fact is that it is incumbent on the government knowing the value of after-care, to do something

about it. Yet there is not so much as a hint of a meaningful programme.

It is well known by the Canadian mental health association and by this government that there was a programme of community foster homes in Winnipeg, connected with the Selkirk mental hospital in Manitoba—a very adventuresome project. The primary impetus came from volunteers, I stress this, Mr. Chairman. What they did was to contact only board-and-room advertisements in the newspapers, and where they were considered feasible they thereafter made home placements.

Let me tell the hon. members of the Legislature what happened. Within ten weeks of beginning in 1962 the hospitals were unable to keep pace. Forty-two patients were placed in the first five months; 200 patients were placed in the following 20 months; 256 patients have been placed to date and of them all only nine have been returned to hospital. Under the province of Ontario's after-care programme 130 of them would have been returned to hospital!

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I feel I must make reference to a fascinating study, recently available, of the psychiatric home care programme at University hospital, Saskatoon. This psychiatric home care programme again followed seriously ill mental patients into the community with a social worker or public health nurse. In fact, the public health nurse was the main vehicle for the follow-up. It was financed since 1961 by the province of Saskatchewan and by the national institute of mental health grants. They accepted only the most difficult cases, and let me emphasize that they also accepted older people. The evidence of rehabilitation was absolutely astonishing.

I am not going to read all the individual cases into the record but let me tell the House of one or two.

There was a man, 90 years of age, whose diagnosis was senility with sensory changes. His after-care amounted only to 16 weeks. He was visited regularly by a VON and by a social worker, once by his general practitioner. He is now well. He had one admission to a mental hospital which it was thought would be permanent. He has had no admissions in two and a half years.

Another case, a paranoid schizophrenic, 52 years of age, the duration of home care lasted only 29 weeks. Again, just a VON and public health nurse. His present state: He is at peace with his delusions, he is working. Prior to the after-care programme he had five admissions in one and a half years; now no

admissions in two years since the project was instituted.

Now, no admissions in two years since the project was instituted. And so it goes with patients in manic state, patients with neurosis, patients with reactive depression, patients with all the most acutely serious psychiatric ills—a total rehabilitation. The preliminary survey is astonishing in its findings, and there is not a thing, Mr. Chairman, to approximate it in the province of Ontario.

So much then, in summary, for that part of my remarks. I realize that my remarks are somewhat extended, but I shall pursue them because I think it is important that this be given hearing in the Legislature, whether it be June of 1965 or July.

First, I repeat, we are starving our Ontario hospitals premeditatedly and consciously; second, the staff—senior staff—complement is suffering a desperate attrition with all the unhappy consequences; and, third, we have no after-care programme whatsoever so that the readmission rates continue to soar.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fourth major crisis in our Ontario hospital system is essentially the crux of my entire argument. The Ontario hospitals are tottering amidst the confusion of an undefined pattern of mental health services. Their overall role is uncertain, equivocal, haphazard and anxious; they are dismembered bodies in a dismembered system and there is simply no graphic overall plan available.

Oh yes, to do the hon. Minister justice, his original pretensions were bold. Earlier in his speech, that lilting Scottish ballad speech that I quoted earlier, the hon. Minister of Health had this to say:

From this it will be seen that the modern concept is that organization of mental health services should start at the community level.

The hon. Minister of Health, in conjunction with the head of the mental health branch and with, I think it is, Dr. Henderson, who heads the community health services wing, was going to set up—essentially—a triad of services—the hon. Minister can correct me if I am wrong—Ontario hospitals on one hand; psychiatric wings of general hospitals on another; and outpatient departments for the third. That is well and good, Mr. Chairman, we shall return to that.

But surely the community organization should have an integrated and planned framework within which all these existing systems, all the branches of the triad can function. Otherwise, I suggest, mental health in any

one of them—Ontario hospitals, psychiatric wings or outpatient departments—is reduced to a catch-as-catch-can proposition. And everywhere I travelled, I found the same confusion, uncertainty, anxiety, and lack of definition.

Let me ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman: What is to become of St. Thomas Ontario hospital? Let us know what is to become of it, in its splendid geographic isolation—an increasing sense of isolation; an isolation where distance discourages early diagnosis and creates problems of rehabilitation.

Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the future of Hamilton Ontario hospital before McMaster has a fully operative medical school? How many more psychiatrists can it lose before it is reduced to having the attendants in the wards administer psychiatric help? How do you stem the dramatic contraction in professional staff? What relationship does the Hamilton Ontario hospital have to the two psychiatric wings in the general hospital in Hamilton? What relationship does it have to the community psychiatric centre which is being established? Who defines the relevance? How do you overcome the fragmentation of services? A fragmentation to which Dr. Henderson has himself made reference in published articles—each facility operating under an independent and unrelated administrative authority.

Let me continue, Mr. Chairman. Will Kingston Ontario hospital get its special clinic for treatment of adolescents? Will it get its special clinic for treatment of alcoholism, for geriatrics? When will we have some definition about the facilities of Kingston, because of course, all of eastern Ontario is bereft of that entire range of services?

And, Mr. Chairman, what about research in the Ontario hospitals? We are now talking about the things which give a *raison d'être* to these hospitals, which give their staff and their structure and their programme some substance. What about research? The truth is that in the entire Ontario hospital system in this province, only New Toronto is doing any concerted and consistent research. Oh, the hon. Minister talks blithely of research. I remember the Ontario government submission to the Hall commission. Let me quote:

Specific methods of preventing mental illness or mental deficiency can only be achieved through research, which in proportion to the magnitude of the problem, has been grossly neglected.

I suppose the gross neglect was to be a commentary on the federal government. And then a further quote:

Research in the field of mental illness, mental retardation and epilepsy is perhaps the most pressing need in the health service field.

Brave words, Mr. Chairman; hypocritical words, Mr. Chairman, because of all the money allotted to Ontario by the federal government for mental health, only 1.2 per cent is used for research purposes. So the abdication of responsibility lies at both the federal and the provincial levels.

Why was it not possible, Mr. Chairman, for London Ontario hospital to have a small general hospital wing, or for Toronto Ontario hospital to have the same? It avoids duplication of services, it further integrates mental and physical illness and it overcomes the community stigma. Dr. Wickware wanted it. The geographic position in the east end of London made sense for a burgeoning population. The London academy of medicine wanted it—and had editorial support. The mental health branch wanted it, too, but instead, the university got a teaching hospital because here was no overall regional planning, and because this hon. Minister, as is his wont, refused to intervene. So again, Mr. Chairman, we have this hopeless lack of co-ordination, this invidious state in the Ontario hospital system. Indeed, it can be summarized in a parting quote again from Dr. Christie, because I think no one is better qualified to speak than the superintendents involved:

The clarification of the future role of this hospital both immediate and remote is an urgent community need. How should a metropolitan psychiatric hospital be planned, constructed, funded, staffed, organized and operated? No self-evident answers to these questions are available, yet their urgency becomes ever more evident here in Toronto in 1964.

No plans, no answers, nothing provided, and the Ontario hospital system continues fragmented.

Mr. Chairman, I was looking at this report on mental care in Metropolitan Toronto because, for many people—the hon. Minister of Health himself—this was to provide the plan. Yet, Mr. Chairman, this is a most limited, superficial, unimaginative document. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I think this whole survey has been intimidated by their own initial courage. When they projected the figure of hospital bed shortage in Metropolitan Toronto in the summer of 1964 at 2,360 beds, a relentless furor built to the point where the

hon. Minister seemed to acquiesce and make progress—there will be more about that later on. Immediately thereafter all the observations and recommendations in subsequent reports were toned down, became temperate, moderate and cautious, until the entire report is deprived of substance; until the only thing it does is make the obvious and not very inspired observation that there is a 400-bed overcrowding in the Toronto Ontario hospital, that it would be nice to have a community board to run these hospitals and that things are not quite as they should be. Let us hope that the hon. Minister moves on it. Well, you know, the recitation of the obvious does not need to be enshrined in published documents of this kind.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Chairman, that the fundamental proposition of this report was not met by the group involved. Indeed, I want to put forth something now to this Legislature which I think may be of interest to the hon. Minister of Health; he certainly will not have seen it in this report. The only thing this report does, and does well, is to show that the commissioners are totally unable to do elementary arithmetic. Their mathematical computations are ludicrous. They are so complicated in nature that they could have been fed into some Gemini computer.

After a complete appraisal of the field and a subtraction of people who might be moving out of Toronto, and an addition of people who might be calculated into Whitby—and one projection and another projection—they came up with the astonishing decision that there would either be 171 beds too few or 45 beds too many. And that, Mr. Chairman, was a magnificent piece of contradictory nonsense. I want to tell the House how they arrived at that figure, because I think they have made a very inaccurate projection which is going to cause serious trouble in Metropolitan Toronto unless we do something about it.

This report, under its section entitled "The Needs," page 27, states categorically the following three points—I shall try to spell it out slowly, and hope that I can communicate to the hon. members because I myself am no mathematical wizard by any stretch of the imagination.

The conference of western European hospitals held in November, 1962 at the international hospital federation said that the ratio for mental hospital beds was $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 per 1,000 population. That was for both mental illness and mental subnormality. And Mr. Chairman, if I can extract just mental illness, it would be a range very closely

approximating two to four-and-a-half beds per 1,000.

Secondly, the report pointed to a widely based American study in 1962 which recommended 6.5 beds per 1,000 population for mental illness and mental subnormality. And on that basis, Mr. Chairman, mental illness would be 3.8 beds per thousand.

Then the report referred to the British five-year plan which was based on an evaluation of the entire British network in England and Wales, and came to the conclusion of a minimum 1.8 beds per 1,000. And that, Mr. Chairman, was an absolute minimum. The figure of 1.8 per 1,000 is a reduction from the previous figure in the United Kingdom of 3.3 per 1,000, and 1.8 is accepted as a figure, also taking into account community treatment, outpatient clinics, foster homes, after-care—things which we do not have in the province of Ontario—and which would maintain patients in the community.

So the figures given by the report itself on which to project bed needs range from 1.8 per 1,000 to 4.5 per 1,000.

And then the report states—some of my hon. colleagues will be taken aback, even if the hon. Minister is not:

Present allocation and need are approximately equal, since the waiting lists reported by the Ontario hospitals are very short, comprising a fluctuating total of between 30 and 50 patients.

Now, this surely must be the first report, Mr. Chairman, by a distinguished assemblage of men, which suggests that the immediate demand is the effective need five years hence. There is absolutely nothing in the report which takes into account the effect of the opening of psychiatric wings on pressure for Ontario hospital beds, there is nothing in the report which relates to the experience of other jurisdictions which shows expansion. There is nothing in the report but this absurd proposition that because our waiting lists are not longer than the effective known needs, therefore we will establish the present percentage as a ratio. It is as if to say that because there are only 2,000 people in the city of Toronto who demand low-cost public housing that is all the number of units we must provide. The argument has been shown to be specious on endless occasions.

But what is the figure that presently provides the present satisfactory ratio?—1.26 per cent beds per 1,000, Mr. Chairman. So the report very calmly takes the 1.26 figure prevailing in 1965 and projects it to 1970 and says that that means we will either have

171 beds too few or 45 too many. It is absurd, just ludicrous!

The lowest figure that could possibly be used is the 1.8 figure, and when you apply the 1.8 figure to the projected Metropolitan Toronto population of 1970, the actual bed needs will be 3,474, which means that we are likely to have a shortage in Metro Toronto between 1970 and 1975 of 1,046 psychiatric beds.

I bring it to the attention of this House because those figures are seriously related to other jurisdictions and other studies, whereas this report is obviously a defence mechanism for the hon. Minister. Once again, Mr. Chairman, the needs of mental health are left in limbo because we have no integrated scheme, we have no field blueprints on which to plan.

What then, more precisely, is the essential rationale around which to some degree I have been speaking for so long? I shall not in fact exceed the length of other estimate speeches, but I shall approximate it. I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, of the community mental health centre—to which this government supposedly subscribes—in its most dramatic and creative format; an organization of community services which provide—not necessarily within the same building, indeed they should not provide within the same building—the whole spectrum of treatment facilities. I am talking of inpatient, outpatient, day hospitals, night hospitals, the now famous walk-ins, the 24-hour emergency service, the specialized adolescent forensic, geriatric and alcoholic units—after-care, half-way homes, foster homes, and so on—research and training. And the only facility, Mr. Chairman, in the province of Ontario which even begins to approximate that is the Toronto psychiatric hospital.

The concept of community health which I am putting forward on this side of the House, and which stands in total contradiction to the policy that is now being developed by this government, is a concept which reaches into the community, associating with all community agencies, shifting the emphasis forcefully to that of prevention as well as of treatment.

Such a scheme is difficult, but if the hon. Minister maintains the present pattern, it is fraught with peril. The head of his community mental health services branch is on record in the June, 1964 issue of the *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal* as saying:

It is inherent in the basic concept of community psychiatric centres that the outpatient service will be an integral part of

a more comprehensive programme. Many of these services will be located in general hospitals. Those engaged in outpatient programmes directed to broad needs in the community have expressed the fear that a service identified with a general hospital will become centred on the organic and physical elements of psychiatric practice. Such an emphasis would minimize the psycho-social aspects of psychiatry and tend to exclude the involvement of the supporting agencies and services in the local mental health effort. We must make sure this does not happen.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the sad truth is that it is happening. Our mental health services are rigidifying, and rigidifying in the wrong direction. We are sacrificing the community emphasis to the hospital emphasis; instead of the community model we have only the medical model and the focus is on mental illness rather than on mental health.

Let me be more explicit for a moment. The entire thrust at present, as the hon. Minister knows, is in the direction of psychiatric wings in general hospitals. That is where the impetus comes. And there is some very real validity in integrating mental illness with physical illness. But not absolute validity, not at the expense of the community needs as a whole.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the psychiatric profession, and the hon. Minister, and the mental care in Metro study corroborate this viewpoint of *More for the Mind*. But let us not think that *More for the Mind* is some biblical preaching before which we must all stand in awe. *More for the Mind* was written by eight psychiatrists, it was the reflection only of psychiatrists. I think it is worth putting to this House the fact that an even more eminent study was made by the United States joint commission on mental illness and health. This commission had 45 members, 24 with medical degrees, but 21 with various qualifications—representing the entire range of the ancillary professional field—psychology, social work, welfare work, nursing, and so on. They had a rather different community emphasis. I want to read from a review of *More for the Mind*, written by Dr. Clyde Marshall, in the February, 1965, issue of, I imagine, the *Canadian Psychiatric Journal*, and he asks:

Can all activities now being carried on by independent community mental health centres outside of a general hospital be done just as well in a hospital facility? Certainly, the definite medical functions can be done just as well in such a facility,

and probably better, but what about those activities of psychiatry which relate more to community problems than to illness narrowly defined?

Can all the various services now supplied to schools, colleges, welfare organizations and private individuals be carried on just as well in a general hospital setting? Specifically, what about the school services, or when a husband and wife are having difficulties and wish to consult a psychiatrist? Is this to be interpreted as illness, and should the two be referred to an outpatient department of a general hospital?

And Dr. Walter McLay on the occasion of the Adolf Meyer lecture said, after appraising some of the hopeful aspects, and I quote:

On the other hand, psychiatric patients need more time and space than the general hospital offers. The regime of a general hospital is authoritarian, whereas the therapeutic community needs a more egalitarian approach. Regression to a state of passive co-operation and obedience may be good for the physically ill but it is bad for the psychiatric patient. Choice of patients by the general hospital may lead to a deterioration in the morale and standards of the mental hospital.

The fact of the matter is, that that is the direction in which we are going, and I suggest that not sufficient thought has been given.

Mr. Chairman, another point needs to be raised. Psychiatric wings, when first opened, were supposed to bring mental health into the community, thereby relieving the Ontario hospitals of the burden and the work load. The Ontario hospital population was supposed to grow smaller, was supposed to contract, perhaps ultimately disappear. The hon. Minister has hinted at this direction from time to time.

But, Mr. Chairman, no such thing is happening and the reverse is true; that is why this "Mental Care in Metro Toronto" is such a misleading document.

One need only visit Dr. Pratten in his Ontario hospital in Kingston and ask what happened to the pressure on that hospital when the psychiatric wing at Peterborough was opened, to know in fact what the pattern is. When you open up psychiatric facilities in a wing of a general hospital, what you are really doing in this society, in our very limited state of psychiatric development, is increasing the identification process, making it possible to assess the incidence more validly and thus the admission rates tend to rise. They

do not contract. From one Ontario hospital to another across the province, the needs will be greater, rather than less. The need for definition will be greater, rather than less, but there is no such definition available.

Next, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the psychiatric wings are often exclusive and restrictive in the worst possible sense, and their exclusiveness and their restrictions militate against the community interests. Some, like those in Hamilton, for instance, will take only patients from psychiatrists practising in the community. Others will take patients only from the staff and the general practitioners of the hospital involved. In every instance, the independent boards of governors lay down policies; the community, inadvertently or otherwise, can be misplaced or discarded, and there is no policy at the provincial levels to allow for community needs.

Further, Mr. Chairman, some of our esteemed psychiatric wings move with very serious lethargy toward opening outpatient departments, and this is a complete negation of community involvement. This was the rationale, this was the test, this was the justification for Dr. Henderson's emphasis on psychiatric wings. But even this watered-down mental-care study shows that of the five general hospitals in the city of Metropolitan Toronto, only one has an outpatient department of any formalized kind, and that is not a very happy or enlightened picture.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make perhaps a more important and crucial observation. Indeed this observation and the analysis I am about to offer to the House, is fundamental to my whole argument. I submit to the hon. members present that the acid test of genuine community involvement lies in the channels of referral. Whence do the prospective patients come and how do they get there? Just how strong are the community roots of our supposed community mental health services. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is at once revealing and distressing, and the answer is found in this document, the eighth annual statistical summary, "Community Mental Health Services in Ontario, 1963."

This is a fascinating document and alone, of its own, it indicts the entire mental health pattern in the province of Ontario.

In fact, this is a description unmerited for a document of this kind, "Community Mental Health Services in Ontario." What a pretentious appellation. This is just an analysis of outpatient clinics. Community mental health services, in the meaning of the phrase as it is developing in Scandinavia and in the

United Kingdom and in the United States, is an all-embracing concept, not merely outpatient departments.

But let us look at our outpatient departments for a moment. Let us take a look at that table called, I think, "New Patients by Referring Agency." It analyzes the referral channels of 26 provincial and 17 local services in Ontario in 1963—some 15,000 cases—and what does it show? It shows that of the 15,000 cases, 44.2 per cent were referred by general practitioners, and another 15.3 per cent by other health agencies. In other words, 60 per cent of the referrals to our community mental health centres, the so-called outpatient departments, come from medical sources. Again the medical model.

What about the things which we consider to be community channels? What about them? Let me give the percentage of referrals from those sources: children's agencies, 3.9 per cent; family agencies, 1.2 per cent; educational agencies, 8.8 per cent; courts, probation officers, police, 6.3 per cent; friends or relatives, 2.1 per cent, and the most important source of referral of all, the self-referral by the parent, the precise family involvement, 11 per cent.

In one centre after another, Mr. Chairman, the whole referral pattern is almost exclusively medical. Indeed, in many of the outpatient clinics of Ontario hospitals and some of the wings of general hospitals, it is from 70 to 100 per cent medical in nature. Yet in all the valid American experiments, and with all the people with whom I discussed this problem, the contention was invariably that community mental health meant exactly that—it meant family agencies, children's agencies, educational agencies, probation agencies, self-referrals, not confined, restricted medical patterns of mental health. Certainly, we want to involve the general practitioner, no one denies that; but not the general practitioner at the exclusion of the community.

Then we take a closer look at these fascinating few pages, and we look at the tables, "New Cases by Referring Agencies," and look at some of the agencies and what do we find? In some of them, Mr. Chairman—the London Ontario hospital, the Hamilton mental health clinic, the Toronto psychiatric hospital, and the Toronto mental health clinic—the medical referrals are only 15 to 25 per cent of the total. The self-referrals, the educational referrals, the children and family agency referrals are the great bulk of the channels from which people with mental problems are coming to the outpatient clinic.

And what characterizes all these outpatient clinics, what distinguishes them from every other clinic in the province? They are non-medical, Mr. Chairman. The London mental health clinic has been operating on Dufferin Street in London because there has not been room in the Ontario hospital. Hamilton mental health clinic, Toronto psychiatric hospital adult outpatient clinic, and Toronto mental health clinic are all rooted in the community, located in the community, and developing community channels. The only Ontario hospitals which are doing that are the Ontario hospital at Toronto and the Ottawa community psychiatric clinic, this on the basis of the figure—and those again come from inspired psychiatric leadership—from a premeditated and calculated and designed exploitation of all the important and relevant community resources.

Community—the word is slandered in our present mental health picture; the word is betrayed in our present mental health picture. Our emphasis is in the other direction. If you watch the pattern of the agencies that I have mentioned and singled out you will find that over the years the community involvement has risen. It is true for all of them. It is not true for the others.

I am frankly very sorry to see the London mental health clinic on Dufferin Street go back into London Ontario hospital, because as sure as I am standing here today, that will deprive the London mental health clinic of its community focus. In fact, these are not my opinions particularly, they are the opinions of the people in the field.

The hon. Minister, in his opening remarks, said it was conclusive psychiatric and medical opinion that his was the best pattern. It is not at all. In fact, there is one whole field of psychiatric opinion, reflected in that magnificent publication, the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, that advances that team approach to psychiatry is best, the attitude of community emphasis. That whole group has no use for the preoccupation that is developing in this province. Let me read from Nicholas Hobbs, a doctor in Tennessee, in a recent issue of the journal of orthopsychiatry:

There is a chance that the new mental health centres will be nothing more than a product of the general urbanization of America, a movement from country to city. Twenty years from now people may moan not over bricks and mortar, but over glass and steel. There is a real danger that we shall succeed in changing only the location and the architecture of the state hos-

pital. If the new centres turn inward to the hospitals, they too will be monuments to failure.

That is what is happening, for with the total emphasis on psychiatric wings, the new centres are turning inward to the hospital rather than outward to the community. And they will be monuments to failure.

Mr. Chairman, let me refer to a major Boston mental health survey of outpatients which failed to find any meaningful community pattern. Dr. Ryan, very fundamental to that plan in the Massachusetts committee on mental health, came to Toronto and had this to say: "After we had analyzed the community referrals and realized that only the middle class was being served—"; not the low income earners, not the working class, not the people on \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year who are invariably discriminated against by this government, but purely the middle-class clientele was being served. When he found this out, he said:

This leads us to raise a very fundamental question as to the appropriateness of our basic referral model. In our Boston study, we reached the conclusion that one of the basic causes of the failure of our referral system was the fact that in many instances an inappropriate model was being used.

Let me elaborate on this point and I continue to quote Dr Ryan:

We have become so used to our standard system of identification referral that one would almost think it is spelled out somewhere in the Bible. The system is old but not that old. It goes back to the beginning of modern medicine and of modern public health. In other words, the identification referral model is primarily a medical model.

It assumes three things: first, that a person is sick; second, that he is sick with a disease, and third, that the basic difficulty to be solved is one of locomotion, of getting the person from the point at which he is identified as sick to a point where someone who is skilled in curing this disease can go to work and do something.

And then Dr. Ryan says, "Let us consider other mental health problems," and he does —problems which do not involve purely acute psychiatric illness. He comes to the conclusion that our whole trend is wrong, or at least the trend in the province of Ontario is wrong. And he says, as I quote again:

If this analysis is correct, it represents one significant instance of the difficulties that arise from a thoughtless application of medical models to situations that are at

best only analogous to medical problems and at worst are quite irrelevant to them.

That is a very famous study, the Massachusetts study.

There is also—and I will not read it into the record but the hon. Minister is acquainted with it, and I am sure Dr. McNeil under the wings is far better acquainted with it than I am—the study by Hollingshead, which is a book on social class in mental illness, indicating that all the classes—the lower classes, the urban working classes, the rural farm classes—are discriminated against by the non-community orientation of outpatient departments in psychiatric wings, and by the obsession with outpatient departments in mental hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, I am much exercised, obviously, at the direction in which we are moving. I was again, let me say, sorry to see the York county health unit close down in March, 1964, when the psychiatric wing of the York county hospital opened. Grants were cut off. There is a considerable debate on comparison of services, but let me quote from Dr. R. B. Murray, the medical officer of health for the county, in the *Globe and Mail* story of January 1, 1965:

Dr. R. B. Murray, the medical officer of health, said that the two clinics were difficult to compare. A hospital-based psychiatrist would be more likely to slant his approach to the treatment of mental illness rather than to prevention.

That is exactly the point. That is the point that all kinds of esteemed people in the field are making. We are off the right mental health track in Ontario, Mr. Chairman. There is a neat and difficult line to maintain between treatment and prevention. But at the moment we have opted for the former at the expense of the latter, with significant fragmentation of services to boot.

We desperately lack overall planning; we lack any prototype experiment of a genuine mental health clinic; we are bent on an inflexible pattern, wrongly headed and wrongly directed; we are inclined toward mental illness rather than mental health; we have taken in the medical model and, I suggest to you, have not fully exploited other possibilities. The present trend, Mr. Chairman, may in a decade put us back inestimably in the provision of mental health services in the province.

Perhaps the key fault lies in the circumscribed limiting definition of community care. Our preoccupation with the hospital basis tends to denigrate all the other facts. But there are exciting experiments all over the

world which are worth emulating and which are nowhere reflected in the province of Ontario.

There are family protection units—let me mention them—in the United States, in the United Kingdom, and particularly in Norway. The mother is considered emotionally and physically the key person in the family. They set up a centre which does not have the so-called hospital psychiatric stigma. Norway established two clinics in the two provincial capitals, and their team was much broader than we envision it: They had a public health officer, a psychiatrist, a gynaecologist, a social worker, a lawyer and a psychologist. It had unprecedented acceptability, Mr. Chairman. Five hundred cases were treated in the first three years, all manners of referrals.

Let me read some of the reasons that people came to the clinic: for disease or illness in the family, divorce problems, sterility, wanting to adopt a child, mothers wanting to give away their children for adoption by others, alcohol, unwanted pregnancies, problems related to education and adaptation to school, miscellaneous family problems such as social conditions, economic, housing, occupation, etc. These were the things that were satisfied by a family protection unit of that kind—a very creative formula and format, the best kind of front-line preventive mental health.

In the United States, Mr. Chairman, there are striking developments which also should be incorporated in the Canadian plan. There is a whole spate of day hospitals in the United States, Mr. Chairman. Let me explain it to the hon. members of the House. Day hospitals provide the full range of treatment programmes and then the mentally ill patient returns to his family at night.

They began in the Soviet Union in 1933, interestingly enough. The most important day hospital in North America was established in Montreal in 1946, at the Allen memorial institute of psychiatry. In 1948, one was opened at the Yale psychiatric clinic, and in 1949, another at the Menhinger clinic, so that what we are putting to the hon. Minister has been available in North America for a long time. It should not merely be confined to TPH.

Let me read an expert opinion from *Community Psychiatry*, by Dr. S. Becker, Murphy, et al, in the issue of, I think it is June, 1964, about the day hospital:

By averting hospitalization or shortening the period of hospitalization, the day hospital accomplishes a significant reduction in the cost of psychiatric services. One

nursing shift suffices, whereas three are required to staff an inpatient ward. Despite the higher staff-to-patient ratio in day hospitals and in wards, the total staff budget remains less. Additional savings accrue because no beds are required and only one meal a day must be prepared. The economy and efficient use of personnel at a day centre make it particularly appropriate in communities where there are few psychiatrists and other trained mental health personnel and funds for psychiatric services are limited.

And then, Mr. Chairman, what about night hospitals designed to reduce the readmission ratios and deal with acute crises? It does not interrupt gainful employment. Where are the night hospitals across the province of Ontario?

There has been a unit at the Montreal general hospital since 1954, and all kinds of units over North America. Where are they in the province of Ontario to provide not only places to sleep, but drug therapy and psychotherapy and group therapy between 6.30 and 11 every evening? And the half-way houses, where the former patients live together with the house mother or father, and assume a rehabilitation emphasis. The three that are operating in Boston are models of their kind. Why are there not similar models patterned across the province of Ontario?

And the whole realm of ex-patients clubs, like Fountain House in New York, which are rehabilitative and vocational in direction, again relating to the after-care programme, the absence of after-care that so unhappily destroys prospects for rehabilitation in the province of Ontario.

And then, Mr. Chairman—and I cannot emphasize this strongly enough—there is the family care aspect of psychiatric illness, about which one would think the province of Ontario knows nothing. This is a matter—if I remember correctly from my reading—that began two or three centuries ago, in the community of Geel in Belgium. It is a matter of maintaining seriously ill psychiatric patients in foster homes, or real homes, in the community.

Again, in Scandinavia, Mr. Chairman, let me say to this House that fully half of all the mental patients are maintained in community foster homes. That country is not busy building psychiatric wings, beds to fill crises of their own making. But that is what the hon. Minister of Health is doing. This incredibly exciting concept of maintaining acutely ill patients in their homes

has by no means been developed, and yet there are studies after studies.

I want to mention them because I think they should be on the record. There is the study, which I am sure the mental health branch has seen on the prevention of hospitalization of schizophrenics and community centre treatment of schizophrenia. Let me tell the House what these studies show. They show that you can maintain seriously ill people—schizophrenics, for instance—for over 90 per cent of the time at home, a foster home, with a little community care, with some extension of drug care and with some visits from VON or public health nurses. The surveys have been taken in one jurisdiction after another in the United States. I am going to refer to them, so the hon. Minister need not think I am talking off the top of my head. All these surveys demonstrate that the ideas work.

It was pointed out in a comparison of 50 patients, Mr. Chairman, that you could save literally 4,800 hospital days over a period of 30 months by using the community centred approach. Let me ask about the walk-in emergency treatment, the 24-hour emergency care that is provided in so many of the American centres. One thinks particularly of the trouble-shooting clinic at the city hospital, Long Island.

All these things I have mentioned, Mr. Chairman, advisedly fall within the umbrella of proper community mental health patterns. But they are only trends or forms. There are several magnificent community mental health centres which embody the best of all. I therefore suggest to the House that the hon. Minister of Health and his mental health branch, and all their cohorts and colleagues, before they formalize any further planned patterns or trends which we will forever regret, should go to the United States and visit those magnificent experiments that are available in other jurisdictions.

One of the hon. members suggests that maybe I should go along. I should be happy to accompany them. The reports make exciting reading. As a matter of fact, I commend a particular book to the Legislature called *The Community Mental Health Centre, an Analysis of Existing Models*. It reports on the 11 finest models in North America, chosen out over 360 that were evaluated. So those that I am reading about, I think, are properly representative of the best.

I want to say that the only Canadian model in this study, and I say it with some pride and the hon. Minister will forgive my interposing it, was the Yorkton psychiatric clinic

in Saskatchewan. There was not another Canadian model that was deemed worthy of choice.

But let me tell the hon. members of this House something about the American models. Take the psychiatric receiving centre at the Greater Kansas City mental health foundation, Missouri. There is a waiting list for staff, a waiting list for nurses who want jobs. They cannot get the jobs for there is such an exciting treatment milieu provided that there is simply no staff problem. Their 24-hour emergency admitting treatment means no waiting. There is five-days-a-week day care with no fees, and 40 patients and two full treatment teams. The director says, and I quote:

It is constructive experience in living in a social system that reflects the largest community outside the hospital.

All of these men are preoccupied with both the community and inpatient care of all kinds.

And listen, Mr. Chairman, to the community aspect. There are child research councils to diagnose referrals from the school system; full-time psychologists supervising teachers of classes for disturbed children in schools; weekly seminars with teachers plus classroom visits; psychologists and social workers linked to local juvenile institutions; special training courses for general practitioners, 40 to 50 every three years. All the local police officers must have psychiatric teaching and some schooling before they get a job in the particular state of Missouri to ensure that they can handle the job. There are special units giving scientific information and consultation in reducing mental health problems that arise from the work environment, and special departments for the community work.

To name another—take the Fort Logan mental health centre in Denver, Colorado. It has special research buildings; nurseries for children; day patients; cottages and single rooms; children's units; two half-way houses; 24-hour and night patients; a day hospital; family care and after-care. And the whole emphasis again is not the medical model, as the hon. Minister and his department are obsessed with, but the community model. I cannot emphasize that strongly enough, Mr. Chairman. A decade from now, I expect we will regret the entire pattern we are developing, a pattern which is corroborated by the statistics that I read into the record from the department's own report.

There is constant work with families; group meetings with families—indeed, the families

are involved in the treatment programme—after-care homes; all the ingredients of proper community centre treatment.

Take the Massachusetts mental health centre at Boston, a special hospital for the acutely ill. Thirty per cent of the referrals by courts run by a community board. The recruitment of staff has never been a problem. Let me read a quote from the medical directive:

Most of the psychiatrists are graduates of the centre's own residency programme.

All except two are graduates of U.S. or Canadian medical schools.

And why not? Where are the challenges in working under the staff situation and the per diem per capita in St. Thomas OH, or Hamilton OH, or Whitby OH in Ontario?

In Boston there are walk-ins, 24-hour facilities, no waiting at any time and the inpatients programme is completely flexible. The patients spend at least one day a week outside—or more—again the pattern is community oriented; social workers working with teachers; training courses for correction officers; summer courses for the clergy; the police trained in the hospital—obviously a mature and community centred approach.

Finally, if I could just mention it, Mr. Chairman, because I was intrigued by it, the Nebraska psychiatric institute of Omaha, Nebraska, not only provides a full spectrum of service, but it has a 48 inpatient bed unit. I want to read into the record of the House the staff complement for that 48-bed unit: three psychiatrists; eight residents; two psychologists; two psychiatric social workers; three occupational therapists; one industrial therapist; one vocational rehabilitation officer; five psychiatric nurses, and 11 part-time social work personnel of one kind or another.

Among the services they provide: A day care for children, a team of workers working in the schools in a joint evaluation programme, consultation provided for the schools, vocational counselling, testing, training, work adjustment and sheltered and competitive job placements in conjunction with state rehabilitation officers. In other words, Mr. Chairman, a community mental health programme, not a medically dominated mental health programme.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister will know, with immense relief, that this brings me very close to one or two final, short observations.

An hon. member: Not just the hon Minister.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. member says: "Not just the hon. Minister." I suppose he has a

perfect right to say that and his words will be echoed by his colleagues.

What I have endeavoured to do, and the hon. Minister, in fact, may prove me wrong hereafter, is to outline the dilemma, not merely in the Ontario hospital system across the province, but in the entire mental health pattern. If that is not important—meriting two hours of this House's time—I do not know what is, particularly since the hon. Minister himself is on record as saying, and I quote: "Mental health is Ontario's number one health problem."

I, and the members of this party, will not begrudge the extra time it may take to make an analysis of that problem and the wrong-headedness which characterizes the present pattern and the present direction.

Mr. Chairman, I offer what I have offered in good faith; I have, in fact, tried to comprehend. I have visited the hospitals accordingly and I hope that the hon. Minister's response will be in good faith despite the fact that I am unequivocal in the criticism, because it is a criticism which derived from that analysis.

Mr. Chairman, the Ontario hospital system needs a massive reconstruction. The psychiatric wings cannot be considered an immutable fact; it would be a mistake to think so. The mental health services are in a sorry state. Thus far it has been a failure of understanding and a failure of will, and such self-defeating failure can no longer be tolerated. Attention must be paid and I am reminded in closing, Mr. Chairman, of a quote from Gisela Konopka, writing in the journal to which I had occasion to make previous reference, and she said on the occasion of the presidential address for the 1964 meeting of the American association of orthopsychiatrists:

Many years ago Zola called out his "J'accuse!" to make a nation aware of injustice and violation of the human rights of a single person. We social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists and all others in this vast field of mental health and social problems see such violations of the rights and dignities of thousands. We cannot and must not forsake or add to it. Our practice must consistently counteract this, and since our particular work brings those voiceless and powerless people to us, we take on the responsibility to call out for them the moving cry: "Attention must be paid."

Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House say: "J'accuse." The hon. Minister is starving the mental hospitals in the first place; he is watching staff contract so that proper treat-

ment is not possible in the second; he is watching readmission rates soar because there is no after-care programme in the third; and he is watching a disembodied, as yet unintelligent, poorly co-ordinated mental health plan evolve in this province. A plan that is obsessed with the medical model at the expense of the community. I say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that it is time for a dramatic shift to community mental health, and preventive mental health.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

On vote 701:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Has the hon. Minister any remarks?

Mr. Chairman: He has made his remarks.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): All the remarks of the hon. members of the Opposition were directed to the mental health vote. I shall wait to reply until we come to that vote.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a few remarks in regard to item number 4, that is, "Medical and other research services." I think our research services, according to page 54, are at \$10,000. Can the hon. Minister give us any idea of just what that \$10,000 is for and why it is so small?

It has been mentioned on a number of occasions how small our research work actually is. We in this province, and in this country, rank especially low. I think we spend about one-fifth per capita compared to what is spent in the United States; compared on a national basis. We, as Canadians, spend one-fifth per capita to what is spent in the United States.

I am quite willing to admit that a lot of the blame should lie with the government in Ottawa, regardless of what party has been in power in Ottawa. They have not spent nearly enough on medical research, but still the government here in this province has to face up to the fact that it has a constitutional responsibility for medical research and it certainly has not been facing up to it. Has the hon. Minister any remarks to make on why we do so poorly on medical research?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this item 4 on vote 701 cannot, by any manner of means, be considered the government contribution to research. This is a special item and it is badly named. This money is used for conducting studies at the present time. During the ensuing year I expect it will be

used for the financing of the committee on the study of nurse education and related matters; that is the sort of thing for which this sum will be used. It will not be used for direct medical research in the scientific sense.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, under what item would you consider most of your research? I know that some comes up under mental health, but where would you consider that medical research could be discussed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, my attention was distracted, Mr. Chairman. Would the hon. member mind repeating his question?

Mr. Trotter: I would like to know where the hon. Minister would consider medical research to be discussed.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We could discuss it here.

Mr. Trotter: Well then, could the hon. Minister give us some idea of what the province does, or why we are so far behind? My question was this, that as a nation we spend one-fifth the amount per person in Canada than they do in the United States; and Ontario is similar, even as a province. I admit—as a province—we spend more on research than Prince Edward Island, but basically we are away behind. Can the hon. Minister give us some idea of what we do in this field?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Actually there is no specific item provided by the provincial government for scientific research. I have discussed this very thoroughly and very frequently. Unfortunately, the director of the medical research council for Canada died very recently. But I had discussed this with him on frequent occasions and he had always maintained that if the provincial governments provided the structures and the facilities, then the responsibility for providing the project money should lie with the federal government. This was always his policy and his philosophy. Now the province is doing this, and it is part of the special programme announced last October. For instance, there is a fairly substantial item or amount included in that money allocated for health sciences centres and teaching hospitals, either university hospitals or university affiliated hospitals which will be for the provision of research space, buildings and facilities and equipment. The province is taking responsibility for that. I would hope that the federal moneys then would all be available for the actual research projects.

Mr. Trotter: Is there much in the way of federal funds being used? I admit the federal government is poor on this, but what does it actually do?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Really, I cannot tell the hon. member what the total is. Usually the late Dr. Farquharson gave me a rundown on the total figures just about this time of the year but unfortunately, as I say, he died very recently and I did not get the report this year. I would be guessing and I am so uncertain of the amount that I would rather not hazard a guess.

Mr. Trotter: Again, still on the matter of research, could we switch over to item 37, the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation? I think we are spending \$1,200,000 less this year. I think we have dropped an amount—let me see, this year it is \$1,050,000, last year it was \$1,200,000. Why would we drop there, because certainly cancer is still one of the major killers in the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, while it does not show here, this amount has been increased in the total amount that will be spent. As the hon. member will recall, last year we extended the insured services under the Ontario hospital services commission to provide radiotherapy and this will amount to something of the order of \$500,000 if it is estimated for this year. This is not shown in here but it is included in the overall budget of the OHSC.

Actually we will end up the year by spending more on cancer, but the grant from this province is reduced somewhat because of the additional \$500,000—partly paid for by the province, partly paid for by the federal government—which will be spent on services included in this vote until last year.

Mr. Trotter: Under this item, we have been under the impression that No. 37 had to do with research. The OHSC, we admit, is giving services, but my understanding was that this is meant for research alone.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, this, Mr. Chairman, has never been; this is research and treatment. Here again the basic research is financed by the federal government. A part of the research financed by the provincial grant is clinical research—that is, the research on patients—although the foundation has always told me that here in Ontario it has financed a good deal of basic research out of provincial and federal grants as well. But the total allocation to the foundation has

always included certain outpatient services which are now paid as an insured benefit under OHSC.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think the very fact that the hon. Minister is saying that there are different sources for research and that there are different organizations, shows that there really is not a great deal of co-ordination in research. I would suggest to him that if he looked to his sister province of Quebec, he would see that there is in Quebec a council of research set up to give co-ordination.

I am sure that the hon. Minister is as concerned as everyone would be in this province when he realizes that not only in Canada generally but also in Ontario more specifically, there is clearly a deficiency in funds in medical research. I would suggest some of the reason for that is because some of the American foundations have indicated that they are now no longer giving assistance to Canada and they are giving it to under-developed nations. I think that the danger is becoming very real now that this deficiency—and I am talking of the deficiency of grants from the federal government and from the various large wealthy foundations in the States—will not be made up. One of the problems, of course, is that with such a multiplicity of agencies concerned in medical research there can be overlapping in this.

I am looking at the list of organizations to which the hon. Minister gives grants. I know the old question is, "Which would you exclude?" I do not want to exclude any of them, but I want to get co-ordination with each of them. I suggest again that there is a lack of co-ordination of medical research and I think that this is implying serious consequences for health in the province of Ontario.

In the first place, in order to supply adequate health services for the province, there must, as is commonly recognized, be a tremendous expansion in medical education. I do not want to keep harping on this, in one sense, but I am going to—there is a need for a proper health programme throughout this province. I come back again to this ringing chapter by the Hall commission, which apparently has been ignored by the government.

I would suggest that it is difficult, in the first place, for teachers to teach properly if research is not made available to them. Research and teaching, if I could suggest this to the hon. Minister, who I suspect is a Presbyterian, are something like sin and

confession. If you do not do the former, then you really have nothing to talk about in the latter.

In the second place, it is virtually impossible to attract teachers without the offer of extensive research funds and facilities. For example, I draw to the attention of the hon. Minister that the University of Toronto has built a new medical teaching and research building. I would like to hear from the hon. Minister, if I could, what the guarantee is of staff and funds for research. You have your building, but what about a guarantee of funds for staff and research?

Let me re-emphasize that I think in Ontario there is not an overall co-ordination in research in medicine. You have bodies like the Ontario cancer research and treatment foundation and the Ontario heart foundation, and they provide very valuable services in this field of research. But let us face it, they are severely handicapped by limited funds. Again, these come not only from the province but from the federal government as well as from these other American foundations.

They are also handicapped by their dual capacities of treatment as well as research. Of course, the Ontario research foundation is concerned with research in general and not medical research in particular. In Canada as a whole, there is a medical research council of Canada; in Quebec, there is a Quebec medical research council; in Ontario, there is no comparable organization.

I might just make some suggestions to you, sir. I think perhaps the hon. Minister of Health will recall that about four years ago I raised questions about the need, not only for co-ordination in medical research, but also for opportunities for PhDs to be able to work in research laboratories, to give greater recognition to those men, who if they come through with research, may open up the doors of many of our hospitals with discoveries that may enable people to walk with new health. We think particularly of Banting and Best, in the past. These are some recommendations and programmes.

I think that we should be giving greatly expanded support to these bodies because of the fact, and I am talking of the research bodies, that they may give the answer to some of the crowding of institutions. They may be able to give the key that will open the door to good health for thousands of our people. I think particularly of the national cancer institute and the other Canadian institutions which specifically carry on research activities. I think that these funds, and I am referring to the provincial govern-

ment in connection with funds, should be earmarked for Ontario and for research.

The prime difficulty in this suggestion is that research is a long-term and a group matter. Funds must be guaranteed over a long period of time, say, five to ten years. I remember talking to the hon. Minister about this, I think it was about four years ago, and he talked about the fact of government responsibilities and of public funds. But I think he would agree with me that with research, the scientist has to have a feeling that he can get his equipment and can take a length of time and not worry about coming to the government every year to see if he can get an appropriation of funds.

I talked previously about a world-famous scientist. He had worked in Montreal at the centre of neurology; a Dr. Rupelski, who died some time ago. He had given me the liberty to speak about some of his problems in getting research grants. This man was examining, as I understand it, brain cells—and I am getting out of my depth here in this—but he was doing pure research. He might have been able, if he had got certain discoveries, to arrive at an answer that would do away with psychiatrists' couches. If I can be permitted a personal touch, there was a write-up in the paper saying that, if he was successful, psychiatrists' couches would no longer be needed. I think this caused a great deal of controversy in the papers; to suggest that perhaps some of the reasons for mental illness are due to the hormones, or whatever it is, that are inside a person rather than the emotions.

However, it just shows the importance of a man being able to work on this. I was astonished at the difficulty that this rather quiet and gentle man had, in going through a great deal of red tape, in order to get a laboratory set up. But he was very persistent and very persuasive, and apparently he did get the necessary funds to continue. I think he was a great man, and may I say again, while I am talking about this, that our research scientists—many of them—are not given enough recognition. I would like to see some kind of recognition by government to these men who are dedicating themselves to the health of our nation. I have said before that I would like to see Ontario known for its scientists, as it has been in the past, in medical research. Instead of giving medals to generals and so on, I would much prefer to see recognition given to men in research.

Let me say that the prevalent view—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, may I, if the hon. member has

reached what I hope is a natural break in his remarks, interrupt the proceedings of the committee and perhaps we could resume.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the House revert to introduction of bills?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

TORONTO ELECTRIC COMMISSIONERS AND LOCAL NO. 1, CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting a certain dispute between the Toronto electric commissioners and Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will give a very brief explanation of this bill. For some time now, the government, through the offices of The Department of Labour, has been attempting to conciliate the labour dispute between the Toronto electric commissioners and Local 1 of the Canadian union of public employees. Because of the implications of a strike in this essential public utility, I have been personally interested and concerned in negotiations as they have taken place.

At four o'clock this afternoon I was informed that the negotiations between the two parties had broken down completely and that there is no hope of a settlement before the strike deadline, set for 12 midnight, Thursday, June 10, 1965. In other words, I am informed that the strike will proceed at midnight, tomorrow night.

Now, sir, any threat to the power supply of the Toronto area will affect the lives of every resident and will lead to an emergency situation. Because of the fundamental importance of electric power to the city and

the citizens, the government of Ontario cannot allow this situation to arise.

While compulsory arbitration is distasteful to the government, to labour unions and to management, the public interest is paramount. The government, therefore, has decided that it is in the public interest that a bill be introduced in this House to settle some 54 outstanding issues that exist between the two parties, by compulsory arbitration.

This bill establishes a three-man arbitration board, to be so constituted: One representative from the union, one representative from management and a chairman to be chosen by the two representatives.

I want to make it very clear that the decision to institute a compulsory arbitration procedure in this dispute arises solely because of the implications of a strike in an essential public utility and because there is absolutely no hope that the two parties can be brought together under the normal conciliation process.

I should also like to make it absolutely clear that this bill applies only to this dispute and applies only to the parties who are involved in this dispute.

The bill will be given second reading and the normal procedure through the House tomorrow, and I ask the Opposition parties if they would consent to this procedure we are following in order that the bill may be before you prior to it being discussed here some time during tomorrow's proceedings.

I can only reiterate, sir, that electric power is so basic to our lives that the threat to every resident posed by even the possibility of disruption cannot be contemplated, even though compulsory arbitration, as a principle, is not accepted by this government.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I may say that it comes as a very real shock to us when we hear the words "compulsory arbitration" used by this government. It would appear to me that it is a situation of us moving from crisis to crisis in our labour relations. We have heard this term used with all the abhorrence that is attached to it and the emasculation of collective bargaining, which we stated even yesterday to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), when you bring in compulsory arbitration. We have seen it with the Ontario Hydro and we have seen it with hospitals.

Let me say that even yesterday we were trying to stop the extension of compulsory arbitration—yea, even to the cleaning women in police stations—and we are concerned that the reaching tentacles of compulsory arbitra-

tion will spread throughout the working people of this province. We have seen a corrosion taking place in the basic rights of the people; we have seen a steady nibbling taking place. This indicates to us, because there has been crisis after crisis and compulsory arbitration has been suggested to us and demanded of us, that there is almost a jungle-like law in connection with labour relations. We have not clearly identified yet what the principles are of labour relations in this great industrial province, especially when we think of other areas. We look at Norway, Sweden, West Germany and other areas where there seems to have developed a harmonious relationship and where strikes are not a usual occurrence, particularly in connection with essential public services.

It is apparent, I think, to everyone in the House, that there has to be a revamping, a revising, a new approach and a move into the twentieth century in connection with our labour relations.

It is at the eleventh hour that once again we hear that all negotiations have broken down, and we are asked to make a decision that the public welfare of the people is going to be completely cut off if we do not agree with compulsory arbitration. We have not had a chance to look through this bill closely. Indeed, we do not know if the union itself has suggested that this will not be a complete deterioration of all services, and that they are prepared to move in and insert an emergency measure, such as for hospitals and the sick and nursing, and so on. As yet we do not know that situation, and because of that we wish to reserve some judgment on this.

Let me say that if the situation is such whereby the whole of this great Metropolitan Toronto is going to be paralyzed as of tomorrow night; whereby children are going to be affected from the point of view of milk and many other necessities; whereby industry is going to be crippled and closed down; whereby hospitals and nursing homes and subways are going to be shut down and everything else, then there is no question that we would support this move on the part of the government. But we support it with the greatest of reluctance, because—and let me re-emphasize—we are concerned with the rights of working people.

It comes to a point where a partial government is saying: "We will emasculate your collective bargaining rights; we will move in with compulsory arbitration."

As far as we are concerned, we will support this move only on condition that we are

satisfied that the alternative is going to imperil not only this great city, but also the people who live in it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in introducing the bill, the hon. Prime Minister stated that labour, management and the government are opposed to compulsory arbitration.

At this point I want to say only one thing, and the burden of my remarks will be made appropriately on second reading. But something is sadly wrong when the Prime Minister of a province can rise and say that his government, labour and management are opposed to something, and yet with increasing frequency he does what he is opposed to.

Mr. P. J. Yakubuski (Renfrew South): In the public interest!

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. gentleman interjects and says: "In the public interest." Quite true, Mr. Speaker. The public interest is of paramount consideration, but there is something wrong if the public interest has to be guarded by doing something wrong, which you yourself condemn!

Maybe the hon. member for Renfrew South does not condemn it, but the government does, and labour does and management does.

I think it is time that this House—perhaps within the context of this bill and perhaps even better, in the quieter context when the heat is not on in this specific issue—finally comes to grips with issue; finally finds the solution to this problem instead of evading it.

We do not have a solution. When faced with the same problem two years ago, the government took the easy way out with compulsory arbitration. They have done nothing in the intervening years except move in the direction of imposing compulsory arbitration across the whole board with the hospitals.

And now we come, with all the sins of omission, to the refusal and the failure to find an alternative solution. Once again, we are doing something and professing to be unhappy about doing it.

I think that on the second reading of this bill tomorrow, this House—with seriousness instead of the cheap interjections that we have this afternoon—should face up to the problem of reconciling principles and actions, instead of professing principles and then so acting that you deny them.

Clerk of the House: House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

On vote 701:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I had been talking about the need for a more co-ordinated approach with respect to research. Let me say that the prevalent view—especially the view of this government—that funds for research is a matter of charity, must be revised to see that research allocation of positive grants as investments, providing tremendous benefits to medical treatment and medical education, is enshrined in our approach.

I think that a special Ontario organization should be set up, comparable to that in Quebec, to co-ordinate medical research and the various research bodies now existing in Ontario, as well as to project long-term needs and projects in the field of medical research. This organization would work in close conjunction with the universities.

The third point I want to make is that an intensive staff recruitment programme should be begun by offering incentives to Canadian doctors and medical research personnel now practising abroad, to return to Canada. This is basically a question of money, but it must not be viewed in limited terms, but rather in the broad perspective of investment in the health of this province. I would ask the hon. Minister to reply to those suggestions.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, the reason that we do not have an Ontario research council is that it would cause duplication and overlapping. This is a programme from which Quebec has opted out I understand, and they have set up their own organization. But here in Ontario, as in all other provinces, all of our projects are screened by the Dominion medical research council—I believe that is the proper name—and all of the projects are submitted through our department to this council and to the national health advisory council on research. All the projects are screened by them.

Ontario is well represented on this council and, therefore, the needs and any other matters peculiar to Ontario would be thoroughly looked after by them.

But here again is another matter I have discussed with the late director of the medical research council, and he was in complete agreement with us. I believe he had something to do with advising us in this matter some time ago, perhaps before my time, because it has only been discussed between us as two persons since that time.

I must emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that his

opinion—and I regarded it very highly indeed, because I knew of no man better qualified to give an opinion on this matter than the late director of the medical research council—was that the province should provide the buildings and the equipment, and that the federal government should take responsibility for the cost of maintaining the projects.

I would like to say to the hon. leader of the Opposition, that we wholeheartedly agree with his proposition that research money should be taken off the year-by-year allocation. Very few people will be encouraged to go into research that might be of long duration on a system of that kind, and we have asked for this many times and we continue to press for this.

I would also say to the hon. leader that, in keeping with further advice given to me by the late Dr. Farquharson, we are watching very carefully the effect of the withdrawal of moneys that have been available to Canadian researchers and Ontario researchers from the national health institutes of the United States and other bodies which are withdrawing their support of Canadian-based projects now. We are watching the effect that that might have and it may well be that I would be placed in a position of recommending to our government that we need to involve ourselves in at least partial financing of actual research projects. But, in the meantime, we believe that we can best serve the cause by providing capital construction funds and funds for facilities.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. Minister's reply to this. I raised this question and I am trying to get an answer from him. With all the grants that you do give, and looking at the mental health grant, for example, I presume they would be doing some sort of statistical tabulation, or some sort of research.

It seems to me, if I recall, that that grant was suddenly pulled out or there might have been another one. I remember a debate about three years ago where, because of a rather outspoken remark by the director of one of these associations—I thought it was the mental health association—the former Prime Minister, Mr. Frost, suggested that he might have objected to the remarks that were being made because he was moving into a decision to be made politically, but it was the decision of this government that you suddenly cut this grant.

I can remember another debate I had with the hon. Minister of Health in which I was asking what was he giving these funds for, and for what kind of projects. The hon.

Minister told me, if I am correct on this, that he gives them just on general principles and that they are worthy organizations. I was suggesting that it should be clarified what kind of projects were actually being done. Because of the hon. Minister's answer on this, and I am recalling an answer and I may have been unfair, I had the general idea that the government gives certain funds year after year traditionally and it is very hard to refuse some of these funds after this had been established.

I do not know how many, but there are something like 35 organizations that you are giving funds to and I would expect that these organizations are doing some kind of statistical research in the areas in which they are working. It would seem to me that in Ottawa they are organizing the co-ordination of research in this field. That is my first point. In other words, I just take issue, as a layman, with the fact that from Ottawa they can co-ordinate all the research of Ontario organizations and I think there could be a place for Ontario co-ordinating this itself, as a first layer to the Ottawa national group.

My second point is that I have talked to a number of research scientists and they have a feeling that the research council in Ottawa, while it is made up of thoroughly able and reputable men, is made up of men who are not active in scientific research. In the research council in the US, a scientist who has actually been in the field joins the research council for a period of two years. Because he has been in the field of research himself—he is not a dean of a medical school or something else—when he walks into these laboratories he can sense and assess whether this should be given priority. He is something like a general who goes out into the field and because he has been in the trenches, he is more aware of what the situation is when he comes back again.

I suggest that there may be within the council men who actually are not working in the laboratory and therefore they are not as well able to assess the priority of the capabilities of the research. Therefore, perhaps the priorities which are given to certain research may be on the basis more of the PR attitude on the part of the man in charge of the laboratory, or else the priority is from the point of view of public interest.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot name the members of the federal research advisory council, but from the few whom I do know I can say without equivocation they have been—and some of them still are—actively engaged in the research field.

There is no doubt it would be foolish of me to ignore the fact that many scientists do apply for budgets or for project funds and they are not granted. This is usually on the basis of their having been very thoroughly screened. If we set up a council here to look after them again, we would only be duplicating the work that is done; or if we looked at them primarily before submitting them, we would only be duplicating the work that will be done by the federal government, which includes within it personnel, Ontario scientists and Ontario clinicians, people skilled in the field.

Then we would also be placed in the position of probably turning down a project that might well find merit in the eyes of the federal council, and I would be loath to do that. I would like to feel that every project submitted to us—although the applications come to us—would have every possible consideration. Really, Mr. Chairman, I can see no good flowing from the establishment of another council.

There was something else that the hon. member asked in a previous question about a programme to repatriate Canadian researchers or scientists who are now doing work in the United States, and I am told that this is being done. I know for a fact it is being done by some of the universities and they are meeting with quite remarkable success in this matter, because of an apparent awakening and an upsurge of interest in research in Ontario and in Canada which I hope will continue to grow.

The grants that are involved in most of these items are not for research. Indeed, the grants for the alcoholism and addiction research and treatment foundation, the cancer research and treatment foundation, and one other—I believe the Banting and Best research fund, which has been in our budget for many, many years—are the only items within this whole range of grants that are mainly for research. The projects of the Banting and Best research fund would all be under the direction of the university and I have no doubt that they have some well-established research advisory committee or research screening group. The cancer foundation and the addiction research foundation both have their research advisory bodies, set up by statutes of this Legislature.

There is one further item here dealing with the Ontario mental health research foundation. The amount is \$250,000, which the province provides. This is provided for our own foundation, whose duty is to co-ordinate all research efforts in Ontario in the

field of mental health. This is the provincial share.

Those groups also have access to federal budgets, and in their case, the projects are screened here at the provincial level by the research advisory group of the mental health foundation, and then go on to the federal government for further examination. Those that are turned down by the federal government, sometimes are brought back to our Ontario foundation and may well find merit again in the eyes of the committee and be granted here, when they had been rejected by the federal government.

In the main, these grants provided here are not for research. We spoke about the one that was cut; I have to say, sir, with great respect, it was not cut. We did ask the health league of Canada to use this money for adults for immunization against poliomyelitis and they are still using it, because we find a great number of our adults still have not availed themselves of the opportunity to be immunized against this disease.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, while we are talking on this vote about research, I wonder if I might put into the record some feelings which I know a lot of the other hon. members of this House will share with me. There was held today, a memorial service for the man who, as the hon. Minister of Health has already said, was probably one of the outstanding physicians in Canada in this field, Dr. Ray F. Farquharson, who for many years headed the medical research council of Canada. In fact, his report brought about the founding of this council. He died last Tuesday, and I think that without itemizing the many contributions that he made to Canadian medicine, many of us who knew him know that he was an outstanding gentleman, an outstanding scholar and a man of great compassion.

While he headed this medical research council, he was not only an administrator, but also—as the hon. leader of the Opposition asked for—a man actually in the research field. Dr. Farquharson made great contributions in the field of calcium metabolism, anaemia, pigment metabolism and many other associated endocrine diseases, and I think that all of us would want to remember him, as we talk about medical research here, and the great contribution that he made.

Now, other men of his calibre are still on that council from the city of Toronto. I think of one, Dr. K. J. R. Wightman, who also is an outstanding physician and an outstanding man in research.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, we are not sitting tonight, so I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will go back into committee of the whole House to deal with Bill 136; and I will arrange an appropriate time to deal with this bill that has been introduced, I will give ample notice of when that will come. I think we might safely say it will not be before the afternoon sitting.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Report, standing committee on public accounts, Mr. McKeough	3947
Final report, select committee on consumer credit, Mr. Price	3947
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	3948
Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, continued	3948
Recess, 12.30 o'clock	3964

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from Bishop Townsend public school, London.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West) begs leave to present the report of the standing committee on public accounts.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the final report of the select committee on consumer credit.

As chairman of the select committee on consumer credit, I should like to express my thanks to the committee members for their co-operation. The opportunity of working with them on this important study has been a privilege.

The duties of any select committee are similar to those of a Royal commission, but carried out less formally. I am sure we in this House all acknowledge the contribution made by a select committee to our parliamentary system.

I do not intend today to make more than a few remarks on behalf of the committee and to summarize the recommendations of the committee contained in the report. Copies of the final report will be made available immediately to the hon. leaders of the Opposition parties and copies of the recommendations will be made available and distributed to the members of the committee and the members of the press.

During the last session of the Legislature the committee presented its interim report. Now, having completed our inquiry, we place before you the final and comprehensive report containing recommendations for your careful examination.

In our report on this complex subject, we have refrained as much as possible from any reference to legislative detail. We have pursued our investigation into consumer credit matters objectively and without regard to

party politics. The secret of success of select committees, which are so much a part of our democratic process, is largely their freedom from party consideration.

A printed copy of the consumer credit report will be sent to all hon. members of the Legislature during the summer. We shall all have an opportunity of participating in the debate on the report at the next session of the Legislature.

All that remains for me to say at this time is simply that a number of recommendations have been made in the report which we feel merit your consideration in the public interest. The report on consumer credit contains 18 recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) why the provincial graduate fellowship cheques are being held up until June 30?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member understands that I had very little time to get this information this morning. It was not possible. I will be very glad to answer the question tomorrow morning.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) a question in regard to the press release this morning in the *Globe and Mail*. In view of the unworkable features in the police officers having to stop motorists to give them a summons under the present provincial point system, would the hon. Minister tell the House what steps are being taken to change this system?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, any change in the present system would seriously hamper the effectiveness of the demerit point system, which is considered by the department and enforcement agencies as the best method yet

devised to isolate and take remedial action against a driver who abuses the privileges of operating a motor vehicle.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary) begs leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. Fourteenth annual report of the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation, for the year ending December 31, 1964.

2. Ontario hospital services commission annual report for 1963.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The forty-seventh order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

Section 15 agreed to.

On section 16:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): We come back again in section 16 to another phase of the problem of waiting periods and conditions and so on. We had the astounding revelation yesterday that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) envisaged the possibility that there would be discriminatory rates on the basis of the health of a person. In addition to that, we have enrolment periods and, even under the enrolment periods, we have waiting periods and an undisclosed possibility of additional conditions which the hon. Minister never did explain yesterday. Now we come to the same matter in a somewhat different phase. This section sets forth the conditions under which a person could be accepted for a standard contract or a standard co-insurance contract in the event that he did not apply during the enrolment period.

Now we see, of course, that he will have a three-month waiting period imposed on him if he does not subscribe during an open enrolment period. It is our argument, Mr. Chairman, that this is really doing it up a little too brown for the insurance companies. They have all sorts of different ways of protecting themselves against adverse selection under the bill as it now stands. The public interest is hardly considered here at all. The needs of people for medical insurance are hardly considered. We believe that the present section 16 should be relaxed. I may say that we object to subsection 2 of it, just as we objected to clause B of subsection 3 of section 14 regarding the waiting period with respect to pregnancy. However, I will

not open up that discussion again, Mr. Chairman. I believe that matter was settled by a previous vote and I have no doubt that you would step in if I tried to raise it now. I mention it, however, to indicate that our failure to move an amendment relating to that point arises only from our realization of your acute appreciation of the rules, and not because we think the subsection should be there. We believe that it should be struck out.

However, there is another phase of subsection 1 where we think some little consideration can be given to the consumer—the person who wants medical care insurance, as distinct from the person who is selling it. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move:

That subsection 1 of section 16 be amended by striking out the words "three months" in the sixth and seventh lines, and substituting the words "one month."

Mr. Chairman, the words "three months" appear at the end of the second last line and at the beginning of the last line. It is simply a matter of changing those words "three months" to the words "one month," so that, in effect, what it will say is that a person who applies will be entitled to receive a contract which will be effective one month after the date of application and payment of fee.

Unfortunately, even if our amendment carries, the person will still be subject to all the other limitations and restrictions which are set forth and implied in this bill, but at least we think that the three-month restriction should be reduced to one month.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Bryden moves:

That subsection 1 of section 16 be amended by striking out the words "three months" in the sixth and seventh lines, and substituting the words "one month."

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of this motion. This bill has all kinds of different qualifications. I was going to move such an amendment myself, and I am very glad to endorse the amendment of the hon. member for Woodbine.

If you look at section 14, subsection 2, you see that for people who have become 21, are residents and an open enrolment period has expired, the waiting period is only one month. Then in this section it becomes three months. I fail to see why we have all these variations and restrictions. It will take a Philadelphia lawyer, let alone any other kind of lawyer, to understand all

of this. It seems as though we are barrelling steadily around the whole of the medical insurance coverage to make it more difficult for people to apply. Once again, I want to emphasize that this bill is for the advantage and for the convenience of the carriers, and disregards the health needs of the people.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I think it is reasonable, and I do not think that in any way, shape or form, we should leave any reason for a person to be caught with a high medical bill, and certainly if there is a three-month waiting period a person can be left with a doctor's bill that will set him back in wages for perhaps years.

I do not feel that there should be any waiting period at all, and that once a person puts his money on the line, he should be covered in continuity so that he has no fear of having doctor bills pile up, and we know what doctor bills amount to in these days. I think that the hon. member for Woodbine has been reasonable in suggesting a one-month period. Certainly there will have to be some reason for us to establish the administrative procedure such as filing, and getting things in line.

When the high pressure car insurance salesmen go out to get a person's signature on the line, one of the pressures they use is: "You sign this and you are covered from the time you put your signature on this piece of paper." But they invariably find, if this becomes a legal case, that there is a 24-hour space in between. But they do use this argument, and they try to sell their car insurance with this kind of reasoning. If this kind of reasoning is accepted, then the health of people and their medical bills should be looked after immediately.

I am afraid that if we go along with these waiting periods there will be a lot of chaos. A lot of people just do not know the regulations. I do not care what kind of an educational job the government tries to do in regard to insurance medical coverage, we are not going to be able to teach people exactly what they should do, and there are going to be a lot of people confused and a lot of them left with doctor bills.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what the OMA schedule provides for confinement, including delivery, of a child?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I really could not tell you, but I think it is \$100 for a general practitioner and \$125 or

\$150 for a specialist. I am out of touch with present schedules as I am not practising at the present time.

Mr. Sopha: It strikes me that we are speaking here about a very moderate amount of money. When these limitations are put in in at least two places in the Act in respect of pregnancy, it leads me to—

Mr. Chairman: We have already settled this question.

Mr. Sopha: This section deals with pregnancy. It uses the words: "If the costs of such service arise from pregnancy, or resulting childbirth or miscarriage."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is just a repetition of what was in the other section. It has already been dealt with, I submit.

Mr. Chairman: We have already dealt with this in section 14.

Mr. Sopha: Are you ruling me out of order on the clause-by-clause study?

Mr. Chairman: I am ruling you out of order on this one.

Mr. Sopha: My democratic rights are being abrogated, then.

Mr. Chairman: We dealt with it on section 14, and you are out of order.

Mr. Sopha: I say to you that this is tyranny.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I say that the section is different—it refers to mid-section, section 16, to five months. In section 14, which you say we have passed on, it refers to eight months, and I feel that my hon. colleague is showing that there is a difference in this by referring to five months in one, and eight months in the other.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have to contradict the hon. member since it refers to five months, in addition to the three months' waiting period which is laid down, bringing it to a total of eight months for the pregnancy.

Mr. Sopha: Why did they write the section, if it is the same thing? My protest is simply this: I contend to the committee of the whole, with the greatest respect, that if the bill referred to is subject 20 times, a member of this House would still be allowed in a clause-by-clause study to make his representation in respect of that section.

Now, I wanted to say in respect of the three-month waiting period, that a quotation from a columnist—I think it is Needham, in this morning's *Globe and Mail*—is very apt, when he says:

The strong will do what they will, the weak will suffer what they must.

Certainly the person who has a meagre income and is without means, under this section is discriminated against by this government, in that he has to wait three months for the benefits. In respect of the references to pregnancy, I sometimes wonder if the draftsmen of this legislation know anything about the begetting of children and their importance, in their attitude toward them in this bill. Let me say that this party is for pregnancy, first, last and always. We hope we have more of them.

Surely the government has read the Hall report. The hon. Minister keeps chastising us in that we have not—according to him—read this bill. Many of us here have read the Hall report. I take it to be a cardinal principle that we are concerned in this country with making available medical services to our people, and you cannot make medical services available if you have a three-month waiting period. In addition to that, you tack on a five-month waiting period by way of discrimination against women who are pregnant. That is why we so heartily endorse this amendment to this bill.

We are not concerned with a sick person who has not got the means, and who is more likely to be sick than the person of the low income group. We are not concerned about the wealthy. They get good nutrition, they eat the right food. They take vitamin pills. They have access to the best doctors. They are inclined to be healthy and well and they do not need access to the benefit conferred by a medical insurance contract.

It is the poor, those in low income categories who have not got access. Rather than approach it from the point of view that we will do everything we can to make available as speedily as possible medical care to them, on the contrary, in this section the government says, "No, if your premiums have lapsed, your subscription rate has not been paid, then you will be penalized by having to wait another three months." I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is that justice? Is that equity to a large number of our citizens? Does that expose a willingness on the part of this government to approach the problem from a rational point of view?

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, that the amendment should be

carried and the government damned for its obsequiousness to the efficient running of insurance companies and their convenience of issuing their contracts.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, may I take but a moment to remind the hon. Minister that in that country where the mother of parliaments operates—the British Isles—not only is a child entitled to free service an hour or even a minute after he is born, but they also will look after you immediately if you visit that land. May I ask the hon. Minister if we will—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not any more. There is a three-month waiting period.

Mr. Whicher: Anyway, there is no three-month waiting period for inhabitants of that country, as you are asking us to do here.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, I thought the hon. Minister was going to rise.

I would like to get, if we could, clarification from the hon. Minister as to why this is a five-month period. The hon. Minister was replying on this, but I did not catch it. Five plus three equals eight. Perhaps I could ask again, sir; I also did not get an answer.

Assuming that there is a mother who has a premature child, can you always define what a premature child is? I am getting back again to this eight-month pregnancy. I am thinking that if someone comes into the hospital and says that she became pregnant in January, and there is some debate about this situation and she has a child seven months later, she will argue that it is a premature child. Then we have the insurance companies coming down—and I think we all admit that they do on occasion—to suggest, "She was pregnant in December, therefore she has got to pay the premiums herself." How can we substantiate this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is the time or the place to get into obstetrical practice. It is not always possible to tell the exact date of conception and it is not always possible to tell the exact period of gestation. By and large, the average practitioner can tell if a baby is a seven-month baby or older. However, Mr. Chairman, I have already gone into all the arguments relative to the eight-month waiting period. It is a period that is a standard provision in all insurance contracts at the present time.

My hon. friend from Wentworth knows perfectly well that it was written into the hon. members' contract—a contract with one of the largest non-profit companies. There was an eight-month waiting period for pregnancy, even in a group contract. Every one of the members who is covered by the contract that covers us as member of this Legislature, if he has read his contract, will know that, and this is a non-profit corporation.

My hon. friend speaks of the co-operatives, and, in many of their contracts, I believe, it is a ten-month waiting period. This is to make certain that every possibility is covered for the insurance carrier in such cases. But we have taken the eight-month period, to take into consideration the possible premature child.

The three-month waiting period, vis-à-vis the one-month I will accept as a good idea. But, Mr. Chairman, and my hon. friends, this is a matter of cost. If we cut this down to a no waiting period or a one-month waiting period, the cost will automatically go up, and all of you have bombarded me with your beliefs, and they are well founded perhaps in your minds, that the cost is now already too high. This has been an accepted provision in the hospital insurance plan, ever since it came into operation here, sir. There is a three-month waiting period, and every one of us is aware of this.

Occasionally it causes trouble and I think every member is also aware that where there have been questionable, borderline cases, or where there is reason at all to believe that a decision may be made in favour of the subscriber, something has been done, by putting the case before the council of the commission which is charged with the responsibility of dealing with such matters.

For my hon. friend, the hon. leader of the Opposition, to compare this with section 14, of course, is quite wrong. The person who reaches the age of 21 and moves from the family contract to a self-supported contract, does not have any waiting period. He is immediately covered, and he is immediately covered without waiting period because he has already gone through the waiting period, having been covered by the family coverage, Mr. Chairman.

In the case of the new resident coming into our province, he must wait 90 days to establish residency. He actually, therefore, has gone through the waiting period. In many cases he would want to be insured as soon as he came into our province, but the law says that he is not a resident and this only applies to residents.

So, in both of these cases, they have gone through the waiting period.

The waiting period of three months, I again would point out to you, has nothing to do with justice or equity. It is a matter of economics. If you want us to put the cost up, we could cover these persons from the very time they are registered—

Mr. Bryden: We want you to get a proper plan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond:—then this is what it amounts to. We believe that it is wiser, and we believe also that it is an incentive, for the people to come in during open enrolment periods when they would not have to undergo the waiting period that is required if they come in outside of open enrolment periods.

Mr. Sopha: To be a Liberal means that one cannot be impressed with the statement: "It is an acceptable practice"—especially when a Liberal sees innovation as improvement. It strikes me that I would be willing to bear the additional cost involved in giving immediate care for pregnant people, if I could be assured that all of those people under section 7 would be so policed that those who do not deserve to be subsidized would not get subsidies. But I know I am going to be back here next year complaining about groups of seasonal workers who are milking this fund. In that regard, I am reminded of the fact that the great architect of social welfare in this country, William Lyon Mackenzie King, initiated—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if I heard the hon. member correctly—

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment, the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Did the hon. member say "the great architect of social welfare"?

Mr. Sopha:—can quarrel with my statement later. The great architect of social welfare, William Lyon Mackenzie King, initiated after the war the programme of family allowances, whereby we pay hundreds of millions of dollars of our tax money toward helping families through family allowances. We do that every year; we slice up part of the tax pie and then pay it to families for their children. Accordingly, since I do that with my taxes and I do it gladly to ensure that children, especially in large families, will receive those things which they ought to receive, I am more than happy in respect of pregnancy to see that expectant mothers get good health care and the children get a start

in life by having the supervision of qualified medical people to ensure that start.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, every time I look at each of these sections, I see a door open that any horse could romp through, indeed a whole herd of them could. I am looking at section 2:

Such service arising from pregnancy or resulting from childbirth or miscarriage or conditions that result directly or indirectly therefrom.

Now I am not a lawyer, but I have learned colleagues who are lawyers and I can just see how they could use this section to open up a whole area. Some poor woman who has a miscarriage and suffers ill health because of it—a whole variety of things—and then has a lawyer coming in and saying: "Look, you did not pay up three months ahead of time," or whatever your technical barrier is, "therefore we are not responsible for looking after you from here on in." Or I could see a situation of a child being born because of an early childbirth.

Let me say to you, sir, that you must be aware we have mortalities in childbirth; that there are dangers to women who give birth to children; that there are children born with defects, unfortunately, and I would hope there would not be loopholes such as this: "or conditions that result directly or indirectly therefrom."

Would you tell us how closed you have made that condition? Would you define it for us? Or is this, again, a great, big wide-open escape for anyone to be incurring expenses because they did not meet your technicality of three months or five months?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as I explained yesterday, there are certain complications of pregnancy which can be fatal and troublesome to patients and naturally, very costly to them. These are the exceptions which will be covered by regulation and payment for them will be provided. I think I can set the minds of the hon. members at rest insofar as the children born are concerned whether it be from early or late pregnancies, whether the mother be covered for her pregnancy or not. The child will be eligible for coverage from the moment it is born.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think—to be fair—that all of us can admit that William Lyon MacKenzie King is entitled to the major share of the credit for the fact that we still have no health insurance plan in Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: The Liberal Party included that concept in its platform in 1919 and, according to MacGregor Dawson's authoritative biography, Mackenzie King wrote that section of the programme. He was in power for about 25 of the succeeding 30 years. He spent those 25 years preventing the people of Canada from getting national health insurance, and his successors have carried on in that noble tradition.

As a result, Mr. Chairman, we are reduced now to fight to try to get minor improvements in a totally inadequate bill. That is the problem we are up against.

The hon. Minister made the point, in replying to the representations made from this side with respect to my amendment and other matters relating to the clause, that he was concerned about the cost of medical care insurance. Well, let us face it, the reason the costs are going to be high—and may even be higher if we try to get reasonable consideration for all of the people—is because of the basic type of plan he has.

As long as we have a phony voluntary plan under private insurance companies the cost is going to be high. There are bound to be anomalies. People are going to be faced with waiting periods, they are going to get inadequate coverage, there are going to be restrictions on their coverage, limitations and so on. This is inevitable in the nature of the beast, and I use the word advisedly, that the hon. Minister has put before us.

However, recognizing all that, and recognizing that to get a measure of equity into the bill is going to result in some increase in costs, we on this side have chosen what we think is a less objectionable principle. We will run the risk of somewhat higher costs in order to get equity. We believe in equity first and foremost. It is limited equity within a totally inequitable situation, but at least it is some measure of equity. Equals will be treated equally if our amendment is adopted.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister should not have the crust to talk any more about the possibility of increasing costs when he has brought in a bill which is designed to maximize costs so that profits of insurance companies and incomes of doctors will be maximized. This is the kind of bill he has before us. Let us deal with it on the limited, inadequate basis to which we are inevitably reduced at this time, by at least trying to make the thing as fair as possible for all the people of the province.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member has made a very valid point. To show you the type of thing that can happen in respect to the

interpretation of these words "that result directly or indirectly therefrom," I know of a case where a young man—professional man—paid a premium into a health insurance plan for a number of years and then had a newborn baby that had something wrong with its feet. I am told it is quite common; the bones in the feet at birth are not exactly what they should be and this requires corrective treatment—that I do not pretend to understand—which cost \$10 each, and the baby has to have one over a period of several weeks.

He applied to the carrier to pay for these and the carrier came back at him and said: "We don't pay for this because if you look at your contract, it says that we pay for sickness or accident, and this is neither sickness nor accident, because the condition was present at birth." The individual had not even read the contract, but he assumed that what he had bought was medical care coverage. He discovered that he had not bought exactly that, he had only bought a specialized form of medical care coverage; that is, one to cover the incidents of living—not the totality of the human organism—in society and the proneness to accidents and illness.

Now, similarly, I point out to my hon. leader that he raised a very good point because many women, I have no idea how many, suffer from what is called post-partum psychosis as a result of pregnancy. Now I only use the term because one runs across this in the law where women unfortunately, after giving birth to a child, indulge themselves in violence; sometimes directed at their other children, sometimes directed at themselves.

A woman conceivably could be ill with post-partum psychosis for a number of months, but if she got expensive psychiatric treatment the insurance company—the carrier—would be perfectly at liberty to reply to a request for payment by saying that the condition, the costs of the service, arose directly or indirectly from pregnancy; then this family would be faced with the very expensive psychiatric care that would be required in this case.

It is but another example of the unintelligent approach that is inherent in this bill. I must say that I have come to the conclusion that the Scotsman who pilots it through the House has now got his back up in such a way—over the past two or three days—that he confuses flexibility and good judgment and willingness to accept suggestions that are put forward in good faith with a sign of weakness. And that silly matter yesterday, that they would not give in on the question of class, that was the epitome of the ridiculous. But he will not give in on

anything because he feels if he changes a comma in the statute it will be a confession of weakness. In the meantime—

Mr. Bryden: The insurance companies will fix him.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. In the meantime, the insurance companies are sitting in the background, maybe some of them are here to watch his performance, and clapping their hands. That is our boy that is piloting this through; we have a champion on the floor of the Legislature. It has come to the point, I must say, that we are going to continue to talk. I have got an amendment ready for the next section. I advise you, we are going to continue to put these things across, because it is to our advantage that we get them in the record. We can go on the hustings and say, in respect of this bill, this is what we said. When the people come into my office and say, look, I paid the premium for a year, and I have got no coverage, I will just get my speech out and I will say here is what I said in respect to that child you just had; I hope the baby is well, even if you have to pay.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury and the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine made me feel that the temporary coalition, at least on this half of this side of the House, was a little bit strained this morning, and I hope we get back into that realm of opposition on this particular item.

In reference to the hon. Minister's remarks that the union in Hamilton had negotiated coverage that provided a waiting period in case of pregnancy, I would say to the hon. Minister that in the past ten years we have transferred from a company-sponsored plan to an insurance plan, to a PSI service plan, and back again to an insurance type of plan, and there has not been a break in ten years, of the continuity of coverage for the members in that plan.

Now there is, I agree, a waiting period in case of pregnancy for new employees just on that one item. But this is not the fault of the union. We have tried our best to remove this waiting period, and of course, you know, we were dealing with insurance companies. But I take it that here we are dealing with government legislation, and the job of the Opposition—the job that we are trying to do—is to remove from this legislation the dominant influence of the private carriers. That is our objective and we think that the government has to have more control over these sort of things that relate to the welfare of the people.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment by Mr. Bryden say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of Mr. Bryden's amendment, please stand.

All opposed to Mr. Bryden's amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 27, the "nays" 50.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 16 forms part of the bill.

On section 17.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in regard to this section. There are a couple of things wrong with this section. One of them I think an extreme abuse, especially in subsection (d) of section 1, where they use the term: "For misuse of services for which benefits are provided."

This particular subsection gives an insurance company the opening to cancel any policy they want. Any of us who have experience with insurance companies, know how they can seize upon the smallest technicality in order to cancel a policy. In fact, one of the great weaknesses of free enterprise insurance—and obviously they have to work on the weakness in order to make a profit—is to get rid of those people who cost them money.

In section 17 it already provides that a policy can be cancelled for misrepresentation or fraud, and misrepresentation or fraud can be given a legal interpretation. You can go to court and have it defined. But what in the world is a misuse of service?

For example, when speaking on this bill on principle, I mentioned as an example, where a man was in a wheelchair and was covered by insurance because he was confined to his home. Yet when it was found out that he was sitting in his back yard, the policy was cancelled, because he was not confined to his home, or if he was wheeled around the block, he was not confined to his home. So this could be interpreted as a misuse of the policy.

Again, when a person has a policy that protects him in case of accident, they often find that a certain type of accident is not covered.

The insurance companies have been notorious over the years, for tripping up the unwary on the small print, and words can

be interpreted in so many ways. If you get down to what is misrepresentation or fraud, this is something that can be given a legal interpretation.

This "misuse of services," I say, is giving a wide-open policy to the insurance companies to do as they see fit. We know from the past that any interpretation that the insurance companies are going to give, is to be for their own particular benefit, because these companies simply cannot exist, unless they make a good profit. They would not want to be in the business unless they made a good profit. This subsection (d) is the subsection that certainly will make the cash register ring for the insurance companies. This is another indication that not only this particular section, but this whole Act is really written for the benefit of the insurance firms. So I would like to move an amendment to this subsection, to read as follows:

That subsection (d) of subsection 1 of section 17 be deleted.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member also include subsection (a)? I would like to speak on that in a moment.

Mr. Trotter: In other words, that is to be deleted as well? I am willing to co-operate with my hon. friend, Mr. Chairman. I move that subsection (a) as well as subsection (d) be deleted.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, in this section of the bill as the hon. member for Parkdale has already indicated, there are included certain phrases and clauses which are lifted directly from private insurance company contracts, and they are there, not for the protection of the people, but of the insurance companies.

I can quite understand that section 1, subsection (b) is all right, "non-payment of subscription," as that, of course, is a logical reason for the cancellation of a contract. And (c) "Where the covered person ceases to be a resident"—that, too, is a logical reason for the cancellation of a contract. But when it comes to misrepresentation, or fraud, or misuse of services for which benefits are provided, then we are coming into a very questionable area, and there are questions that should be asked when protection is needed and they are, "Is the man sick?" and "Does the doctor say that he needs care?" These are the fundamental questions and it is not a question of protecting insurance companies, it is a question of protection of citizens.

I think again and again we have discussed this fact, that in any kind of legislation of this type, the need of the sick person must be paramount, and it is not the person who says ultimately whether he is sick or not and needs the care, it is the doctor, and it is the doctor's responsibility to say whether he needs that care and the doctor's responsibility to say whether the bills should be forwarded to the insurance carrier or not.

Though it well may be that there are ways and means by which certain misdemeanours may be practised—I am not conversant with the law here—this is a matter for the courts to decide and once the courts decide, then action can be taken by the appropriate authority. But to give the insurance companies this power seems to me to be beyond all reason and beyond the scope of this Act.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the hon. Minister, that the only reason for cancellation of a contract should be (b) and (c); and (a) and (d) should be cut out.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the matter of misuse of services, as has been pointed out by my hon. and able colleague from Parkdale, is purely a matter of opinion. The question then becomes: In whose opinion has there been a misuse of services? And if it is the opinion of the carrier, then I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it is open to a very subjective and a very biased interpretation and, of course, may lead ultimately to the exercise of very arbitrary power on the part of the carrier.

I am concerned about the individual covered who would not fight the decision of the carrier. He would get the letter from the carrier saying that they were cancelling his contract for misuse of the services and he would merely accept the decision. The result is that that individual is left without any coverage whatsoever. He is the one who will ultimately suffer the greatest.

But, of course, one can see it. One can picture in his mind's eye the huge monolithic insurance company with its immense bureaucracy and resources and technical know-how on the one hand, and the individual policyholder on the other and there is just no equality of strength between them. The individual is in complete subjection to the whims of the insurance carrier and no one can tell me—just no one can ever tell me; never, never can I be told—that some of these insurance carriers are not arbitrary and, indeed, unethical, in their treatment of the policyholders. I have had too many cases where clients have come to me and have been refused payment of medical services or have

been refused payment of income protection under a policy of insurance.

All is not lily white. The hon. Minister may think so; he may think that these inhabitants of the York and the National and the Toronto clubs, and the Ontario and Albany clubs, are all great paragons of virtue but I am one of those who must have some reservations on that score. They are in business to make money; the pursuit of private profit is their main aim in life and they will exercise all the rights given to them under the statutes and the regulations to the fullest extent, in order to enable them to arrive most effectively at the end of profit.

Then I ask aloud, what happens to the individual who wishes to resist or object to the cancellation of his contract for alleged misuse of services? Subsection 2 tells us that he may appeal to the council. Of course, as throughout this statute, we are left until we see the regulations in order to evaluate the mechanics of such an appeal. The statute and the 17 sections we have dealt with now make reference time and time again to the regulations and the faceless, nameless, anonymous bureaucrats who my hon. friend from Downsview (Mr. Singer) so eloquently portrays, are going to become, after this session is finished, a legislature unto themselves, as they sit down and put the flesh and meat on the skeleton of this statute.

Indeed, they will have more power than we, the elected representatives of the people, have, but I do not have to prove that point. The only comfort—and it is a shallow comfort—that we will have, is that they are supposed to enact this legislation in the confines of their offices under the purview and the watchfulness of the hon. Minister.

I wish we could feel comfortable about the protection we get from that source, but we cannot, so what is the individual to do if he is going to appeal against the cancellation of his contract? And I would want to ask questions like these: Where is the council going to meet? Is it going to hear oral representation on the part of the policyholder, or is it going to be in writing? Will it be needful for the policyholder to appear before the council with a lawyer?

I cannot imagine that the insurance company, wishing to uphold its cancellation of the contract, will be there without benefit of counsel and, of course, it will have the most able counsel there to protect its position that money can buy. One thing about this is that insurance companies can take you to court for about \$10, if it establishes a principle. To them money is no object. No matter how

small the demand or how meagre and puny the claim, they will go to court if it means they will establish a principle. They will harass the individual to such an extent that he is without means and without money to pursue the acquisition of justice that he may so richly deserve.

I would want to know such things as: What will be the test of misuse of services? To what extent will the doctor's opinion be valid? I would feel much more secure if there was a section in the statute in relation to misuse of services to the effect that if, in the opinion of a duly qualified medical practitioner, the individual required the services, then that would be the end of the matter. It would be something along the lines of what happens when an employee absents himself from work; he is away from work and he appears the next day at his work with a slip—it is called a doctor's slip in my community—saying that he required medical treatment or the state of his health did not permit him to go to work, and then that is the end of the matter. I would like to see some protection to the policyholder along those lines in this statute.

As to this debauchery of common sense that is inherent in section 17, we merely put it to the hon. Minister that this subparagraph is so dangerous from the point of view of its effects upon the policyholder, that it ought to be eliminated.

I am not completely sold, however, on the elimination of paragraph 8. The cancellation for misrepresentation or fraud is a standard in insurance policies except that it is usually spelled out that the misrepresentation or fraud must go to the heart of the contract—it must be a misrepresentation or fraud of such a nature that the insurer would be put in the position that had he known the truth about this item he would not have accepted the risk. That is the extent to which the misrepresentation and fraud is usually applied to contracts of insurance.

There may be, in other words, many misrepresentations or fraudulent answers to the questionnaire or the application which do not go to the heart of the contract; they are irrelevant, and they would not put the insurer in the position that I have postulated, that is to say that had he known the truth he would not have accepted the risk. I would have hoped then that subsection (a) would spell that out by the addition of some words for misrepresentation or fraud that enables the insurer to determine whether he would accept the risk or not. However, since it is not spelled out, I agree with my hon. friend

from Yorkview that that section, in its present form, ought to be deleted, and I will vote against its inclusion.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I will not pursue the argument with regard to clause (d), relating to misuse of services. I think that the iniquity of that clause has already been well established. Obviously it is a clause that gives a wide-open loophole to insurance companies to get out from under their legitimate obligations if they see fit to do so.

I would, however, like to make one or two observations with regard to clause (a) under which a contract could be cancelled for misrepresentation or fraud. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister, certainly if he follows his procedure up to date in this committee, will tell us that both (a) and (d) are clauses that appear in private insurance contracts. That has been his justification for almost everything in this bill—that this is the way the insurance companies do it, and apparently if the insurance companies do it that way, we in the Legislature are supposed to take our cue and continue their practices whether they are good or bad.

I am going to put it to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that (a) is just about as wide open for abuse as (d). As I understand it, if a man actually is guilty of misrepresentation or fraud, he can be prosecuted. Fraud is an offence. And so, if a man engages in something fraudulent then let him be prosecuted and let the law take its course. Let us not penalize a man twice for the same offence. The danger here is, you see, that if an insurance company wants to get out from under an obligation, it will allege that there has been a misrepresentation or fraud which there may, or may not, have been. The matter could be battled right up to the Supreme Court of Canada. The average person cannot engage in that sort of a fight, so he will probably just give up and permit his contract to be cancelled.

In other words, this clause (a) is wide open to abuse. It permits insurance companies to badger and harass subscribers who, for some reason or other, they want to get rid of, just as (d) can be used. So it is not enough, in our opinion, simply to strike out (d). We want (a) out, too, because we think it can be used for the same purpose, and we appreciate the courtesy of the hon. member for Parkdale in agreeing to incorporate that provision in his proposed amendment.

I think all of us know from dealing with automobile insurance policies the trivial,

trumped-up reasons insurance companies will use to try to unload somebody. They will push people on to assigned risk without notice, and without any adequate reason, in fact, without even giving a reason, frequently. They just tell him he is on assigned risk.

I have found also that in respect to private medical insurance contracts, there are companies—I am not saying all of them, but there certainly are companies—that will look for every conceivable nit-picking reason to duck their obligations. As a matter of fact, I had a case not too long ago with regard to a blind man in my constituency. I referred it to my federal colleague, Mr. Brewin, who is a lawyer, and it was only because Mr. Brewin really went to work on this company that it paid up. Yet it was clearly liable to pay in his opinion as a lawyer and in my lay opinion, formed from reading the plain words of the contract. If they think they can get out from under, there are many of them that will do so.

Clauses (a) and (b) are admittedly taken out of private insurance contracts and they are now put into the legislation. But let us remember the private insurance contracts were drawn up by insurance companies and by their lawyers, and they have every conceivable provision in them to protect the interest of the insurance company and as few provisions as possible—in fact, no provisions really—designed to protect the interests of the client.

So I would say that when we pass laws in this Legislature, we should not do so simply on the basis of what one interested party wants. We should write them on the basis of the public interest. The public interest here is that where a standard contract is granted, as it must be, although the section of the Act relating to that point is quite inadequate, but if it is issued, then it should definitely stay in force, unless the man ceases to pay his subscriptions or unless he moves away.

Obviously, in cases like that, there is no point in it staying in force, but otherwise it should stay in force. The company should have to honour the obligations with respect to medical services that are provided in that contract, regardless what other issues may be at stake. If there is a fraud, well then, let it be dealt with in the courts in the normal way, let us not penalize the man by depriving him also of his medical coverage.

The hon. member for Sudbury mentioned, with regard to the question of misrepresentation or fraud, that in the courts—and I hope I get this reasonably accurate—it is usually

considered that this principle is applicable only if it can be shown that the misrepresentation or fraud is of such a nature that the insurance company would not have accepted the risk if it had known about it. That being so, there is obviously no point to this clause here if we really mean what we say in section 12 and in other sections, namely, that insurance carriers must—not may, but must—sell standard contracts to people who apply for them. There is no basis on which they can refuse.

So where can a misrepresentation or fraud arise? I do not see how a misrepresentation or fraud can arise at all, unless the hon. Minister has in mind a whole lot of exceptions that he is going to put in those regulations that he has not told us about; say, where a man might omit to mention that he had had the jaundice 20 years ago or something, so that the companies can go to work on him. But if it is genuinely intended that anybody who applies is entitled to receive a standard contract, and if it is genuinely intended that standard contracts will provide a comprehensive range of medical services—not fully comprehensive, unfortunately, but at least as comprehensive as this bill envisages—then there is no point in clause (a). It should go out. Its only point could be to provide insurance companies with a weapon in the event they wanted to escape their obligation.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring in another point. Because of the term misrepresentation—and this is really a question to the hon. Minister—one of our concerns is that the people of Ontario will know that a standard coverage is available to them. I do not want to belittle every insurance company, or every insurance agent, but there can be a tendency, where there is a profit motive, that a man will in fact omit to tell a client that he can get a standard coverage, and suggest why not take some other coverage which has some frills in it and so on, and sign up for it.

I would like to see that under misrepresentation, there should be some aspect included to ensure that when an insurance agent is talking to a prospective client, that he has an obligation to tell him there is a standard coverage that is available to him, if he prefers it to the alternative. I would like to see, as we have in the human rights bill—and I congratulate the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), who I think was responsible; I think this is a most worthwhile thing, and it does my heart good when I go into a motel to see our human rights stated

clearly—some similar kind of insurance or guarantee on the part of the insurance companies, that they are going to see that the agents are frank about saying that there is a standard coverage that is available, but if you want to have these extras, they are also available to you and that he just does not happen to omit that there are standard coverages, in order to try to sell the Cadillac kind of policy.

Would the hon. Minister reply please?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, here is another indication in this section of how the bill will protect the carriers and put an unbearable onus on the subscriber. I am not a lawyer, but I understand that under the contract misrepresentation or fraud is a criminal offence. It is my opinion that the only person who should make judgment upon that should be a competent legal authority of the court and certainly the carrier should not have the right to cancel on that basis. It says in section 2 that an appeal can be made, and where an appeal is made, the contract will be in force until a decision is made by the council.

Of course, the subscriber will get a letter saying the contract is cancelled for some reason, and as I explained before, in their ignorance, the majority of the people who will be covered and who are working long hours and do not know their legal rights, may just pass the thing off. The letters will go onto the windowsill and into the wastepaper basket, but the people are then out of coverage and may need the service of a doctor in between that time and when they are hooked for a large amount of money for a misuse of services for which benefits are provided.

I thought that under this programme the doctors were going to provide the services and if there would be any misuse it would be the result of the doctor's actions. I cannot for the life of me see how the subscriber can misuse the services. There are examples where doctors have, of course, misused the services provided by insurance coverage and PSI. We had an example, not long ago, of where they had to discipline some of their own members for misuse of the plan.

We had a great example in our first insurance agreement in Stelco, where the in-hospital doctor-medical coverage provided for \$3 for each visit in hospital, and the first quarter of the experience showed that it was averaging two days a week. In the second quarter it went to four and in the second year, it was a blanket \$21—\$3 a day for seven days went onto each bill for each person who

went into the hospital. The union and the company made joint application to the Hamilton medical academy to see just what was going on, and the only way that we could rectify it, keep down the premiums, was to change the coverage to a specific number of days.

I cannot see, for the life of me, how we can hold the subscriber responsible for misuse of services provided by the doctors. I would hope that the hon. Minister will give us some explanation of how this might be misused by the patient.

Mr. Sopha: If I were not, Mr. Chairman, absolutely convinced that I could write a better statute than this one, I would maintain my silence. I am also convinced, and I make the allegation to the hon. Minister, that before this bill was presented to this House—I would be willing to bet a dollar—it went to the insurance companies for their examination and for their assistance and their representations in respect of the writing of this bill, because too many terms in it come from the insurance jargon for me to think otherwise.

But as a lawmaker, elected in this province to represent 80,000 people, I am not given the same opportunity to make my representations until the bill comes on the floor of the House. I do not intend to reiterate what I said, but I only wish to call for simple justice for the policyholders of this province, and for the government to give the impression that first and foremost in its mind is the protection of the policyholders and not the protection of the insurance companies.

Before the hon. Minister gets up to speak, I wish to plead with him on behalf of all those in the Opposition that he reconsider most seriously the deletion of this clause, or spell out in some more rational way a means whereby people will be protected against arbitrary conduct.

We know, and I can state categorically, that insurance companies will strive to get out of the coverage of risks that do not bring them a profit. Everybody will have a file. Every policyholder will have a file in the insurance company's office, and as that file gets bulkier with the number of claims, that file will be examined from the point of view of getting out of the coverage of that risk, to have done with that policyholder. Then when they feel they have reached the straw that breaks the camel's back, they are at liberty to employ subclause (d) and to say to you, Mr. John Q. Policyholder, "We no longer cover you because you have misused the services."

Does a person misuse the services who feels that he has a carcinoma of the lung and goes to his doctor perhaps four or five times in a month for an examination or to express to his doctor his concern about the symptoms that he feels? Similarly, in regard to a great many other maladies. The doctor tries to reassure him. Perhaps he is neurotic about it. I postulate examples of how this can arise. Maybe he needs the counsel and comfort of the doctor. I am not a doctor and I do not know how they employ their skilled techniques in this way. But that person, in resorting to medical advice from the man he trusts in regard to the state of health of his body, is in danger of receiving the fatal letter from the insurance company, which says, "You have misused the services and we cancel your policy."

In other words, it boils down to this, and this is our position. We are concerned about maximizing the coverage of our people. We want to see the greatest number of them covered. We are not interested in devices that will leave large numbers of them uncovered by medical care insurance, or will put them in danger of losing their medical care insurance; we are not interested, over here in the Opposition, in the enunciation or the establishment of any such principle as that. We believe in universality. Having got people covered in the plan, we want to keep them covered in it and we want to limit the right of insurance companies to come along and say to any one or any group of people that they are no longer covered under the plan.

Of course that is the advantage of the universal compulsory coverage that we have promoted. We cannot get that; we have been defeated on the floor of the Legislature, our meagre numbers. But not having got that, that does not mean that we give up the battle, that we fold our sails and disappear—to mix a couple of metaphors—into the gathering sandstorm. Not at all. In the carrying out of our responsibility, we stand here and we try to make improvements to this legislation—

Mr. Thompson: It is built on sand, built on the principle of sand.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, yes, "built on the principle of sand," my hon. leader very aptly points out.

One of the reasons I rose to speak again was to say that I predict, and I look forward to it with some enthusiasm, that under subsection 2, the counsel, the adviser, the agent, the representative, the steward of people who is cancelled under subclause (d) and subclause (a) is going to be the member

of the Legislature. I take great enjoyment out of appearing before the appeal tribunal of the workmen's compensation board—and here is another tribunal that I will be able to appear before on behalf of my constituents. I will not know the ground rules until the regulations are published, and until the first person comes into me with the letter saying that his coverage has been cancelled. That person, no doubt, will be some individual who will also announce at the same time, "I need the coverage; we have had it for a long time, we have had it more than the fatal eight months." Eight months has almost taken on a mystic quality in this policy in this province. "But I need it because my wife is expecting another baby; and you have got to help me get that policy reinstated." So it will be an excuse whereby I can tell my wife I have to go off to Toronto to appear before the council on this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, she keeps me close to the tether. I must appear because I cannot visualize that this council will go around the province holding hearings. I cannot visualize that. It will meet in Toronto and we will have to come down here in order to take the appeal.

Now, at the very least, if the hon. Minister will not accept this amendment, may I make this suggestion: That subclause (d) be reconsidered from the point of view that the first step must be taken by the carrier—the onus is placed upon him—and reword it by the addition of some such words as this: For which benefits are provided subject to the approval of the council. In other words, the policyholder in the initial stages is not in the picture at all; the carrier has the onus of going to the council and getting approval for the cancellation of the policy.

I say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), who is a very reasonable man, it may be at this stage that the council will refuse the carrier permission to cancel the policy and the policyholder will never know at that stage that his policy was up for review. In other words, it is an intermediate step of protection and the carrier would have to show the council that it had just cause to cancel the policy—even in the absence of the policyholder. If the council approved the cancellation of the policy, then subsection (2) would come into operation and the policyholder would have the right to go to the council and make his appeal and submit his evidence and make his arguments, either through himself, through his member of the Legislature, through his union leader or through his lawyer.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, it is hard to conceive of a section that is more ill-conceived than this particular one. When you really examine what the Minister is trying to do here you discover he has tried in a superficial way to give the insurance carriers the opportunity to unilaterally cancel a policy and throw the onus on a citizen of the province to do something about that cancellation. And he has provided an appeal to a council, and the medical council has absolutely no capacity to deal with what, in law, are probably two of the most difficult matters to prove or to decide; namely, misrepresentation or fraud, let alone this ambiguous phrase "misuse of services."

Without repeating all the things that the other hon. members have said about this amendment in speaking in favour of it, I point out that even if the hon. Minister were to delete this sentence—this section completely—and accept this amendment for that deletion, what position is a citizen of the province in? He has the services performed for him, he has a standard insurance contract, he goes to a doctor, the services are performed and he applies for payment under the contract. And what can the insurance carrier do? Without any reason whatsoever it can simply not pay the charges.

Once again it puts the onus on the citizen of the province to then take steps to find out why the insurance carrier has not paid the charge. Even if this amendment were accepted, you still have the citizen of the province in this strange position where the carrier will simply refuse to pay a bill. If the carrier refuses to pay a bill then the citizen must exercise all his rights and take whatever course he can to persuade somebody—and there is no provision in this bill as to whom he is to persuade—that the licensed carrier should pay that bill.

Surely the hon. Minister can withdraw this one section and make absolutely certain that if a citizen of the province—holding a standard medical insurance contract—has medical services provided for him that there will be unequivocally a payment by the insurance company of the cost of those services. Then, if the insurance carrier wants to do something about having made a payment on the grounds that he was not obligated to make them, let him take his remedy. But let us not have any misunderstanding that the individual citizen in the province can find himself in the position where the medical carrier unilaterally says: I am not going to pay this particular bill because we do not like what you have done in some way.

Again, I state my complete agreement with the remarks that have been made by the other hon. members on this amendment. But I say that even if the amendment were carried, the citizen in the province would continue to be faced by this possibility of unilateral action by the insurance company to simply refuse to make an individual payment. If the government is going to make such a play about the non-cancellable feature of these policies and about their permanent renewability, then the Minister has got to make absolutely certain that the insurance contract payments are made by the carriers for the services which are performed.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make some comment on this because this is a matter which is of great importance and a matter which received perhaps more than its share of consideration vis-à-vis the length of the section. At one time we had this out of the bill. However, after listening to representations made by the non-profit plans—and I emphasize that because it was from them that these representations came—the degree of misuse was rather staggering. We are not talking about the examples cited here, Mr. Chairman. Common sense should dictate to these hon. gentlemen that the examples they cited, with the exception of the one cited by the hon. member for Parkdale, are in a different class altogether. The hon. member for Sudbury may be a very brilliant lawyer, sir, but he certainly has no knowledge of medical practice. To think that any doctor or any insurance corporation would consider misuse of a contract with the man with carcinoma of the lung seeking advice—

Mr. Bryden: This is a legal not a medical question, sir.

Hon. Mr. Dymond:—five times a month or five times a week or seven times a week; this would not be unreasonable in such cases. These non-profit plans, the co-ops, the doctor-sponsored plans gave us the facts of cases that had visited different doctors—10, 12 and 15 of them. Just the day before they had come in to make these representations they had a case where a patient had visited 17 different doctors in one day. Now, Mr. Chairman, the only effect of this sort of thing is misuse; complete and total misuse. It hurts all of the people who are covered by insurance, and this is why it was put back in the Act, so as to provide protection for the great mass of the people.

I have heard my hon. friend say that one bad apple in the barrel can ruin the whole barrel. Why let us run the risk of ruining the whole barrel if we can extract that bad apple from the outset?

This is what is envisioned in misuse. I am not going to attempt to argue this matter of misrepresentation or fraud, because my legal advisers told me that this should be put in. I do know—and I checked it for myself—that it is in every contract of the service corporations and the non-profit plans as well, and I am quite certain that my hon. friend from Sudbury knows this very well.

All the emphasis, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. members put was on the indemnity corporations; let us remember that the non-profit plans carry a large percentage of the insurance in the province of Ontario and, in 1962—the last date I have for such complete information—they carried 31.2 per cent of all the medical services insurance.

My hon. friend from Parkdale cited the case of the man who was in a wheelchair taking a run around the block—and very probably on his doctor's orders—but his insurance, I submit to you, sir, was not his medical service insurance; it was income protection insurance or some other type of insurance, but certainly not the insurance that paid his doctor bills, because there would be nothing in a contract of that kind, Mr. Chairman.

And if it were, the standard contract, as laid down in this bill, rules that sort of thing out completely.

The bill is aimed at ruling out these loopholes that corporations have in the past clung to and used wrongly. I am quite prepared to consider changes in this bill, Mr. Chairman, but I find myself in a difficult position. I was prepared to consider changes and should probably have mentioned them first. But I find myself now in the difficult position that should these amendments that are now before the House be defeated, you will declare the section carried, and I believe that there are two amendments which I would propose that can clear up some of the doubt that apparently is in the minds of the hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I raised the question about the obligations—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: How do we control what the insurance agents take? I do not know. The only thing I can undertake to say to you on this is that we will use every available means to make certain that the availability of the insurance and the provisions of this

Act are known to all the people of the province.

The industry, I hope, will police itself. I do not know, and I do not see how any legislation can control what shall be said by people who are trying to sell something. If my hon. friend with some knowledge of the insurance business, would give us some concrete assistance in this regard, I assure you that we would welcome it very much.

I would like to point out, too, Mr. Chairman, our concern for misuse is not only directed to the consumers of the service. We are just as concerned about over-service being given by doctors, and I recognize the validity of what my hon. friend from Wentworth East has already said. We have had examples of this. I agree that cases have been brought before our disciplinary committees. I have the assurance of the disciplining body of our profession that they will watch the operation of this very carefully, and they will take strong, firm and positive steps to be sure that it is kept in control insofar as it is possible.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, the amendment before the House now is an amalgam of two proposals that came from the Opposition side. I wonder if you might not discover whether the hon. member for Parkdale, who was the mover, might not withdraw his amendment temporarily, to give the hon. Minister an opportunity. I would be delighted to see this government introduce one amendment; I would like to take a look at it, and at this point I have a sense of frustration that I am not going to see even one.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to it being withdrawn temporarily to see what the hon. Minister has to offer.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would move then that clause 17, 1 (a) be amended by adding the words: "as to a material fact," so that the clause shall now read:

—for misrepresentation or fraud, as to a material fact.

I am sorry that my hon. friend, the Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is not here to guide me in this matter.

Then I would also say—and I meant to speak about this—there may be some question in the minds of some of us, and it has come to my mind, that 17 (2) may not make clear to the subscriber, who should find himself in the position of having his policy cancelled, his rights of appeal to the council. In an attempt to make sure that he will know of

those rights, I would like to move that section 17 be amended by adding a sub-paragraph 3, which will read as follows:

17 (3) In the notice of cancellation, the carrier shall advise the subscriber of his rights to appeal the cancellation to the medical services insurance council.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Are you doing anything about (d)?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No. I have explained (d).

Mr. Sopha: This is a special bill, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister if his legal advisers have told him whether the statutory conditions under part 7 of The Insurance Act are applicable to the standard policies under this Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I have to say that I cannot recall them specifically telling me that, Mr. Chairman, but I must admit that I did not ask them what paragraphs of what Act applied to ours. I took it that they had thoroughly screened our Act—

Mr. Sopha: Is this accident or sickness insurance, I wonder?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Sopha: Is this accident and sickness insurance?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, this is insurance under The Insurance Act and under The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act. It has nothing to do with sickness and accident insurance.

Mr. Sopha: It is the only one that deals with this type of thing in The Insurance Act, and there are all types of insurance in The Insurance Act. There is a group of statutory conditions that form part of the policy and I have not heard, nor do I see anywhere in the statutes, where there are any statutory conditions that are to form part of this standard contract and I am worried about it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister asked me if I would give him concrete suggestions so that everyone in the province will know that there is a standard coverage, and I am assuming that he is going to make some arrangements to it through the medical societies and unions and the foreign language groups. I am thinking particularly of those who are in the country of newcomers, not only those who are here but also those who are in the country.

from the point of view of sales, and my hon. friend from Parkdale has listed a number of occasions on which slick salesmen are able to promote everything from vacuum cleaners to everything else. So I am hoping that on that basis the hon. Minister will do something.

I also think of the consumer credit report which I have not had a chance to read as yet, but I understand from my hon. friends to my left that one of the requirements that is being considered is that the interest rate is going to have to be stated clearly. I do not see why this same requirement could not be made of insurance agents, that they would have to say that there is a standard policy, and if there is a situation where someone has complained and says that they were sold a policy and never told about the standard policy and did not know anything about it, then there is a situation where the insurance agent could be hauled up before the superintendent.

I also would like to emphasize again that I like the idea that in hotels and motels—I do not know if this is mandatory, but I ask the hon. Provincial Secretary if he knows if it is mandatory—that they have the charter stated clearly so that people know their rights. I do not see why an insurance agent should not have a bylaw requesting him to put out a statement saying there are certain standard contracts which a person can have and the coverage that is given.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we would be very pleased to consider the feasibility of this, and if there is any possibility of it having a salutary effect, we would entertain it. However, my understanding is that a great deal of insurance is sold away from the office and though we might lay down in law that the insurance agent shall make certain statements, how in the world would we ever police it or enforce it?

It is quite true, the subscriber, the policyholder, or the policyholder who was refused might say: "Well, I was told nothing about it," and then become involved, I presume, in lengthy, costly and probably difficult litigation. As I understand the law, it would be one word against one word and whose is to be taken? I can see very grave difficulties and a very cumbersome type of redress available to the purchaser in this regard.

We will, as I have already told the House, use the broadest possible type of information dissemination across the province, and we will keep this up periodically. One of the things we plan to do—as we did in the case of the inception of the hospital care insur-

ance plan—is to produce a pamphlet. I would certainly hope that our planning will include that this be reproduced in ordinary language, particularly in places where we have many different ethnic groups, to the end that all it is possible to reach be advised of what is available to them.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I am really thinking of suggestions on my feet for the most part. I am sure the hon. Minister will look into this thoroughly and get much advice. One suggestion that comes to mind is the fact that on an application for insurance you might have in big bold letters the fact of the availability of a standard contract. I realized when I spoke previously, the very real difficulties of how you can tell what one man said to another when he signed something. However, if you are making a contract, it is obvious that you need signatures when you are making the application for contracts and that might be the point to inform the public about.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I was just looking through The Fair Accommodation Practices Act and I do not think that is a mandatory provision. It is as a result of the education campaign carried on by the commission in co-operation with the people involved.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the amendment now before the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. gentlemen opposite think it would be better if the Opposition just accepted anything the government proposed, but we have a different conception of the role of Opposition.

I now wish to make some comments with regard to the amendments that the hon. Minister has put before us. I suppose one could say that they are unobjectionable, one could also add that they are innocuous. With regard to his proposal to add a subsection 3, I would think it would be elementary that the carrier, after arbitrarily cancelling somebody's contract, should be expected to advise that person at least that he may appeal; this I would take to be elementary. We obviously would accept that great new departure by the hon. Minister.

As for the proposed amendment to clause (a), it would appear now that the hon. Minister has got himself fully into line with the insurance companies. Previously he had outdone even them. He had put it in on broader terms than even they do in their

own policies, but now he has, I would judge, suggested that we write into our bill the actual language of the private insurance company policies rather than having it broader even than they want it. I am suggesting to him again that the whole thing is meaningless. I take it this term, "as a material fact," refers to what the hon. member for Sudbury was talking about, that is that it must be shown that the misrepresentation or fraud was of such a nature that the insurer would not have accepted the contract if he had known about it.

If he is required to accept a contract under our law—and we are told that he is required to accept that type of contract—what is the material fact on which he would refuse to accept one? I submit to the hon. Minister that if he really means that insurance companies must have standard contracts available and must be willing to sell them to those who apply for them, subject to such conditions as to rates that apply, then there is no point in this at all. This is applicable, it makes sense in an insurance contract only where the insurer has discretion. If he has no discretion to refuse in the first place, then how could it be said that a so-called misrepresentation or fraud is a matter that would have led him to refuse?

I suggest to the hon. Minister that his amendment to clause (a) adds nothing to the clause, it does not improve it, there is no point to it. I hope that my friend, the hon. member for Parkdale, will come back in again and move his amendment when an opportunity arises and really clean up this section.

The hon. Minister, of course, does not touch (d) at all, the really vicious section relating to the ill-defined term "misuse." The example the hon. Minister gave us of the type of thing he was trying to legislate against, was such an atrocious, far-fetched, ridiculous example that it really gives rise to concern as to the type of stuff that is going to be pulled under this clause. The hon. Minister said that he had a case of a man who had consulted 17 different doctors in one day. I assume, Mr. Chairman, that that man was working not on a 24-hour day, but a 36-hour day, because any time I have gone to consult a doctor, I have had to wait at least two hours before I could even say hello to the guy. And how you can consult 17 different doctors—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, is the hon. member doubting my word?

Mr. Bryden: —over a 24-hour period, I do not know.

Mr. MacDonald: No, we think your suggestion was absurd.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I was stating a fact as presented to me by a non-profit insurance carrier.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Since the hon. Minister raised the question of whether or not I was questioning his word, I thought I should clear that up.

Mr. Chairman: We will finish that at two o'clock.

The House took recess at 12.30 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, June 10, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, continued	3967
Recess, 6 o'clock	4004

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

House in committee, Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

On section 17:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, just before you left the chair at 12.30, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dymond) had asked whether or not I was accepting his word as to the accuracy of the cases presented to us. Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously I must accept his word for what he says, difficult as that may be in this particular case.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He only said he heard it.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Oh, no—

Mr. Bryden: Well, I accept his word that he heard it, and yet he further asserts he knows it for a fact. I accept that, too.

I would like to say however, Mr. Chairman, that we now begin to get some light on the six years of research that the hon. Minister claims he and his people had been doing prior to the preparation of this bill. I would suggest that they probably spent the entire six years digging through about ten million cases, in order to find the one that the hon. Minister put before us this morning, the case of a man, who it is said, went to 17 different doctors in one day. I certainly think he was reaching for an example, and if that is the best he can provide as the reason for including in this bill a provision that a policy can be cancelled by an insurance company for alleged misuse of services, then I would say that there is no reason at all for including the section in the bill. That, I would suggest, happens about once in ten million cases.

Furthermore, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if it does happen, then the person concerned is one who is obviously in need of medical services. He is obviously a man

who needs psychiatric treatment. There is something the matter with a man who would go to 17 different doctors in one day. He may not need treatment for the ailment that he imagines afflicts him, but he obviously is afflicted with perhaps an even more serious ailment that should be treated.

We still face the question that we, on this side of the House, have been urging from the very beginning, that there is no need at all for the provision that the hon. Minister has included in this bill and which he has copied directly out of private insurance contracts. Why should we enact what private insurance carriers want, whether or not that is in the public interest? In this case, it clearly is not in the public interest. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I hope that the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), at the appropriate time, will reintroduce his amendment in an effort to get rid of this offensive clause in the bill.

I point out, Mr. Chairman, that when misuse occurs—and no doubt it occasionally does occur—it is misuse by medical practitioners, not by sick patients. Or at the very least, a medical practitioner will be a party to the misuse. He will be part of a conspiracy to misuse the benefits. There is no way whereby a patient can submit a bill for medical services by himself. He has to have a bill from a medical practitioner, or alternatively, the medical practitioner must submit the bill directly. So why should a patient's contract be cancelled arbitrarily because of misuse on the part of the medical profession?

The hon. Minister said this morning that the college of physicians and surgeons is trying to police this phase of the matter to make sure that there is no abuse of insurance contracts by its members. I think that is the best way to handle that problem. In every professional group there will always be someone who tries to take advantage of a situation, and the professional group itself is best able to deal with the matter. But the patient should not be involved at all, and should not face the possibility of arbitrary cancellation of his contract.

While I am on my feet, with regard to this clause, Mr. Chairman, I would like to

ask if it is intended that the two amendments proposed by the hon. Minister will be submitted as two separate questions?

Mr. Chairman: Just as one.

Mr. Bryden: Well, may I request, sir—and I think it is possible in a matter of this kind, where an amendment covers two quite unrelated subjects—that they be separated into two questions?

Mr. Chairman: It can be, but I thought we might—

Mr. Bryden: I would request that you do so because so far as this group is concerned, we are prepared to support one of the hon. Minister's amendments, but not the other.

Mr. Chairman: We will vote one by one, then.

Mr. Bryden: Well, then, Mr. Chairman, I take it that the first one, relating to clause (a), is the one that is now before us, and I do not think I have to repeat our reasons. We have already stated them. We do not think that the hon. Minister's amendment makes any change in the clause that is worth mentioning. It is not worth the trouble to amend it in the way he suggested. We are opposed to the clause in total, and therefore opposed to the amendment as it is now.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment of the hon. Minister of Health, that is in section—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Before we go on, Mr. Chairman, we cannot support the amendment to subsection (a), because we, on this side of the House, we do not think it makes any difference whatsoever, so that subsection 3, it is going to be read separately, I guess.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. The Minister's motion is:

Section 17, subsection (a) be amended by adding the words: "as a material fact," so that the clause shall now read:

"for misrepresentation or fraud as to a material fact."

All in favour of the amendment—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, if I may suggest, that the words are: "as to a material fact."

Mr. Chairman: "as to a material fact."

All in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

Opposed to the amendment, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of the first amendment by the Minister of Health, please stand.

All opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 41, the "nays" 24.

Mr. Chairman: The first amendment is carried.

Second amendment.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I will have to amend my amendment. It will be to the section as amended.

Mr. Chairman: After this one.

Mr. Trotter: After this one?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

All in favour of the second amendment, that in the notice of cancellation the carrier shall advise the subscriber of his right to appeal the cancellation to the medical services insurance council.

All in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You come up with a reasonable amendment and we will support it.

Mr. Chairman: Carried.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that I would withdraw my amendment temporarily, providing the government did something worthwhile. We have come to the conclusion that their suggested amendments were not worthwhile, and I would like my amendment to stand, only it should read: "to the section as amended."

Mr. Chairman: All the arguments have already been made.

Mr. Trotter: If the arguments have already been made, we must repeat the arguments.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment, say "aye."

All opposed say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

The amendment is lost.

Section 17, as amended, agreed to.

On section 18:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, in section 18, subsection (1), we now come to grips with this question of maximum subscription rates.

Yesterday, the hon. Minister finally revealed something of the nature of these maximum rates, and I think it would be accurate to state his revelation produced nothing less than a shock in this House. Indeed, it was so much of a shock that it even captured the attention of the press that had really lost interest in this whole medicare debate and has been burying it on page 45 or thereabouts. We find that this morning it is the headlines on the front page. Headlines which read: "That the maximum rates are going to be for the sickly and the aged."

It seems to me that this is a very serious kind of situation. The bill reads:

Section 18 (1) No licensed carrier shall charge a subscription rate under a standard contract in excess of the applicable maximum subscription rate prescribed by the regulations.

We do not know what that maximum is. We have been trying after six years to discover. The hon. Minister of Health apparently has not had the green light yet from the insurance companies, so he is not in a position to tell us what it is. But what we do know now is that this maximum rate is going to be reserved for those who are least in a position to cope with it economically—it is going to be for the sickly and the aged. For those who will be best able to cope with it, they will be able to get a lower rate because they will be a better risk. The bad risks are going to carry the maximum rate. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an intolerable kind of situation. Now that the hon. Minister has made clear the nature of his bill, I think that we should do something about it.

I think there are two ways in which we could do something about it. One, you could fix a number of maximums in various categories along the lines the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) pointed out yesterday, in which you would, in effect, be duplicating the outmoded car insurance kind of approach. Alternatively, it seems to me, and this is preferable, you could eliminate the discrimination against the various other people.

Therefore, I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that subsection (1) of section 18 be amended by adding thereto the following:

and no licensed carrier shall discriminate among individuals or families in the subscription rates it charges.

Therefore, the subsection would read:

No licensed carrier shall charge a subscription rate under a standard contract in excess of the applicable maximum subscription rate prescribed by the regulations and no licensed carrier shall discriminate among individuals or families in the subscription rates it charges.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this would create an opportunity for a genuine pooling of risks within this limited area of the high risks, the bad risks, and conceivably come up with a maximum which would be less onerous on the higher risk group.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. MacDonald moves that subsection (1) of section 18 be amended by adding thereto the following:

and no licensed carrier shall discriminate among individuals or families in the subscription rates it charges.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we endorse this. It came as a considerable shock to us yesterday to realize that pooling did not mean that both poor risks and good health risks were all going to be included on an equal basis. As the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has said, when this was exposed, naturally there was an outraged reaction not only in the newspapers through headlines but also from senior citizens and the very people who are concerned.

I notice where Dr. Hannah has said in the past that some of the poorest risks—if you want to put it that way, which I also find obnoxious—are young mothers and young babies. I think the doctor recognizes that they are the people who are very liable to suffer ill-health in some way or other. Yet these people, young mothers with babies, are going to be looked on, not from the fact of their financial resources, but on the basis of their health. Surely we should be trying to arrange that this group gets, in the easiest possible way, complete health services made available to it, rather than it being suggested as it will be that, "You are going to cost us more because you are more liable to get ill-health, therefore, you are going to have to pay more."

I agree thoroughly with the suggestion behind this amendment. I may say, sir, there are other aspects of section 18 that I think should be considered. The hon. Minister will correct me if I am wrong in this, but I think that within the past year the college of physicians and surgeons has raised its fees

20 per cent. I understand that one non-profit organization had based its premiums on the understanding that they would only be raised 10 per cent, and they have now been raised 20 per cent. Assuming that the college of physicians and surgeons were to raise them another 10 per cent, there could be a situation where the whole premium structure would have to go up within the two years, and yet it cannot be changed in two years. I can see a great many difficulties attached to this.

It also raises a question concerning a carrier who goes bankrupt. Again I think of remarks by Dr. Hannah, with a suggestion that perhaps they would not be able to keep their premiums at the rate they had and that these non-profit organizations might be going out of business if this continued. The hon. Minister has told us, and I would like to have this clarified by him, that if people buy policies from one carrier and if the carrier should go bankrupt, they automatically can be covered by another carrier without a waiting period.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. As far as the maximum premium is concerned, we know from the explanation that he has given that if a person is in poor health, the premium will be more than for someone who is in good health. May I ask, will there be any difference necessarily in the premium between our citizens who are in good health? We will take a person who is 65 years of age, in excellent health, and somebody who is 25; will there be a difference in premium as far as age is concerned?

If you wish to answer all of these questions at once, I have another one. We see that there will be one rate for a family of two, and one rate for a family of three or more. Does that mean that where a husband and wife have already paid their premium and then the mother has a child, that immediately, on that day, the premium rate is going to be advanced? As I read it in the bill, it does, and I think that this is most unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as to some of the questions raised by the hon. member for York South in his amendment, I am not just sure that I understand exactly what he is trying to get at with his amendment. Did I get it right? "And no licensed carrier shall discriminate among individuals and families in the subscription rates charged?"

Mr. MacDonald: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I must have eaten too much dinner or I am not celebrating very well because I just cannot see what on earth this does to the—

Mr. Thompson: It provides one common premium for everyone.

Mr. MacDonald: It would eliminate penalizing—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It eliminates the maximum fee—

Mr. Bryden: No, it does not.

Mr. Thompson: Just one set premium, not a maximum one for some people; a lower one for others.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I see it now, this does change what we are trying to do. It is a maximum premium and this is the reason for pooling.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of illness can only be paid out of the moneys taken in. If enough money is not taken in, then the fees cannot be paid, or, if the demand for outgo exceeds the intake, then of course only one thing can happen, the fees must go up.

I have already explained the system of pooling, that a small factor is built into the premium of every insured person across the board and that factor is taken out each month and put into the pool in order to bring the maximum premium down below what it would have to be to carry the risk, if the risk were to carry itself.

Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) pointed out yesterday, the existing premiums, by at least one of the non-profit plans, are far in excess of what I would anticipate—and I underline that word "anticipate"—would be the approved maximum. The maximum that is now being charged, not to high-cost risks but to all individual families who insure under our plan will automatically come down. I believe that this system is a very sound one in that it brings down the cost of insurance below what these people must now pay and below that which is being paid by families who are not looked upon as particularly high-cost risks, but are charged at a rate known as community rates. To adopt the amendment offered by the hon. member would completely change this and would leave us in the position that the high-cost risks would have to carry themselves altogether.

A great deal has been said about the poor, and of course we are concerned about the

poor. The bill points this out, and if they are poor or if they are in the low income groups—again, if they are not subject to income tax or if their tax is below a certain acceptable level—they are subsidized or totally supported by government funds in the first case, and partially in the second case. The aged and those who cannot afford it will be looked after. That is one of the purposes of our bill. If those who are able to afford their own insurance are high-cost risks, or are suffering from chronic illness, or if they are of an age where to carry insurance upon them costs more and they can afford it, of course they will have to pay the higher rate, and, to protect them so far as is possible by legislation, we are setting a maximum beyond which the insurance carriers cannot charge.

Again I repeat that we ought to be at least realistic about all this talk about the profit to insurance companies. I repeat what I have said so frequently, that a large number of non-profit carriers—my hon. friend, the member for Bruce spoke about them, the medical co-ops who cover a very large segment of rural Ontario—have done a tremendous job in this area. Anybody can buy insurance from them, just the same as they can from any of the other corporations. They do not make any profit and their records will show this. They have not great reserves, any more than are demanded by the superintendent of insurance in keeping with the Act.

Mr. Whicher: Would the hon. Minister say how somebody from the city of Toronto, downtown Toronto, would buy from a medical co-op in this province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is a medical co-op operating right in the city of Toronto. I think they call it CUMBA. It has been operating here for years.

Mr. Whicher: Is that well known to the public?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe the municipal employees, at least some of the municipal employees in some of the municipalities in the area, used to be covered by that in a group policy.

The hon. leader of the Opposition, I believe it was, suggested that we are not looking at this from the standpoint of financial resources, that we should be looking at it from the standpoint of physical needs. This is quite true. But we are also concerned about the financial resources.

I repeat, if the individual cannot afford it or if they are in an income bracket below a

taxable level of \$2,000 for a family, then, of course, we are concerned about the financial resources, because the public has provided, or the government has provided out of the public purse, moneys to support those. Carriers are going bankrupt, and some of the small carriers tell us that they may very well go bankrupt because of the provisions of this Act. We hope they will not, but if they cannot provide the standard contract as we have proposed in our Act, then there is not very much we can do about it.

On the OMA fees, we will come to this later on. For the information of the House, the college of physicians and surgeons has nothing to do with setting fees. It was suggested that the OMA schedule of fees could be changed at the same time. But as we come to section 20 you will find that a ceiling is put on that, at least insofar as payments under the plan are concerned, and that the fees in effect when this Act is proclaimed will obtain for the first two years, just as the maximum premium will have a ceiling put upon it.

Does the married couple go into the other bracket as soon as a new arrival comes to the home? I would expect that they would, but, whether it takes effect immediately the baby is born or not, I cannot tell you. On the cost differential as to age, certain contracts, many carriers, non-profit and profit alike, have that ruling now and have had it for a long time, that when a person reaches the age of 65 he is considered a higher cost risk. But they do not all observe it, and there are many carriers who I know are continuing to carry their healthy aged people. I believe there is a nominal charge in the case of some, 24 cents a month, I believe. One of the biggest non-profit groups has this provision when one reaches age 65 or a certain age considered as retirement age. But I cannot give you specific information as to what all of them do. I do know that into many contracts is written the provision now that they either be cancelled or they go into a different rate structure. Under the bill, without any regard to age or state of health, they must have the opportunity to buy, or to have provided for them, a standard contract.

Mr. Whicher: May I ask the hon. Minister one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, it would seem that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for York South is one amendment

that tries to bring some commonsense into this bill. Now, the hon. Minister of Health did not know what the amendment was trying to do. Obviously, it is trying to overcome one of the greatest weaknesses in the bill, and that is to protect those who are older and those who are sick. If, as he admitted yesterday, that these people—those who are sick and those who are aged—are going to have to pay higher rates, it is obviously a very great weakness in the bill. After all, the whole idea is to spread the risk across the population, and we should have a set premium right across the board in order to protect those who need this insurance most.

The hon. Minister has said that so much goes into the pool and you have to have that money in there in order to pay it out. But we are going to have to realize that insofar as medical insurance is concerned, or so far as the whole broad spectrum of health insurance is concerned, that a large proportion of the payment of these services is going to have to come out of the consolidated revenue fund, and this section points out the whole weakness of this bill, that too much of the support of this bill is thrown upon the people who can least afford to pay. This is why we in this party are strongly in support of the amendment as suggested by the hon. member for York South.

Again, this section shows how the premiums can get completely out of hand. True, they are set for a two-year period, but do not forget we are setting an Act in operation that is going to operate, for all we know, for a long time. I hope in the very near future there is going to be some very radical amendments made in the future sittings of this House in order to make the legislation more modern and to meet its needs. But as we see it today, we know this is going to operate in the future and two years is a very small period of time. And what happens? The insurance companies under this section will have to go to the council for the approval of their fees, but the OMA who set the fees, which are set out in section 20, do not seem to have to seek anybody's approval.

Again, I think it is obvious that the hon. Minister of Health is certainly taking good care of the OMA. So that we can have a situation here where the OMA, after a two-year period, can raise its fees as far as it likes, and yet the insurance companies must have theirs approved by the council.

I am not here to defend the insurance companies. I am sure they can work out a smoke-filled room deal with the doctors in order to get a proper rate set, but it just shows

that when this legislation was drawn up that there was a great hiatus between section 18 and section 20 insofar as the amount of fees is concerned.

The tragedy of it is—the essence of it is—that the person who is paying the premium is left almost utterly at the mercy of the insurance companies and the doctors, and in every section we seem to have come back to this single dominating point in this bill—that the general public, which is approximately 75 per cent of the public of this province, is virtually, insofar as costs of their medical services are concerned, at the mercy of two strong groups. And those groups are strong in any event. But when we bring in sections such as section 18, it only legalizes and makes more entrenched a power already too strong.

I would urge hon. members of this House to support the amendment as presented by the hon. member for York South in this at least; we must see to it that those people who need the protection the most, those who can least afford to pay, the aged and the sick, are assured that they are not going to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water in this whole scheme that has been set up to help insurance interests.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a hypothetical case here. Supposing a young man was in good health with his young family for a five-year period and then suddenly he developed some heart trouble. Does this mean that automatically, under this section, his premium could be increased? If it could, I suggest that it is entirely wrong that this once healthy person who paid a set premium, now that he is sick has to pay a higher premium. This is completely wrong and against our way of doing business in this country.

Generally speaking, we have healthy doctors looking after unhealthy patients. We have healthy nurses looking after unhealthy patients. What is wrong with me, as a healthy layman, by my pocketbook, helping to look after unhealthy patients in this country? I suggest that it should be done. Surely, this is one instance where the insurance companies have a common fee and just because a man has heart trouble the insurance premium does not go up after the policy has been issued. If I buy an insurance policy tomorrow and the premium costs me \$30 for \$1,000, and I develop heart trouble next year, the premium does not go up. Why? Because there is a common rate and I think that it should certainly be done in a case such as this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member asks what is wrong with the healthy person looking after the unhealthy? We have been doing that; the healthy person has been looking after the unhealthy person, as indicated by the fact that a certain amount is taken out of the healthy person's premium every month and put in the pool so that the maximum premium will be less than it would otherwise be if the unhealthy person had to look after the total cost of his own illness. To liken medical services insurance to life insurance is a completely different thing altogether—

Mr. Whicher: Why—because they are both trying to make money?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course they are trying to make money. Did you ever hear of a non-profit company selling life insurance? It is built into the premium structure of the life insurance policy from the very start—

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister asked me if I ever heard of a non-profit company selling life insurance and the answer is "yes."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, mutual companies, but they are making a profit—

Mr. Whicher: What about the co-operatives in this province? The same co-ops that are selling medical insurance at cost today are selling life insurance at cost. The hon. Minister asked me that question, and there is the answer.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Thank you for the answer.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I think if the hon. Minister would clear his mind of the actuarial jargon that seems to be in there, and would think rather in terms of the need of the people of Ontario, then he might understand more clearly the thing we are driving at. He indicated that that 10 cents, or whatever the amount may be, will be taken from the premium of a healthy person to help another person, but the fact still remains that there will be a differentiation between the amount that the poor risk, so-called, will pay and that which will be paid by the good risk.

In other words—if we could use hypothetical figures here—if the poor risk is paying \$180, then the good risk will pay \$150, but if something were not taken out of that \$150 and added to the pool for the bad risk then the bad risk might be paying \$200 instead of \$180. This is the hon. Minister's argu-

ment, but why in the name of commonsense, can we not think in terms of a basic premium across the board? If it costs X number of millions of dollars to administer this plan in the province of Ontario, that number of dollars can be divided among the number of people and that is the premium rate for bad risks and good risks. In other words, those who are well will help to carry the burden of the unwell and those who are good risks will help to carry the burden of the poor risks and the cost will have evened out.

I agree with the hon. Minister that perhaps there is some compensating factor here but it still leaves the poor risk, the aged, the infirm and the halt and the blind, if you will, at high rates, while the person who has strength—and on that account, perhaps more income—at lower ones. This, we think, is a wrong principle. If we are going to think in terms of insurance of this kind, then it should be insurance. The "group" should be the people of Ontario, and even if we are going to help the people with lower incomes, then that group should be the people above the subsidy level—all the people.

As the hon. member for Bruce has said, we are going to have the weak assist the strong in this case. We want to reverse that. We want the strong to assist the weak, we want to cut right across this distinction between these two groups and we want to set one rate for all the people of this province.

Again I come back to the fact that clause 18, section 1 again asks this House to vote for something we know not of. We are asked to pass this legislation, but we still have no idea what is involved as far as cost is concerned. Between the time that this Act is passed and when it comes into effect, the Ontario medical association has the power under this legislation to raise the rate again, so it has, in effect, the power to determine what the subscription rate will be at that time.

It is true that afterward, raising the rate can be accomplished by the OMA raising its scale, but between now and the time the legislation becomes operative, it can, in effect, set the rate which will be charged at that point. This is wrong, and I think the hon. Minister ought to give this House far more information as to what the people of Ontario are going to pay. The information should be a unified price so that—if we are going to get into this kind of a bind and keep this kind of unrealistic legislation—the people of this province should know when they go to an insurance company, no matter how sick or how well they may be, exactly what

they are going to pay for a standard policy in the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, of course, and I would like to give just a brief reasoning as to why. I can imagine what can happen with the present section whereby there is a maximum rate set and then the carrier can have various other rates. I have had some personal experience with insurance people both in the life insurance field and in the field of medical coverage.

They would have no trouble with the persons who they knew were going to be covered by the maximum rate. Of course, they would tell them that their health condition demanded that they be in this rate and they would get them covered. If they had three or four other rates for those in better health—and, of course, insurance companies do have areas for negotiation and for salesmanship in selling their programmes—we could have situations where the insurance man makes his first visit and he finds out that he is not going to make a quick sale and he says: "Well, after asking you a few questions I have come to the conclusion that you are not going to be coverable. It is too bad, but if you get sick you are going to have to pay your own doctor's bill." He leaves at that and the person gets pretty concerned, but the insurance man comes back the next day and says: "I have just rechecked our rate book and I find that I can cover you for this rate." And the person is tickled to death, so he buys the rate.

In all fairness, to make this plan work properly if we want to talk about sharing the cost of insurance for those who are sick, one rate is the best way to do it. It removes the discrimination, as has been mentioned in the amendment. I do not think this really does the job. I do not think this is the real method of sharing the costs, where you have one premium covering the good risk as well as the poor risk. My feeling about sharing the costs of health insurance is that you pay a premium based on your ability to pay in the same ratio that you pay income tax to cover other costs that governments are responsible for. But this is a step toward sharing the cost in an equitable manner and it does remove that area of insurance salesmanship where they have one or more rates in their books.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, whenever we raise the question of the premiums that are likely to be charged to the majority of the public when this legislation comes into effect,

the hon. Minister always insists on getting out of order by referring back to that part of the bill relating to subsidization. I would suggest that we do not confuse this part of the bill with a discussion that was held under another part of the bill.

It is true that the bill provides for subsidization—indeed, for 100 per cent subsidization—of people living in stark poverty; people who are so poor that they do not even pay income tax. I was shocked to hear that there are a million such people in the province. But their medical needs, provided they are aware of their privileges, will presumably be taken care of. What we are talking about is the other 5.5 million people. There is a small number of them who may get some subsidization under this bill, but most of them will not get much. In fact, there is a group of 800,000, the hon. Minister said, eligible for subsidization; but about 600,000 of them still will not be able to afford to pay the premium even with the limited subsidization the hon. Minister proposes.

So what we are now talking about are the rates chargeable to something like 75 to 85 per cent of the people of the province. Section 18, as it now stands, purports to suggest that there will be a maximum rate of subscription imposed by law for this 75 to 85 per cent. I say that it "purports" to provide that. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the section as it now stands is like so many other sections in this bill; nothing but window-dressing. It is quite clear from what the hon. Minister has said that the maximum will be totally meaningless.

I am going to suggest to the hon. Minister that the only way to give it any meaning at all will be by the incorporation of the amendment proposed by my hon. leader. As the matter stands now, the hon. Minister has made it abundantly clear that there will be differential rates. The people whose need is greatest—that is, the people whose health needs are greatest, the people whose health is not good, the "bad risks," as the insurance industry calls them, will be subject to specially high premiums.

Now, the government, in setting its maximum, has to take that fact into account and the maximum will have to be calculated in terms of the worst risks from an insurance point of view. That may be 10 per cent of the population; therefore, there is no maximum for all the rest because the ceiling will be so high in order to make sure that insurance companies can still get their 35 to 40 per cent cut for selling costs and profits that it will be meaningless.

We are suggesting to the hon. Minister that we give some meaning to a maximum. If we establish the principle that there cannot be discrimination in the rates charged as between so-called "bad risks" and "good risks," the risks will be pooled. There will be one rate for all of them. Then it is possible to establish a maximum that means something. But as the matter now stands, your maximum will just be a maximum for a small number of people and it will leave so much leeway for the rest that there will be no maximum for them at all.

Actually, I would support the amendment of my hon. leader on an even broader principle than that. I would support it in terms of basic equity. It is just incredible that the hon. Minister quite blithely and blandly stands in front of us and suggests that it is perfectly all right that those who can afford the least are the ones that should be soaked the most. And bear in mind I am not talking about the subsidized groups. There are a great many people who will be high risks that are not within the subsidized groups; it will include some older people—older people tend to be from a health point of view in a higher risk category.

Not all of the old people in this province are going to fall within the hon. Minister's subsidized group; some of them will just be beyond it—they still will not have very high incomes but they will not qualify for subsidization. Yet there is going to be a higher premium for them. As one of the gentlemen over here pointed out, young mothers and children are high risk groups.

Let us consider this. The morbidity rate, I think they call it, is highest for human beings when the wife in a young family is still in the child-bearing age.

Mr. Thompson: Mortality rate?

Mr. Bryden: Pardon? No, morbidity rate.

Mr. Thompson: Doctor Hannah states that medical expenses are highest for women of child-bearing age, and for children under the age of one year.

Mr. Bryden: Are you denying that statement?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Bryden: Well, then, you are just denying all the evidence that has been produced over 50 years. The morbidity curve goes up for women in the child-bearing stages and goes down again for obvious

reasons; the child-bearing itself will increase it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is just denying it. It is obvious that he is completely beyond his depth in this bill from beginning to end; he does not know what is in the bill; he does not know what the problems are that are being faced; and now he just denies facts that are well established. There is no point arguing with him.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What do you know about the cost ratio?

Mr. Bryden: Just to continue with the point that I was trying to make. Let us take a young family where the wife is in the child-bearing period and the family is growing; they will be one of the high risks. Let us say their income is \$4,200 a year; they will not qualify under your legislation. Say it is a family with two children; they will not qualify under your legislation for any subsidy at all. They will have to pay the entire premium themselves. And from anything the hon. Minister has said, in this debate, he has been remarkably coy when we try to get down to specifics.

He does not know, he says. He is bringing legislation before us, but he does not know what it will mean. From anything that has been said it would appear to me that the kind of premium that those people will be called upon to pay will be something like \$200, \$225 or \$250 a year. They simply will not be able to afford it. The hon. Minister's talk about setting maximums under this section of the bill is nothing but a lot of talk. It merely misleads the people. There will be no effective maximum. The hon. Minister, in this bill, has simply declared open season for the insurance companies to exploit the people and get what they can out of them.

If the hon. Minister is so concerned about cost, as he professes to be—every time we bring in an amendment to try to improve the bill a little bit, to try to make it a little more equitable, the hon. Minister always starts talking about costs—the first thing he should do is take out that 35 per cent cushion for the private insurance companies which he envisages in his rates. The cushion for profit and for selling costs.

Under a genuine public plan—universal plan—you do not need selling costs; you do not need profit; you can reduce the 35 or 40 per cent to two or three per cent for administration, especially since you already have a

well-qualified administrative establishment administering hospital insurance. It would just be a matter of expanding that establishment. So please let us not hear anything more from the hon. Minister about minimizing costs. He has put before us legislation that will put costs at the highest possible level; costs to the public Treasury; costs for the private individual as subscriber. We can do nothing about this, since the government with its steamroller majority has decreed that is the way it will be, but at least within that framework, let us try to provide some equity. Let us not penalize the people who happen to be more subject to sickness than others.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would urge hon. members to support the reasonable and intelligent amendment brought forth by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman: Those in favour of the amendment of Mr. MacDonald—

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, in speaking in favour of this amendment, I simply point out to the hon. Minister that he cannot, as he has attempted to do on every item we have discussed, have it both ways.

Yesterday, he stated in this House that the experience in Alberta—and I use his words for it, because I do not know myself what the experience in Alberta has been—would indicate that there are fewer than 15 per cent of the people applying under the maximum premium rate. Translated in terms of the population of the province of Ontario, that is some 1,000,000 people. The hon. Minister then proceeded to say that in the province of Ontario, because of the arrangements either to defray the whole of the cost for those people who are in dire straits, or to defray a portion of the cost for another 800,000 people who are in slightly less dire straits, there will be a few people in the province of Ontario who will pay that maximum rate.

If that is the case, and if the number is going to be as small as the hon. Minister indicated in his remarks, then surely the hon. Minister can now accept this amendment and include that group in the plan for all contracts so that the premium rate to those people, rather than being at the maximum, will be identical with the premium rate for other people in the province of Ontario. Then we can remove this iniquity of charging those people whose health is poor, more than those people who are in good health, and therefore doubly penalizing them, not only for having ill health, but because they will

not be able to earn the kind of money to pay the extra premium.

If the hon. Minister really accepts the basis that he put forward to this House yesterday, then he must accept the basis of this argument. If he does not accept it, and if in fact, there are a large number of people who are going to pay the maximum rate, then it is even more essential that those people should have the benefit of a uniform rate which is applicable to all the people in the province of Ontario.

I think the hon. Minister should comment on the complete inconsistency of the viewpoint which he expressed yesterday and I think he should comment specifically as to the reasons why he is not prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. leader of this party, by giving us some statement, other than his desire not to interfere at all in the business of the insurance companies.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. MacDonald's amendment, say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has no answer. He just sits there and takes it.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. MacDonald's amendment, please stand.

All opposed to Mr. MacDonald's amendment, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 25, the "nays" 50.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 18 is part of the bill.

We welcome students from grade 8, Hillcrest School, Owen Sound.

On section 19:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on section 19, we have in here in this section, once again, recognition of the private companies who serve particular groups, or as the government prefers to call them classes, at the expense of those who are unable to take advantage of being in these certain groups or classes. For example, PSI has a standard rate, pretty well based on the individual or family plan and it has that rate open to everybody.

It is true that a private company can come along and say, "We give better and cheaper rates than those non-profit plans. In other words, even though we, as a company, have to compete in an insurance market, and we

have to make a profit, we can still come along and sell policies to people at a lower rate." This might be true, if you are within a particular group. Again, lawyers can usually get their health insurance at a lower rate than the average person. Engineers have one of the lowest rates, certainly the lowest life insurance rates of anybody in the country, so that if you are lucky to be within a particular group, or a particular class, you can get insurance at a lower rate.

But what we should do, even under the present principle of this bill, is protect the non-profit plans. For example, in 1964, PSI opened its plan to anyone who wanted to join, and as a result, many of the aged and sick joined, and PSI lost in 1964, \$1,800,000. In so doing, PSI did a good public service, but at the same time it is obvious that such a plan cannot keep operating under the present system.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, a private insurance company that insists on having nothing to do with the aged or the sick can certainly come along and sell a plan to a certain class.

Even the insurance people call it a group plan, and I understand the hon. Minister says he uses that word "class" because that is what his legal advisers have told him. But certainly in the insurance trade and insurance business, the word "group" is accepted. I think the word "class" appeals more to his Tory mentality than the word "group."

But I would like to emphasize to the hon. members of this House, through you, Mr. Chairman, that by introducing this section as it is, we are again putting the non-profit operating plans at a disadvantage to the profit-making plans, and secondly, we are again putting the main risk, the main financial burden, on those who can least afford to pay—that is those who are older and those who are sick, because it is most difficult for them to get into a particular plan where they have any particular advantage.

Again, in this whole legislation, we are missing what is most important and that is to have a standard plan right across the board at a certain basic minimum premium. Once again this section is another further step to entrench the profit-making plans.

Therefore, I would like to move an amendment, Mr. Chairman, and the essence of that amendment is that we should not allow a class-risk basis. That is, in line 5 of subsection 1 of section 19, the word "not" shall be inserted between the words "shall" and "be," and also in line 5, the word "not" between the words "and" and "on" shall be deleted and inserted in its stead shall be the words

"shall be." Then subsection 1 would read as follows:

Any licensed carrier may from time to time but not more often than once in any 12-month period, adjust its subscription rates in respect of standard contracts in accordance with its normal business practice but any such adjustment shall not be on a class-risk basis and shall be on an individual or family basis and shall in no event exceed the maximum subscription rates for the time being in force.

I so move.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Trotter moves that section 19 be amended as follows: The word "not" shall be inserted between the words "shall" and "be" in line 5, and so in line 5, the word "not" between the words "and" and "on" shall be deleted and inserted in its stead shall be the words "shall be," so the subsection shall read:

Any licensed carrier may from time to time but not more often than once in any 12-month period adjust its subscription rates in respect of standard contracts in accordance with its normal business practice but any such adjustment shall not be on a class-risk basis and shall be on an individual or family basis and shall in no event exceed the maximum subscription rates for the time being in force.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite certain that the wording of the amendment conveys the meaning which I believe the hon. member for Parkdale intended. I am going to take it that the amendment is placed by the hon. member for Parkdale before the committee of the House means in substance that at all times there will be a single subscription rate for all individuals, a single subscription rate for all families of two, and a single subscription rate for all families of three or more, so that there will be in fact uniform rates for individuals, uniform rates for families of two and uniform rates for all families of three or more. We will then get away from this invidious distinction between the health risk of various individuals in our community and their having to pay different premium subscription rates.

The other item which I would comment on, and which is not included in this amendment, is that this section provides that the licensed carrier itself may change that subscription rate every 12 months without the approval of anybody at all, without anybody suggesting to him that he is not entitled to change it or that the change is not consistent with the purpose of the bill. It would be our

wish the the government would consider, of its own volition, to provide at least at the beginning of this section that any such changes should be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Without those words, it simply reinforces the conclusion which we have been driven to, that the hon. Minister is not prepared in any way at any time to interfere with the activities of licensed carriers.

My colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, has conclusively shown to this House that there is going to be one maximum subscription rate for each of those three groups that I have spoken about, and that that rate is going to be so high that in fact it is not going to impede, in any way, the area within which the licensed carrier may, in its own discretion, from time to time, every year if it chooses to do so, change the subscription rate.

For that reason, if my interpretation of the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale is correct, we will vote in favour of the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this. I hope that every hon. member of the Opposition will vote against the amendment if it means what I read it to mean. This amendment would really give rise to a jungle, nothing else, because it would mean that any carrier could charge every family a different premium structure. I think I am quite certain the hon. member does not mean that.

This means that no insurance carrier can alter a premium unless he does it on a class risk; he cannot single out one individual because of occupation or because of certain other reasons and put up his premium without involving the whole of the class. The way the hon. member has worded his amendment, it looks as if they are not to be allowed to do that, but they are to pick out each individual and therefore apply whatever premium structure within the maximum they like to each individual.

The hon. member for Riverdale suggested that we should make all changes in premium structure subject to the order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I am afraid I have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, my department has no authority to do that or to recommend that, because under the terms of this bill—and this is the only insurance bill outside of the hospital plan that we have anything to do with—we only have right of control over the maximum premium for the standard contract.

Mr. Bryden: We would like you to assume control.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have no control over general insurance.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify that. The idea of the amendment was that we wanted to do away with this class-risk basis, the fact that a private insurance company, even under this scheme, could cause a great deal of harm to a non-profit organization.

For example, even today it is possible for an individual or a family under certain circumstances to join PSI. This is what I had in mind. PSI has a certain standard rate. There are also those schemes where a private insurance company can set up a class group, such as lawyers or engineers, and it can certainly undersell PSI under certain circumstances. I realize this section has to operate on the principle that the private insurance companies are going to exist, which principle I do not like but we are bound by it and that has been decided by this House. Under these subsections we then must try to change the Act so that first of all we can have a standard plan across the province, and then also, if that fails, where these various groups, whether profit or non-profit, have an opportunity to sell insurance, we do not wish to put the non-profit schemes at a disadvantage, which this section as the government has it, makes it read.

But I completely agree with what the hon. member for Riverdale said. What we need in this province is a standard plan with a standard rate right across the board so that the expense of those who are the most sickly and the most aged is borne by the population as a whole.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's explanations of why these amendments we propose should not be adopted always require a little clarification because they usually succeed in confusing the issue. I may say that as far as we are concerned we are not voting for the specific words contained in any proposed amendment, we are voting for or against the principles in them. The government has all sorts of qualified draftsmen who can straighten out any drafting problems if the words do not exactly carry out the intention as expressed by the member moving the amendment. I think that is a matter of no consequence at all. The important thing is to vote on the principle of the amendment, and as we understand the intention of the hon. member's amendment, we think it is sound and we will vote for it.

I would like to make one or two observations on the hon. Minister's comments with regard to the freedom of action given to

licensed carriers to change their rates once every 12 months without let or hindrance. The hon. Minister says that he has no power to alter that situation; of course he has no power, but we are in the process of making a law. We can change the law so that he will have the power; that is our proposition. He seems to want to be in a position of being powerless vis-à-vis insurance companies. That is the import of the last dozen clauses we have dealt with in this bill, that the insurance companies and their representatives will have the power and the hon. Minister will have the excuse that he could not do anything about it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How can you get so mad at yourself so fast—no one's mad at you.

Mr. MacDonald: What an inane interjection!

Mr. Bryden: We can recognize that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, when he puts his mind to it, can be a master of inanity—if nothing else. He apparently is not interested in the bill. I can understand it; I would think that he would want to remove himself as far from it as possible. It seems that very few of the hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House are really very interested in trying to present any justification for this bill. The—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are not interested in obstruction!

Mr. Bryden: Well, I know your attitude. The trouble is that this bill is not going to give the people any medical insurance, and we are interested in getting them medical insurance. That is why we are making an effort to make even minor improvements in what is essentially a bad bill. We can see that it is a difficult effort. We are facing people with closed minds. Indeed, they are minds that never were open at any time; they are people who do not want to hear anything and who do not—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): We might listen to you if you made your language acceptable.

Mr. Bryden: I think my language is quite acceptable.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it is not, and what you are saying now is quite incorrect.

Mr. Bryden: Are you suggesting that anything I have said is not correct?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I certainly am.

Mr. Bryden: I suggest that a good many of those gentlemen over there have never given any consideration to what is in this bill. I cannot imagine that they would go along with the totally unacceptable principles that are in it, and the only explanation I can see is that they really do not know what is in it. Their silence indicated that they are not much interested.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment of the member for Parkdale say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of the amendment, please stand.

All those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 25, the "nays" 51.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment is lost and section 19 forms part of the bill.

On section 20:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on section 20, this is probably one of the most extraordinary sections in the whole of the bill and I suggest, sir, that it defies every principle of democratic government. Surely within government there is a responsibility by the Treasury benches to have some control over finances, and here we have a situation where there is almost a blank cheque to the doctors.

All of us respect the practice of medicine, but all of us realize that people are human and fallible. I am particularly concerned because there is one doctor in this Legislature—the hon. Minister of Health—and I was surprised that he had emphasized profit in the introduction of the bill, and had reasserted that he was for the principle of profit in health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not.

Mr. Thompson: You certainly did. When we were talking on the bill you said you were all for insurance companies and what was wrong with them making profits on this health scheme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I never said any such thing.

Mr. Thompson: We can quote from *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have told you time and time again I do not care whether they make a profit.

Mr. Thompson: You mentioned there is nothing wrong in connection with the insurance companies in health services making profit.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I never said such a thing; find it.

Mr. Thompson: I will, sir, and I will quote this to you. But I am saying that if you did not say that, you are certainly giving opportunity for it in this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Ah, you would like me to have said it.

Mr. Thompson: No, I would not. It is the last thing I would like you to have said.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You would like to get me to say it all wrong.

Mr. Thompson: I hate to see the clay feet that have been exposed on the hon. Minister of Health. I told him once before, there was a day when I looked on him as a radical reformer.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, not your type of reformation! We are reformers in this respect.

Mr. Thompson: Some of his statements, as I say, have shown his feet of clay.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I thought one time that he was on a white charger, steady in the saddle and pushing this government.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am always uncomfortable on a horse.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Do you know what has happened to you, and I say this before the Chairman leaves, with his biblical background, you remind me a little bit of Absalom—

An hon. member: Do not bring religion into it.

Mr. Thompson: Absalom was hung by his hair as he travelled through the forest, and I suggest to you, sir, that you have abdicated the responsibility you have in this section. You have given a blank cheque to the doctors. How can you possibly estimate your costs? Perhaps this is one of the reasons

for your silence on this. As a Scottish man with a Scottish background, it would seem to me that would be the one thing you would be coming out with—the cost of this, the cost of premiums, and so on. There is still a blur about all that. How can the other carriers possibly estimate the costs?

There is nothing to prevent, nothing whatsoever to prevent the Ontario medical association from doubling or tripling the doctors' fee schedule on May 31, 1966. And you may say they would never do it! I come back to the point again that they increased it—10 per cent to 20 per cent, as I understand—in the past year. Some people have said, and I am sure this is unfair to them, that one of the reasons why the college of physicians and surgeons increased the fees was in anticipation of the Hagey commission—

An hon. member: Straighten that out, it was the OMA.

Mr. Thompson: —and because of your bill coming in. I would suggest, sir, that this creates a very real problem.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have another amendment?

Mr. Thompson: Yes. I am trying to think of some analogy to this. If the government were to pass, for example, a bill saying that 1,000,000 people can be provided with television sets and then it said to the television operators or the people who fix television sets, "You fellows go out and you have carte blanche to fix these sets all over the place. As for the fees you will charge, we will pay the fees for the 1,000,000 people, and you can raise the fees when you want to with no advisory board to check on it. Just you go ahead on it," would you not consider that irresponsibility? It is because of this, because of the carte blanche to the people who are going to be carrying through on this bill that they can raise fees to whatever they want at any time, that I move that section 20 be amended by adding subsection (4) to read as follows:

No increase in fees at any time will be enforced until approved by the medical services insurance council.

May I say, sir, that if, as we had hoped in the previous amendment, the medical services insurance council had had some of the representation as suggested in a previous amendment, I would still have a greater feeling of security that there could then be an examination and a justification for any raise in fees which might take place. But because

that has been lost, we still make a last-ditch stand in the hope that this amendment might come through. I argue with the hon. Minister on this and I suggest to him as a reasonable man, taking the example of the TV operator, that he knows that is wrong and surely he realizes that in this section it must have been an omission on his part. I am sure he can see the necessity for the amendment which I propose.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am attempting to adapt what I would like to have presented to the House to what the hon. leader of the Opposition has moved. He has, in his way, incorporated two of the three points that I wanted to make, and with that amendment, presumably I will have to rest content. I have a third point that I would like to suggest in a moment in the hope that perhaps he can incorporate it, since our rules permit of only one amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I read through this bill I have some difficulty in deciding which is the worst section, because one is almost inclined to purple passages in talking about some of them in terms of their effect. But in my view this is the worst of the whole lot, not only for the reasons the hon. leader of the Opposition has presented in that it makes a travesty of all of the normal controls in the expenditure of public money, but for two or three other reasons.

In the first place, the bill states, for example, that the schedule of fees will be the schedule of fees at the time the bill goes into effect. He has intimated to us on another occasion that it is likely to be July 1, 1966. In other words, you have an open invitation here for another increase in fees, and do not have any illusions it may well come.

An hon. member: He wants it.

Mr. MacDonald: Indeed, he is asking for it. It is an invitation for another increase in the OMA schedule of fees between now and July 1, 1966, if this is the time that the bill is to go into effect. That is the first point.

The second point is that this bill is now going to increase the payment to the doctors—at least those who are in PSI, if not in some of the insurance companies—to 100 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees rather than 90 per cent. On what basis any Minister of the Crown, and particularly a man who is a medical doctor and is almost in a position of conflict of interests vis-à-vis his colleagues in the profession, can come into this House and say that what the doctors themselves have been content with—a 90 per cent payment on the OMA schedule of fees—is going to be

increased so that out of the public Treasury he places \$10 million in addition to their already highest incomes in the province of Ontario, I do not know.

The latest annual report of PSI—actually it is 1963, there may be a 1964 figure—indicates \$52 million was paid to the doctors out of PSI and this is on the basis of an 85 per cent OMA schedule of fees. Now it is going to 100 per cent, so that you hand them now something in excess of \$60 million. The figure for 1964 and 1965 is likely to be up at \$65 million or \$70 million, because there has been this kind of an increase.

I ask the hon. Minister, how can he justify this kind of thing? How can he justify in conjunction with this the fact that 250,000 people are on medical welfare in the province of Ontario, to whom this government, through The Department of Public Welfare, has been paying a nominal amount—\$1.25 a month, \$15 a year, a total outlay of approximately \$2 million? As was pointed out in the Hagey report, they pay doctors for precisely the same services, no more work at all. If this bill covers these people who are unfortunate enough to have to be on medical welfare, the doctors' income will jump, from this area alone, from approximately \$2 million to \$12.9 million. In other words, once again out of the public Treasury, you are going to dip in and hand to the doctors an extra \$10 million.

The simple fact of the matter is that this increase is a gratuitous handout from the public Treasury to a profession which is now the highest paid profession. I have said many times—I have no objection to it being the highest paid profession—I know of no other profession that deserves to be the highest paid profession in view of its contribution to human needs—but the proposition is that the doctors are now receiving on an average in excess of \$19,000 a year, yet we should dip into the public Treasury and hand them on a silver platter, overnight, for precisely the same work, something in excess of \$20 million more. If this is a Scotsman I am talking to, I do not know what sort of renegade Scotsman he is, because he certainly is not protecting the public Treasury.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You are using dirty adjectives.

Mr. MacDonald: I am using them in reference to what I thought was one of the finest qualities of the Scot. He would guard not only his own money, but particularly, when he holds it in the position of trust, as a Minister of the Crown, the public's money.

What justification, I ask the hon. Minister, what conceivable justification—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I heard you the first time.

Mr. MacDonald: What conceivable justification can he give to this House for altering existing procedures so that he hands to the doctors that amount more of money? Mr. Chairman, there is very good reason as to why in PSI they fixed the figure at 85 per cent, very good reason.

An hon. member: Ninety per cent.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, 90 per cent or 85 per cent, whichever figure it happens to be at the time. The very good reason is that if you have paid all of your bills and you have no poor bills that you have to chase, or none that are not going to be paid at all, you will end up with as much money in pocket as though you were getting 100 per cent from those who pay and do not get from some other, if I may use this horrible term, bad risk from the doctor's point of view. There is justification for the 85 per cent or 90 per cent, which varies in various jurisdictions.

This government not only is solicitous to the insurance company, but it is solicitous to the medical profession. In fact, months ago, when the Hagey report came down, this is what the *Globe and Mail* said, the government is far more interested in meeting the needs of the insurance companies and the medical profession than they are in meeting the needs of the people of the province of Ontario. This was their reference to the Hagey report, and I hope after the revelations of the last few days, as we go through this clause by clause, that the *Globe and Mail* will be convinced that this bill is subject to exactly the same criticism as the criticism they attributed to the Hagey report when it came down.

Now there is a final point, Mr. Chairman. It just makes a shambles of the whole government's alleged approach on maximum premiums. When we were talking a few moments ago the hon. Minister stated that income must match outgo. That is sensible, but will the hon. Minister tell this House how he is going to make income match outgo? He has set down in this section, that the OMA schedule of fees shall be whatever is in effect at the time the bill comes into effect and it will remain that way for two years. Beyond that, the OMA regains complete freedom to change its fees whenever it wishes without negotiating with anybody.

Now how is the government going to fix maximums—maximum premiums that are

meaningful—when the doctors are going to be able to increase their schedule of fees and in effect raid the Treasury, deplete the funds, so that the income will not be able to match your outgo? You have actually no control over it at all.

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, if there is one organization in this country which has shown that it is ruthless in terms of looking after its own interests, it is the medical profession. Somebody at one time commented that they act just like the teamsters. It was at a time when public opinion was rather critical of the teamsters in their actions in protecting their own interests, and this is what the medical profession has done. They did it in Saskatchewan and some hon. members cheered for an action of which they should have been ashamed. I expect maybe they learned their lesson and they will never resort to it again.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that the hon. leader of the Opposition has brought in says that any fee schedule change will have to be subject to the medical council. This is an alternative way of meeting the proposition that is now in the bill, namely, that it will be whatever happens to be the schedule of the fees when the bill comes into effect. Quite frankly, I would like to see it set as the schedule of fees as of June 1, 1965. Why should this House, under the leadership of this government, in effect, invite the OMA to introduce another increase in fees before the medical council is set up? This is what they have done in effect.

Also, presumably, under the amendment the hon. leader of the Opposition has introduced they will not have freedom to do as they please after the two years without negotiating with anybody. It will have to be okayed by the medical services council, so that in a fashion the two points that I have in mind have been met by what the hon. leader of the Opposition has stated.

But I come back to the one that has not been met, and that is: Why, when the doctors are going to be paid out of this fund, should you pay 100 per cent of the schedule of OMA fees, when they themselves have not followed this practice in their own plan, PSI, up until now? Why should you have this additional handout of the public Treasury? I am wondering whether the hon. leader of the Opposition, in the fashion that has been followed on a number of times to keep within the rules of our House, would add to his amendment that the payment should be made on the basis of 85 per cent, rather than the 100 per cent OMA schedule of fees? I am sorry, 90 per cent!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would concur completely with the amendment that you make on this. I have been looking again just at PSI rates and I talked to people previously about why these rates are so high. Again I re-emphasize that to a large extent it has been because of the sudden change of schedule of fees by the college of physicians and surgeons and the OMA.

May I say also, to the hon. Minister, if he read Joan Hollobon's articles as thoroughly as I am sure he has, he knows that doctors can be as fallible as anyone else; and he has read where one doctor had made \$80,000. I was talking to someone a couple of weeks ago, someone connected with the medical profession, in fact a doctor himself, and he told me that in Toronto there are 200 doctors who are making over \$100,000 a year.

I suggest to you, sir, that you did say that you had no worries about profit being made in connection with health. I want to quote to you your remarks on this. This is on page 3529. Here is the hon. Minister of Health giving carte blanche to the doctors. This is the kind of philosophy he has and I quote him:

I really cannot become worried about whether the insurance companies make a profit or not.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. Thompson: You are referring to health services on this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not care if they do not make a profit. I have no interest in their profit. I said this in the context of stating to the House that the indemnity carriers have undersold the non-profit plans. If they did that and still made a profit then I think they deserve to do business, because the non-profit plan, as has been rightly accepted by the hon. members of the Opposition, is the plan to be advocated for our people; if they can buy it more cheaply than that, more power to them.

Mr. Thompson: I would suggest, sir, that if you are concerned about people buying health coverage more cheaply, then you should have read that Hall commission far more thoroughly.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said he has an abhorrence of Saskatchewan; you should have checked that emotion and looked at Saskatchewan and looked at the fee of \$24 in comparison with the fee you are contemplating.

All right, I am repeating this and repeating it—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, it is not, that is only a part of it!

Mr. Thompson: Well what are you doing? Do you mean to say that you are suggesting in this bill that by the payment of \$178—or it could be \$200, we do not know—you are suggesting the people will get complete health coverage? There are great gaps in your whole approach, great gaps in connection with health coverage that they pay for, and still they have to pay for hospital services. There are a number of areas where, by compulsion—let me emphasize that—I am proud to be able to contribute through my taxes to pay for research, to pay for hospitals. The premiums alone do not pay. I am proud to pay for a number of the research advances and I have to pay for it. I hate this hypocrisy of saying that there is no compulsion in connection with health.

I simply say to you that I agree thoroughly with what the hon. leader of the new party has said. As far as I am concerned, and I realize it is very difficult to know which is the worst section in this ridiculously weak Act, but I suggest this one is.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Eglinton.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the Opposition has suggested that there has been a doctor who has earned some \$80,000 yearly. He has referred to some doctors in the Toronto area that have earned over \$100,000 yearly; he did not tell the House whether it was on the basis of the OMA scale or not. The truth of the matter is that by having a schedule we are restricting the doctors.

Mr. Bryden: They are the highest paid group in the country.

Mr. Reilly: Yes. Of 11,000 doctors that we have in the province, 8,000 of them now operate under the OMA schedule and 3,000 operate beyond the OMA schedule and without it. What we are doing is saying to them that if they want to come in and operate under this plan, they must adhere to a schedule.

Mr. Thompson: He made them change the schedule.

Mr. Reilly: They changed it. Two years from now you suggest perhaps there could be a change. I am suggesting to you that, if there is a change two years from now,

what would actually happen is that there would be an outcry for a public, universal, compulsory scheme throughout the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I assure the hon. member for Eglinton, who is a very fair man, that the word that they had changed it in the last year—they raised it 20 per cent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party has suggested that perhaps we should continue to serve the people who are on welfare on the basis that we have done formerly.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not say that.

Mr. Reilly: He has suggested it; he did not say it in so many words, but he has suggested that they now receive somewhere between \$2 million and \$3 million, and under this proposal, they will receive between \$11 million and \$12 million. Now I am suggesting to the House, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps the treatment they received formerly was not as complete—not nearly as complete a service, as what they are going to receive under a universal scheme such as provided here.

Surely the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party is not suggesting that people should come with their hands out, and ask that people should give of their skilled services at a lower rate. Surely the professional men are entitled to the rate, whatever the rate may be, whether they are dealing with people on welfare or people who are receiving large amounts of money for their services.

Surely the New Democratic Party leader will agree with me, and with other hon. members of the House, that they are not entitled to a lesser service because they happen to be on welfare—

Mr. MacDonald: In the framework of the right kind of Medicare policy, your argument would be right, but not with this patchwork plan.

Mr. Reilly:—and on all services. So under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, the only reason I rose to my feet was because I heard one of the hon. members here say that perhaps the hon. Minister had some conflict of interests and I thought that, under the circumstances, nobody in this House could associate me with a conflict of interests in the interests of the medical or insurance business.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would be inclined to say this, that perhaps nobody has done more for the doctors and for the insurance companies than the hon. members of the New Democratic Party. They say that we have created a bonanza for them. It has been done through the aid of the New Democratic Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): How do you explain that?

Mr. Reilly: The hon. member for Sudbury asked me to explain it and I would be delighted to. In 1950 I think we had 25 per cent of the people here who were covered by some kind of surgical or medical insurance. By 1962 we had 75 per cent of the people covered. This was brought about because of creating a need in the minds of people that they should be covered from the standpoint of health insurance; and in this way members of the NDP have contributed, innocently or intentionally—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: I shall be delighted to relay those remarks to the House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: When the hon. leader of the Opposition says to include us, I cannot help but think back to his statement a few minutes ago about Absalom who rode through the forest and got caught up in his hair, because this is the only Liberal Party in Canada which is talking in these terms today and so the horse of the Liberal Party has gone out from under the hon. leader of the Opposition and he is hanging there. However, we are glad to see him hanging there, and we are glad to see him working in this way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as this section 20 is concerned, it is the culmination, I think, of the slickest operation that the doctors of Ontario have ever performed, and today, as they are scrubbing up after that operation, they are rubbing their hands in glee at the way they have been able to use their scalpels and implant into the mind of the hon. Minister and the hon. members of the Treasury benches the idea that they should have 100 per cent of their schedule fees all along the line.

I say this is the slickest operation because I do not think that the general practitioners across the board have ever thought that they wanted that. I talked to a good many of my doctor friends and they would be quite happy to continue the scale that PSI is paying.

Even today they still have to do quite a bit of charity work, work for which they get no pay. People come in in good faith, who are not covered by insurance or PSI, and the doctor sends the bill and he just does not get paid. He has to put it into the hands of a collection agency and the agency has expense and trouble and bother. It means that if this plan comes in and they get all their bills paid, it will cut down their expense, and so they would be quite happy to have the bills pro rated, as they are pro rated today.

One of my doctor friends told me the other night about a payment on account from the medical welfare fund. He was getting 85 per cent of his fee for work which he had done and he felt he was doing pretty well and was rather pleased with the kind of service that he was getting through that fund. But these people now are going to be transferred to the so-called "free" section of the plan and the 100 per cent is coming in.

Mr. Chairman, it just does not seem to be commonsense for us to pass legislation which puts the stamp of approval on the 100 per cent, because I do not think that most of the doctors themselves would ask for this. There is no question that if the hon. Minister went to the rank and file of the Ontario medical association and said that he was willing to pay them 85 per cent of scale, there would be no objection to this.

I would hope that some bargaining may be done in the future in this respect. Perhaps some of it may be done by the hon. Minister, and certainly it will be done by industry and by the other plans of this nature. But to enshrine in legislation this kind of scale, seems to me to be extremely uncalled for and the kind of thing this Legislature should not be guilty of at this moment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that this amendment be supported by this House and that certainly the fee schedule in operation now should be adopted as the one which is going to be carried through—for at least the first two years—and that the 85 per cent feature be incorporated into the legislation. As I said before, I do not think there is going to be any great objection from the rank and file of the doctors if this is done.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and perhaps he will correct me if I am wrong, it proposes to place the earnings of the medical profession under the control of a government agency. For my own information, I would be interested to know what

other major groups outside the public service have their income controlled by a government agency. It seems to me that we would be substantially placing the doctors in a position different from other members of our community, and a position which might be regarded as intolerable.

So far as the points made by the hon. member for York South are concerned, I suspect that the Ontario medical association will be quite prudent in the determination of its fee schedule in the future because I think it would recognize that if it was not, it might bring many of the carriers, both private and doctor-sponsored and commercial, into economic chaos and ruin, which would put its own profession very much more quickly under the direct gun of this Legislature.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I hope the hon. member for Yorkview, who now has the hon. leader of the Opposition attached by the hair to his particular limb, will not saw it off.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Health, through you, has the medical profession of this province requested that after this plan comes into effect, they be paid 100 per cent of the fees, whereas at the present time they are only paid 90 per cent through PSI? Have they requested this?

If they have, and held a stone over the hon. Minister's head, I could see where he would be willing to attempt to fight this legislation through this Legislature. But if they have not requested, and I doubt very much if they have, then I would say that there is no conceivable excuse why this government should take money from the taxpayers of this province and give it to the medical profession, who already are the highest-paid profession in this province. Like other hon. members in this Legislature, I have no quarrel as to why they should not be the highest, because I think that they do a wonderful duty to mankind as a whole, but on the other hand they have been quite content up to the moment in getting 90 per cent of the fees as laid down in PSI. Why all of a sudden the taxpayers of this province should have to pay an additional 10 per cent through the grace of the hon. Minister of Health of this province is absolutely beyond me. Last year, as I understand it, approximately \$50 million was paid out by PSI to the doctors of this province and the hon. Minister of Health this afternoon suggested that \$55 million be given to them instead of the \$50 million.

This may be all right in the city of Toronto, where you talk in big figures and big incomes are made, but I appeal to the rural members of the Conservative Party—I appeal to members, for example, like the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde), who comes from a rural area, or the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil), or many of the rest here. When you go back to your small towns and villages, where the doctor is already making \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year and is a highly respected citizen of that area, say to the people that you represent, "They have not even asked for an additional ten per cent of the fees, but we, the Conservative government of this province, are going to give it to them, the poor medical profession. Why, my goodness, we should cry for them."

They are making more money than they know what to do with now, but this Minister of Health and this government is going to take the money, particularly in these cases where the fees are going to be exceptionally high, and by giving the doctors an extra ten per cent, which I fully believe they have not even asked for—the hon. Minister of Health certainly has not suggested that they have asked for it, so far this afternoon—he is going to make the fees additionally higher than the figures quoted for last year, by giving an additional \$5 million.

If I cannot get to the heart of the government or those hon. members who represent the city of Toronto or the highly industrialized areas, I say to you rural members who represent the farmers of this province, whose net income is in the neighbourhood of \$1,500 a year, and who represent the poor areas of this province, have you got the gumption to go back to your people and say, "The doctors have not asked for this extra ten per cent but we are going to give it to them anyway, and you poor people, who are the high risks, are going to pay this money."

Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely inconceivable to me. I hope that the hon. Minister of Health will tell us in this instance he has made a mistake. Evidently in all the other sections that we have had in this bill, he has not made one single error, but I want him to admit that he is not infallible and that in this one instance he has made one mistake, and that the doctors, who are the highest paid people in the province today, are going to be very happy by getting the 90 per cent fees that they got last year. Particularly do I emphasize this when I am positive that they never asked for the 100 per cent fee in the first place.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, there are two things that the hon. members of the Conservative government in this House like to do, and like some of their friends want to be able to do, and that is to set their own income levels. Certainly, I have heard no one of the Opposition yet say that he felt that the medical profession was making too much money, but what I take the emphasis as and the complaint as, is that they should not have the right to increase their rates, the government should not give them this right without justification and without putting to the public the reasons why they should have the increase.

Certainly, there are groups in this province and in this country today that have to go through lengthy steps of negotiations, even to the point of taking economic power on a picket line, to gain a few cents out of the product that they produce. This is all part of our democratic system.

In the past two years, PSI raised its cost twice. I came before this House in January, 1964, on the first increase and asked the hon. Prime Minister at least to have an investigation and show good cause and justification for the increase. Of course, the answer we got in so many words, was that the government, the hon. Prime Minister of this province, did not wish to interfere in the pricing of a free-enterprise system.

But I feel that it is the responsibility of government at least to give some direction and some control, if necessary, to a monopoly and to a group which has so much importance to our society. I have said before that I have not complained about the income of the medical profession, but the time must come, when we are going into the whole field of medical insurance and into the broad field of comprehensive coverage in the coming years, that there has to be some control and direction as to what the medical profession and the insurance carriers can charge for their services.

If other groups in our society have to be open to public scrutiny in gaining a fair share of the product, then everyone should be under the same responsibility. The Hydro workers in Toronto at the present time, who have been bargaining for some months, are now in the likelihood of being faced with a dictatorial approach—compulsory arbitration. I still have hopes that it will not be necessary, but this is what one group of our society has to do to gain an increase in its purchasing power, and others just have the right to establish their own rates and no one seems to want to make them justify the rates.

I think the time has come when all sections of our society must be responsible for what they charge to the consuming public.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, this section, like all others in the bill, cannot be read alone; it must be read in the context of the other sections that are referable to it. Of course, this one must be read in relation to subsection 5 of section 4, and subsection 2 of section 18. I would say that the statute is positively neurotic—a good medical term—about changes in maximum subscription rates.

There will be few present who will be able to tell me of instances where the price of any service or product has gone down in the last 25 years. The trend, of course, is to increase prices. But one will note, of course, that there is an interaction between the amount paid to doctors—who are the very warp and woof of the medical care plan—and their services and the subscription rates charged by the licensed carriers. Indeed, in anticipation of increases in maximum subscription rates, I will never get over the startled feeling I had when I read subsection 5 of section 4, where it says in mandatory terms—not permissive—that the corporation shall recommend to the council from time to time changes in maximum subscription rates, they are required to do it by law. If they sit silent and do not recommend changes, then somebody is going to say to them: "You are not doing your job; you are not obeying the very definite and specific provisions of section 4."

Then again, in section 18, there is a little window-dressing, because they put in there that they cannot raise the rates more than once in any year; in other words, they are saying: "Boys, we must have a little restraint." Now we come to section 20 and it clearly anticipates that, after the two-year period, there are going to be changes in the schedule of fees of the association from time to time. In other words, they are going to go up. There is going to be an ascending curve over the years, I suppose, as the Ontario medical association feels that it is paid inadequately for the services that it performs.

Now, I say to the hon. member for Forest Hill that it does not readily come to my mind whereby other professions are regulated in the amount of income they shall be able to earn. But I do say this to him, that my learned friend, the hon. member for Downsview, and myself strove mightily this winter to have a regulation imposed upon the amount of income that lawyers earn from the munificence of this government. And we are successful to

the extent that the report of the public accounts committee tabled yesterday recommends certain procedures whereby we shall regulate the amount that professionals may charge from the public purse.

I do not think it is offensive to good sense, to morality or to good economics, for the public Treasury to regulate any person who is drawing benefits from it. That is protection of the public moneys; that is exercising care and restraint upon their squandering. We cannot treat the public moneys with the sense of lavishing them on any professional group. So we merely say to the doctors, in accordance with the amendment of my hon. leader, that if you are going to be paid from the public purse, then we have the right to exercise a limit on the amount of payment that you may take for your services.

Mr. Dunlop: Does the hon. member restrict the amendment so that it applies only to the first section?

Mr. Sopha: No, to the whole thing, but—

Mr. Dunlop: Both public and private?

Mr. Sopha: Both public and private, because they are inextricably interlocked here.

Mr. Dunlop: Would the hon. member do that with the lawyers, too?

Mr. Sopha: Indeed.

Mr. Dunlop: I am glad to hear the hon. member say that.

Mr. Sopha: In any system of legal aid, I would not feel it was a proper system unless there was a limit prescribed by the guardians of the public purse. Indeed, I believe that. Let me tell my friend, the hon. member for Forest Hill, by illustration, that I pointed out the payment of \$11,000 to a law firm downtown to draft the statute of this Legislature. I just wish they would pay \$11,000 to some law firm to write a better one than this.

Mr. Chairman: As many as are in favour—

Mr. Bryden: No, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid this is far from over. We have, for the past number of sessions, been dealing with those parts of the bill that string the public up so that they can be plucked by the insurance companies; here we have come to the \$20 million melon for the medical profession. Indeed, my hon. leader understates the case when he says it is a \$20 million melon. He indicates how two phases of this proposal by themselves will provide the doctors with \$20 million that they are not now getting. But there are additional benefits that they will

get out of this, including those that they can get simply by jacking up their fee schedule, and they can do that almost without let or hindrance.

The hon. member for Eglinton was somewhat concerned that the doctors should receive a lower fee for the so-called charity cases than they receive for others. Well, let us face facts, Mr. Chairman. The doctors have always made a public parade of the fact that for many years they do a certain amount of charity work; they take either low fees or no fees for a certain amount of charity work. Their fee schedule makes allowance for that fact. They set their fees higher than they would otherwise do in order to cover their charity work. This is obvious because, under the present fee schedule they now have and with the charity work they now do, they are by all odds the highest paid group in the community.

So what we are proposing—at least what the government is proposing—is that the doctors should now be paid 100 per cent of that schedule, not only for non-charity cases, but for the charity cases, too—giving no allowance for the fact that the schedule of fees was unnecessarily high in order to make allowance for the charity work. Furthermore, a fee schedule of this kind in a free enterprise situation necessarily has to take account of bad debts. It is higher than it would otherwise be if there were not any bad debts to be written off. This is necessary in any form of pricing.

The medical coverage that will be paid for by insurance, whether it is through the public subsidization portion of this bill or through private plans, eliminates the risk of bad debts. There are no bad debts. Yet the government envisages that the doctors will be able to continue a schedule of fees put unnecessarily high in order to cover bad debts, even when the bad debts are eliminated. The thing is completely preposterous, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dunlop: I am glad the hon. member recognizes there will not be any bad debts; that there is going to be coverage and they will be eliminated.

Mr. Bryden: For anybody who will be covered. There are some people who still will not be covered. But this bill relates to the people who will be covered. It says for the people covered by insurance or by government subsidization that there will be payment of 100 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees. This is what we are talking about. I trust that the hon. member for

Forest Hill can follow it this far, that we are talking only about those for whom there will be no bad debts.

There will, of course, continue to be large groups in the community who will not be able to afford any sort of coverage under this bill and I am afraid a substantial number of bad debts will arise in their case. But in their case I assume the doctors will continue to charge 100 per cent of the OMA schedule. We are talking about what they will be permitted to charge for the insured part of the coverage. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would say that my hon. leader and the hon. leader of the Opposition were both a little soft when they agreed that this amendment will be in terms of 90 per cent of the schedule of fees; that is what PSI is now paying.

In the province of Saskatchewan, where a complete plan is in effect and where practically all medical bills are paid under the public insurance plan, payment is on the basis of 85 per cent of the schedule of fees; not 90 but 85 per cent. The doctors, on the basis of 85 per cent of their schedule of fees, are making more money than they ever made in their lives before. In fact, in the first year of operation of the plan, the average income of doctors in Saskatchewan went up by more than \$2,000 a year. As a matter of fact, doctors in Saskatchewan are now the highest paid doctors in the entire country; they are higher paid even than the doctors in Ontario. This is on the basis of 85 per cent of the Saskatchewan schedule of fees, which is lower than the Ontario schedule of fees, for which we are proposing that 100 per cent should be paid.

The melon the doctors get is greatly understated as being merely \$20 million. I would not hazard a guess, but I can tell you that it will be a lot more than \$20 million which will be simply handed to them on a platter for doing exactly the same work as they are now doing. How the government can justify that sort of a proposition is beyond my comprehension. I believe that we should provide that, when this bill comes into effect, the payment should be on the basis of 85 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees now in force. Let us avoid the ridiculous pitfall which is now in the bill, under which the OMA can jack up its fees before the bill comes into force and we will be stuck with them—both in the subsidized portion of the plan and in the part that comes under private insurance plans of any kind.

This, of course, brings us to the other side of the question, Mr. Chairman, and that is

the unrestricted power given to the doctors to determine their own incomes. Now somebody was weeping bitter tears about the poor doctors, and about the proposal that they should have to do some negotiating about their incomes; that there should be some restraint on their powers to simply gouge the public for whatever they want. I am suggesting to whatever hon. member it was that doctors are perhaps among the few remaining groups in the community who can determine their own pay without reference to anybody whatsoever.

I can assure the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) that he would not have any trouble at all, with respect to the Toronto Hydro employees, if it were possible for them simply to write a ticket saying that their wages and working conditions would be so and so. If they could do that without let or hindrance, without having to persuade anybody, else of the justice of their claim or without having to negotiate with anybody, there would never have been any difficulty in labour negotiations at all.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): What has that got to do with the bill?

Mr. Bryden: There would not be any difficulty with labour negotiations anywhere if the employees could simply write their own ticket. This is what we are proposing here. The hon. Minister made a great noise, in his introductory speech, about difficulties in Britain, Belgium and Italy between the medical profession and the public as represented by the government. Certainly there have been difficulties. The difficulties, incidentally, have been pretty well straightened out, except perhaps in Belgium, and I am afraid in Belgium there are many bases of difficulties. The country is going through quite a critical situation generally and there are difficulties of many kinds. But in Britain, the problem—

Mr. Chairman: Stick to the clause in the bill.

Mr. Bryden: That is exactly what I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, if you would care to follow me. I can assure you that I am right within the framework of the section.

Mr. Chairman, there would not be any difficulty in Britain either if the government there was as irresponsible as this one and said to the doctors that they can simply write their own ticket, and can declare what their income will be, with the government simply acquiescing without any consideration at all. It is a situation that simply cannot be toler-

ated. No other country in the world gives that sort of unrestricted authority to one group of people.

I can tell the hon. Minister that he might as well forget about even this bill, because they will wreck it in pretty short order by their inordinate demands. As a matter of fact, many hon. members have said that they do not think doctors are overpaid. I think they are, right now. I think that the last increase in their schedule of fees was nothing but a gouge of the public, yet they got away with it. Nobody says boo to them.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): I knew we would get this out of you sooner or later.

Mr. Bryden: Nobody says boo to them. The last increase put them about \$3,000 a year, on average, ahead of the next highest professional group, namely, the lawyers. The doctors were already the highest-paid group but they were not satisfied. They gouged the public for another 20 per cent and the hon. Minister is now suggesting that they should have a free hand to gouge the public still further.

He has got to face up to the fact that if he is going to get involved in medical care insurance at all—and he has got involved in this bill at least to the extent of covering the cost for certain subsidized groups—he is going to have to start negotiating with the doctors. The doctors have got to face up to the fact that in this day and age they must negotiate with public authorities. They can squawk all they like about it, but they are going to have to do it. We can no longer tolerate a group which recognizes no accountability to anybody except itself—a small, entrenched group that can simply impose its will on the public, and the public can do nothing about it. That day must come to an end, Mr. Chairman.

We saw what happened in Saskatchewan, where this small, entrenched group put a knife to the throat of the public, in an effort to overthrow what the duly constituted authorities of the province, the properly constituted government, had enacted. This was not a strike; it was a mutiny, it was a challenge to constituted authority, such as I do not remember having seen before in this country. That is the type of group we are dealing with. They will be difficult to deal with, we might as well face it. They have always been difficult to deal with. They do not believe that anybody counts except themselves. Under those circumstances, we must face the fact we are going to have to deal with them as best we can. But we will not

deal with them by simply running away from them, letting them write their own ticket.

Under this bill as it stands, before it comes into effect, they can make their own requisition on the public Treasury. Then for two years they will be restrained but after that they will be able to write annual requisitions on the public Treasury—just write out a note saying that they will requisition such and such an amount of money from the public Treasury. There is no provision whereby anybody can suggest that what they might do is unreasonable, or that they should sit down and talk it over. They can just go ahead and do whatever they like.

Mr. Chairman, this section alone is enough to condemn the entire bill. It gives an arbitrary power to an irresponsible group. I use the word "irresponsible" in the sense that they are not accountable to anybody, they are not responsible to anybody. It gives an arbitrary power to that group, and no law should give such power to any group.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he ought to accept the amendment proposed jointly by the hon. leader of the Opposition and my own leader. He should accept that as the very least that could be regarded as reasonable. I would like to see it written out in this bill that there will be a procedure for negotiating changes in fees that will be paid to the medical profession. I think we should set that out. Let us face it, the medical profession should be like other people. They should have to negotiate with the parties that have to pay the bill, as to just how much is reasonable.

Mr. Chairman: The member is being repetitious on the matter. There is only one amendment permitted; that amendment is what we are dealing with.

Mr. Bryden: That is exactly what I have been dealing with, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that you have been over it several times.

Mr. Bryden: If you would desist from interruptions that really have no relevancy to the matter at all—there has been no repetition here, Mr. Chairman. We are dealing with what is unquestionably a matter of—

Mr. Chairman: Speak to the clause, and the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: —the most extreme import to the people of Ontario, a section under which they can be gouged in a most irresponsible way—

Mr. Chairman: Now that is repetition. You mentioned—

Mr. Bryden: —and the hon.—

Mr. Chairman: Order, Order! You have mentioned the word "gouge" ten times already and I am simply pointing out that it is repetition. You have permission to mention it, but this is continual repetition, using the same language.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I have also used the word "and" and the word "the" and the word "but," even more than that and I—

Mr. Chairman: If you continue on the clause, you can proceed, otherwise I will have to rule you out of order.

Mr. Bryden: That is what I have been talking about all along, but it is a little difficult, Mr. Chairman, to retain my train of thought, when I am constantly interrupted. I assure you that I was on the verge—

Mr. Chairman: I can assure you you have used up a great deal of patience or you would have been interrupted previously. Proceed, if you have any further argument on the clause.

Mr. Bryden: I have never been talking about anything but the clause, or the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What are you talking about now?

Mr. Bryden: I am suggesting to you and to the House that the clause and the amendment are of the greatest significance to the people of Ontario. They are worthy of extended discussion. The principle we have before us now is one that ought to be discussed at substantial length.

Mr. Chairman: You have already said that several times.

Mr. Bryden: I suggest that you should retain your patience, Mr. Chairman. I appeal to the hon. Minister of Health to reconsider the section as he has it, in the light of the amendment that has been presented to him. I am sure that if he would reconsider it with a view to its full import, he would be prepared to accept the principle embodied in the amendment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in support of the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the

Opposition. It would require the Ontario medical association to negotiate with a board set up under The Department of Health before any increases in payments would be made, as provided by this bill.

We know that there have been many objections in the past on behalf of those in the medical profession to any scheme whereby there would be government involvement in a prepaid medical insurance scheme. These objections have been based on an interference with doctor-patient relationships, the fact that no one is going without proper medical care and so on. Yet the government must surely be aware that one of the strongest objections on behalf of the doctors has been associated with their fear that a government body would be empowered to interfere with their professional affairs.

The government has been very careful to see to it that there would be no professional involvement in the affairs of medicine. As a matter of fact, it has bent over backwards, I would say, to see to it that the doctors are going to run their own business in this regard, at least their professional business. Nevertheless, it is up to the government, which is the representative of the people, to safeguard the public interest when it comes to the large amount of public moneys, and other moneys as well, that will be paid to the medical profession.

I am sure the hon. Minister of Health will remember about a year ago when the increase in premiums required by PSI was under some discussion, particularly since the programme to draw more people into this form of insurance had been so broadly advertised just a few weeks before. The government then, in its wisdom, decided that this in fact was a private affair and that they should let the persons, the individual citizens concerned, withdraw from the insurance if they saw fit, otherwise to continue.

Perhaps they were right in this and yet, as the months go by, the government is becoming more and more involved, not only with a statute such as this, but with the protection of the affairs of the individual citizens. Under this particular clause we find that the doctors are enabled through their professional association to adjust their fees without reference to any negotiation whatsoever.

My hon. leader used the proper word in connection with this. He said it is irresponsible, and I believe it to be irresponsible as well. It is not unwarranted interference with the medical profession.

The hon. member for Bruce a few moments ago asked the hon. Minister

specifically what involvement the doctors' professional organization have had in certain requests along monetary lines. I wonder if their support of the bill was contingent upon this particular clause. I would not believe that it would be, because it seems to be almost an unfair requirement. I would say that the request of the government in this particular aspect is irresponsible, and I would beseech the hon. Minister and the government to make suitable amendments along the lines proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Forest Hill, during the course of the debate on the principle of this bill, had occasion to quote from the speech of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall at some length in making the point that this government was in the process of moving forward gradually toward the adoption of something in the nature of a health charter recommended by the Hall commission, and that we here in the Opposition were placing an undue emphasis on the payment of medical fees.

I happen to have the same speech available today that Mr. Justice Emmett Hall made in Winnipeg and from which the hon. member for Forest Hill quoted, and I would like to quote for the record—

Mr. Dunlop: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I quoted from the speech that he made in Scarborough.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe he repeats himself.

Mr. Dunlop: He may repeat himself, I do not know.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough): Winnipeg is more reputable than Scarborough.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I may say that I compared the quotation of the hon. member for Forest Hill with this particular reprint of this speech and it was identical, and I assume that the remarks which were made in the speech to which he referred were also the ones which I am now going to place on the record as being the opinion of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall on this question which is before this Legislature.

The emphasis on the freedom to practise should not obscure the fact that the physician is not only a professional person, but also a citizen. He has moral and social obligations as well as self-interest to do well in his profession.

The notion held by some that the physician has an absolute right to fix his fees as he sees fit unrelated to the mores of our time is incorrect. This 19th century laissez-faire concept has no validity in the 20th century in its application to medicine, dentistry, law or to any other profession; or in fact, to any other organized group. Organized medicine is a statutory creation of Legislatures and of Parliaments. When the state grants a monopoly to an exclusive group to render an indispensable service, it automatically becomes involved in whether those services are available and on what terms and conditions.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that quotation focuses the very point that we on this side of the House are trying to get across to the hon. Minister, that there must be some way in which this government is going to have some involvement in the fees which are being charged by the medical profession.

I would like to make it absolutely clear so there will be no misunderstanding in the minds of anyone in this Legislature or elsewhere in the province of Ontario, that the power under this bill which enables the government to set maximum subscription rates has nothing whatsoever to do with any limitation on the fees which the doctors choose to make for themselves in their schedule under the Ontario medical association.

The Act specifically, categorically, unequivocally states that the benefits under a standard contract shall be the Ontario medical association's schedule of fees. It cannot be anything else; it is not even possible for the doctors to voluntarily suggest that they are going to contribute some portion of their services as a social and community obligation. It is not now open to anyone to alter the provisions of this section.

The definition of benefits under the Act simply refers to the payments to be made for a covered person for the services to which he is entitled under a standard contract. So that regardless of what the government may do about maximum subscription rates, it is essential that the full fee of the doctors be paid through the standard medical insurance contract by the carrier with whom any person in this province is insured.

I think that the government must recognize that in this century it is not possible for a single body which is created by this Legislature to have the final and sole say in the fees which they will charge. While there is not necessarily a complete parallel between the medical profession and the legal

profession, and while the legal profession is still in the course of discussing the report of the joint committee on legal aid, at least there is some appropriate reference to the fees which lawyers may choose to charge if this plan is adopted by the government for legal aid.

The committee is satisfied—

that is the committee which made the report on legal aid:

The committee is satisfied that the lawyers of Ontario would be willing to participate in any extended legal aid programme for reduced fees. During the whole of our inquiry, this willingness has been emphasized and reiterated. The Bar of Ontario still appears to regard the provision of legal aid, in both civil and criminal matters, as primarily a responsibility resting on them as a profession. It is regarded, in short, as part of the professional obligation of a lawyer.

And the committee's recommendation simply follows along that line:

Thus in the committee's views, accounts for civil legal aid proceedings should be taxed on the ordinary solicitor and client scale by taxing officers of the relevant courts and compensation awarded on the basis of 75 per cent of the result.

In making their recommendations with respect to compensation for criminal law work, the basis for settlement should be fair compensation for work reasonably and properly done, subject to a reduction equivalent to the reduction in civil matters, that is, 25 per cent.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he at least remove the obligatory nature of this section from the bill, because what it in fact does is to shift the balance as between the medical profession and everyone else in the province of Ontario in favour of the medical profession. It gives them the final, ultimate and sole say as to what their fees will be. I do not know how we can get this across to the hon. Minister, that it bears no relationship whatsoever to the provision in the province of Ontario of an adequate medical care scheme in the 20th century.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put: This is rather a serious matter and some rather strange arguments have been put forth. I am not here to argue what doctors' fees should be, sir, and I would like to make it eminently clear that no hon. member of this House can accuse me of any conflict of interest.

When I came into a government portfolio I gave up the practice of medicine and I have not practised medicine since—nor will I as long as I hold this or any other government portfolio.

Mr. Chairman, it has been totally lost sight of that there was a time when there was no schedule of medical fees and a practitioner could charge what he liked. The schedule of fees is a guide; it is not a regulation imposed upon the doctors, and not a schedule that they must charge or must not charge if they are to practise medicine. They have a right to charge what they will and do just as all other professions do. All this talk about doctors being the only group that negotiates with no one and is answerable to no one for the fees it charges, is ridiculous in the extreme, sir.

I submit to you that every self-employed person, whether he or she be a professional person or in the "designated" trades—as I believe it is called—whether in business or commerce or any of the service areas, has a right to set whatever rate he likes upon his own services. Such people are answerable to no one but they acquiesce with the public in setting the rate.

I do not think that we can get away from this. My hon. friend from Forest Hill asked the question, and so far as I know, there is no statute on the statute books of Ontario which designates or controls the rates charged for services by any profession in the province of Ontario, except those who are employed by and working for the public service.

There has been a good deal said about what the government has been doing. There is talk about the legal profession. My hon. friend from Riverdale rather boastfully quoted the wonderful things lawyers have done. For 30 years, Mr. Chairman, the doctors of Ontario have been looking after those on welfare, and the very small amount provided does not begin to meet 75 per cent of the cost, because the amount paid is only to cover two kinds of service—office and telephone calls. If the patients have to go to hospital, then either he has to find the money to pay for his own costs, or the doctor, as so often happens, has to work for nothing. We have been proud to do that, and I would be so bold as to predict that this will still be done by many, many doctors throughout the province. But I do not have to defend them, their record speaks for itself.

You talk about the incomes that they have. How many other professions work 60 or 80 or more hours a week—and I leave it at that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, politicians are the only other people stupid enough to work those hours and we have no union to cover us.

I want to put this very plainly before you, Mr. Chairman, that the OMA schedule of fees is not a rule or a law imposed upon the profession that it must obey. The doctors have a right to charge whatever fee they will. The insertion of this is in keeping with a principle laid down by the Opposition itself in the resolution that is before this House and now on our order paper—that payment shall be on a fee-for-schedule basis. It is the only recognized and published fee-for-service basis that we have. I repeat for emphasis that it is normally not essential that the doctors abide by it, but, under this Act, they must abide by it because that is all that will be paid.

Has the OMA requested 100 per cent of the fees? I would say, unequivocally, no. They never asked for it at all. What I would point out to my hon. friend from Bruce is that only PSI, so far as I know, among the carriers in Ontario today, has an agreement with a group of doctors, known as participating doctors, who have agreed to accept 90 per cent of the schedule of fees. We did this deliberately to get the thing rolling.

Mr. Whicher: And the premiums are higher.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, the premiums are higher than those paid by groups, of which he has ample knowledge, who pay 100 per cent now of the schedule of fees. Indeed, the great majority of carriers today pay 100 per cent of the schedule of fees.

Mr. Whicher: They are lower.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, they are lower, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, quite in contradiction of what the hon. member for Riverdale has said—and I am not going to get into a legal argument with him because, of course, I bow to his superior knowledge in that realm—we do believe that we have indirect control, at least, over the fees paid by having some control over the maximum premium. The maximum premium cannot be altered without the approval of this government and, if fees get out of line, we will take every step to control them, indirectly at least, by control of the maximum premium.

The hon. member for Sudbury seems to imply that this section means that the fees in effect, from time to time, automatically will go up. This, to me, does not follow at all. I guess it is because I have not got a legal mind, but I do not read that into the section at all.

My hon. friend from Woodbine spoke

Mr. MacDonald: Politicians!

about charity cases. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons for this bill is to remove this stigma, this selection of a group that is labelled as a charity group. This is why we made sure that the same services would be available to all of them on exactly the same basis as they are available to all the people of the province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I want to repeat in answer to a question raised, I believe, by the hon. member for Brant, that support of the medical profession was not in any way related to the fee schedule. Indeed, it was not discussed with the doctors.

Mr. Nixon: It was in relation to the question that the hon. member for Bruce—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You hope that support of the bill by the doctors was not related to this clause. I can assure you it was not.

We believe that this is a recognized schedule and it is in the hands of every practising physician in Ontario. This is recognized by the organized profession as a reasonable schedule of fees for its services and it was for this reason that we adopted it and said that nothing more than this schedule of fees can ever be paid under this plan.

I submit, therefore, sir, that the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister has suggested that he hopes to be able to have some sort of influence, if not control, over the fees. The method by which he proposes that that should be done is like saying that he hopes to control the speed of a car by having the front half go more slowly than the back half. If he wants to have control over the premiums paid, he has to have control over what goes into the premiums. It is idle of him to say that he can have control over the premiums when he does not have control over the schedule of fees.

What is he going to do if he says that the premiums cannot be increased and yet the schedule of fees is increased, so that the carriers, and also himself, are put in an impossible position? If he really means business in saying he is going to have control over premiums, then he has to have control over the schedule of fees as well.

I would like to point out that he did not deal at all with any of the points raised over here, but I am particularly interested in the point I raised with regard to the charity

cases. I pointed out to him, and he has not denied it, that the schedule of fees is now set high enough to allow for charity cases. Now we are going to pay that excessively high schedule of fees right across the board for the charity cases along with the others. That is my point.

I agree with the hon. Minister that it is desirable to remove distinction between one type of case and another, but the point is that we should not remove those distinctions on the basis of a fee schedule which was set on the assumption that fees would be lower for some people.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, just before this amendment is put, I would like to say in regard to the ability of the government to control the maximum—and I stress the word maximum, because it is maximum premiums that will be set through the government agency—that I think we have a very complete control over the ultimate level that doctors' fees may reach and adjustments that may be made by the Ontario medical association. I think also we have control over what may be done by the carriers. We say, on the one hand, "You must provide a certain absolute minimum of service," and on the other hand, "You can only charge a maximum price." The minimum cannot be altered and the maximum premium cannot be altered without the consent of an agency of the government.

Of course, you say, what would we do? If these amounts get completely out of balance, of course the whole plan itself would fall to the ground. It would cease—

Mr. Bryden: Or you would jack up the rates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It would cease to function. Of course, the decision, which would then rest with the government, would be whether the government would exercise its power either to lower the benefits or raise the rates, or whether it would say that this plan in its present form simply is getting to the point where it is not viable, if that is the term, it is not a workable plan. Frankly, I see in this control, the ultimate control of the whole overall plan that is operating, involved in which is the complete function of the carrier and the complete function of the medical profession. There would have to be, if such a situation arose, a great deal of consultation. I must say that, in this debate this afternoon, I have listened to the insurance companies and the doctors being vilified; I think that is the only word I can use.

One would be led to believe from the debate here this afternoon that there were no men of honour, or integrity, or with any social sense whatsoever, operating in the industry or in the medical profession. They are painted here as people who have one idea in mind, and one only, and that is to gouge the public. Now, I do not believe this to be true. I believe that, if this scheme is to function, it is going to require a high degree of co-operation between the carriers and between those men who operate the insurance industry; between them, the medical profession and the government.

I think that degree of co-operation can be achieved. I am quite certain it can, and I think there have been a few straw men set up here this afternoon in order that they might be knocked down. But in the process, I must say that I am a little distressed at the impression that might be left as to who are the men who make up the insurance industry in this province, and who are the men who make up the medical profession.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify this right away, and let me speak just for myself. I have a brother who is a doctor and relatives who are doctors. I am not saying because he is my brother that he is a man of high dedication. But on our side, of course, we recognize that there are many men within the medical profession who went in for it with the deepest sense of purpose for the good of the community; and who have dedicated their lives to helping people. I would not like the impression left, which the hon. Prime Minister has suggested, that every remark of the Opposition is to, in some way, criticize and suggest that the medical profession or the insurance companies themselves are all bad men.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well that is it, whether you intended it or not.

Mr. Thompson: The point that the hon. Prime Minister made was that we need co-operation and consultation. The point in my amendment is that we want to set up the machinery for such consultation and co-operation, because at the moment there is none. Away out on a limb is the medical profession setting fees, without proper machinery set up so that there can be consultation and supervision. We are asking that machinery be set up for this. In view of the hon. Prime Minister suggesting this, if the hon. Minister of Health will look at my amendment again he will realize I am asking only that proper machinery be set up.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the Opposition has lost sight of the fact that the machinery is now set up.

Mr. Thompson: Where?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In the council. This is the machinery for consultation and discussion the exchange of ideas and the hearing of complaints.

Mr. Bryden: It has nothing to do with their schedule of fees.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it stands to reason that the whole business of the programme comes before the council. If the council is rightly represented by two doctors—I remember quite a number of you took very great umbrage at this yesterday, I believe—and that if the complaints come to them that the schedule of fees is too high, it stands to reason they are bound to take notice of it. They are bound to get the feeling of the public, and are surely going to be sensitive to it.

Now I am rather glad that the hon. Prime Minister did stand up and say some of the things that I felt I ought to say. Because I had already been under suspicion of having a conflict of interest. I felt that I did not need—I know I do not need—to defend my colleagues. I repeat, their actions speak for themselves. A great deal has been said, in vilifying terms and scurrilous terms, concerning my profession, and I do not like it the least little bit.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I said a few words about this section, and I certainly do not want my name connected with the possibility that the doctors of this province have been gouging the public. I want you to know—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Whicher: You can shout all you want over there. If some of you fellows in the back would get up and say where you stand on this, and not leave it all on the shoulders of the hon. Minister of Health, you would be doing your party a favour.

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly not the doctors who have been gouging the public. As a matter of fact, for many, many years—since the time Canada was started—they have done a wonderful job in this country. But the people who are going to gouge the public in this particular instance is the government, in allowing doctors to charge 100 cents on

the dollar when they have only been getting 90 cents up to date—and without that profession even asking for it. That is what you call gouging the public.

It is absolutely inconceivable to me, as a small businessman. I ask all the hon. members who are either professional men or businessmen in some line, in what other line of business do you go and give a profession 100 cents on the dollar when, up to this moment, they have only asked for 90 cents? This is what you call gouging the public, because it is going to cost the taxpayers of this province—the premium payers of this province, on last year's figures—\$5 million. Mr. Prime Minister, when you are talking about gouging the public, think of what your government is doing. Because that is exactly what you are going to do in setting up this section; charging our premium holders an extra \$5 million.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted that during the course of his remarks, the hon. Prime Minister—for all practical purposes—admitted what we have been contending over here all along. Ultimately, in this matter, the medical profession will be in the driver's seat. The hon. Prime Minister indicated that the government will set maximum premiums. We have discussed the ineffectiveness of the power relating to maximum premiums, and we will not go back to that. We will accept the point that the government will set maximum premiums, and I pose the question to him, what happens if the medical association raises the schedule of fees so that the maximum premiums are no longer practical? What happens then? The hon. Prime Minister said: "Well, in that case, one of two things will happen, the whole thing will collapse or the maximum premiums will have to be raised." That is a fair summary of what he said and that is another way of saying that the medical profession will be in the driver's seat; which is just what we have been saying. They will be able to push the maximum premiums up by raising their fees.

Now then, the hon. Minister of Health said it is envisaged that there will be consultation through the council set up by this bill, with the medical profession and others, if that sort of tension should arise. He said that is what the council is for. Well, that is the first we have heard of this. It does not say that in the bill. I suggest to the hon. Minister, if that is what he has in mind, it is essentially what the hon. leader of the Opposition had in mind in his amendment. Why do we not write it into the bill?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is in the bill now.

Mr. Bryden: Where?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In the duties of the council.

Mr. Bryden: The council's powers are set forth—it is said that they have—well, let us just see what it says:

The council shall act as advisors to the Minister in the administration of this Act and shall make recommendations to him upon:

(a) the initial and subsequent maximum subscription rates recommended by the corporation;

(b) the designation of open enrolment periods recommended by the corporation;

(c) the general form and content of standard contracts, and

(d) any other matter related to this Act.

Now where does it say anything about the schedule—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: "Any other matter relating to this Act."

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the hon. Minister that if he means that "any other matter related to this Act" includes the schedule of fees of the OMA he should say so. That type of clause is usually interpreted as being within the same general type as the clauses that precede it. All the clauses that precede it relate to subscription rates and the content of standard contracts, they do not say a thing about the fee schedule of the medical association.

If it is actually his intention, as he has claimed, that there will be discussion as proposed, then I submit to him that it ought to be spelled out clearly and specifically in the bill, just as it is spelled out clearly and specifically that the council will make recommendations on subscription rates. There is no reason at all for evading this issue except, I suggest, the reason that the council is not going to have anything to do, or anything much to do, with the schedule of fees of the OMA other than to recommend that the subscription rates be increased every time the OMA jacks up its fees. That is what is going to happen under this bill.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to this. We have been hearing a lot of talk on this whole debate about licensed carriers. I think this is the pay dirt of our whole opposition: Why are the insurance companies in on the Act in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: This is completely out of order. This was one of the principles settled on second reading. We have settled this a long time ago.

Mr. Sargent: I reserve the right to talk on this Medicare bill. I submit, briefly—and I know time is of the essence in this House—but I feel it is within our power in this province to set up a programme that is actuarially sound without paying our political debts to insurance companies. This, in essence, is what our debate boils down to. Take the insurance companies out and—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is completely out of order, as already pointed out by the hon. Prime Minister. This was debated on the principle of the bill and was carried.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to say I listened carefully to the hon. Prime Minister. I find him on most occasions a very reasonable man.

An hon. member: We do not fall for that any more.

Mr. Thompson: It is not a case of falling for anything, I am saying this quite sincerely to the hon. Minister, that I think the point he was making was that there should be close consultation and co-operation between the medical profession and the kind of fees they set up, and between the council and between the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: And the carriers.

Mr. Thompson: Then, sir, I think that there would be no objection to this amendment. I hope that the Chairman will read the amendment, and I think there would then be complete agreement with it.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment of the leader of the Opposition says:

No increase in fees of any kind will be enforced until approved by the medical services insurance council.

All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there is more to that amendment. Also incorporated in it is a proposal that only 90 per cent of the schedule of fees will be paid.

Mr. Chairman: May I add then, "fees payable at 90 per cent of the schedule."

All those in favour of this amendment, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

I declare the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 27; the "nays," 49.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 20 agreed to.

On section 21:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, in this section, if a licensed carrier, for reasons that are beyond its control, goes out of business, and I suppose those reasons would be largely financial or perhaps they might have something to do with the feeling of the licensed carrier that they are not making sufficient profit, that ugly word, out of carrying medical insurance contracts, if such case might happen, Mr. Chairman—either of Mr. Chairmen, both Mr. Chairmen—if such an event may occur I do not see in justice and equity why the policy owner should be put to the inconvenience and delay of applying to another licensed carrier for his insurance.

Why should the corporation not carry out that task for him? The corporation is staffed by men who are entirely familiar with the insurance industry and they know the identity of those operating in the field. Accordingly if upon 60 days' notice they realize that a licensed carrier is going out of business, then surely they are the best people to place that insurance with other carriers operating in the field. If it were a profit-making carrier, then they could place that business with another company of the same type; if it were a co-operative, they could place the business with another co-operative; and if indeed it were doctor-sponsored plan, then they could place the business with that type of plan.

On the other hand, one can visualize a great deal of dislocation if the responsibility is left to the individual policyholder. There may be several hundreds or several thousands of policyholders who have contracts issued by the company going out of business under subsection 1.

I do not feel that my point needs any more elaboration than that. From the point of view of efficiency and justice I am prepared to

move an amendment to the section which would read as follows:

That subsection 4 of section 21 be deleted, and the following be substituted therefor:

4. If any licensed carrier cancels its medical services insurance contracts under subsection 1, the corporation shall place such applications for the persons insured by such licensed carrier with other licensed carriers, as it may deem fit, and there shall be no change of benefit to or obligations on the policyholders in respect of such change of the insurer.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sopha moves:

That subsection 4 of section 21 be deleted, and the following be substituted therefor:

4. If any licensed carrier cancels its medical services insurance contracts under subsection 1, the corporation shall place applications for the persons insured by such licensed carrier with other licensed carriers, as it may deem fit, and there shall be no change of benefit to or obligations on the policyholders in respect of such change of the insurer.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment, I might say that this section shows that because of the basic principle that we passed on second reading this has become an administrative monstrosity. Here we have probably 200 carriers of insurance in the province of Ontario and you might assume that a certain number of them will go out of business. Perhaps some will start out and others go out, and there may be many comings and goings. Under this present section, the responsibility is on the individual to see that he is properly covered by insurance. The individual may go to all the trouble of signing up with a particular company; that company goes out of business and once again that individual has the responsibility thrown on him to apply all over again.

If an insurance company is going to go into this business, it seems that the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Sudbury is quite reasonable in that the responsibility should lie with the company and not with the person so insured.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it seems obvious how much more economical it would be and how much easier it would be to administer a medical insurance plan in the province of Ontario if we had one basic carrier and one standard contract.

This, again, leads to tremendous confusion and there is also obviously extra expense. It

means more paper work every time somebody must sign up once again with another insurance firm. Bearing this in mind, I would ask hon. members of this House to support the amendment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this section, I think, brings to the fore a point that is not sufficiently stressed with regard to this bill. I think the impression is abroad—and I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister has done anything to create that impression—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think this section brings to attention a point that has not been fully realized by the public with respect to this bill and that is: In normal circumstances their insurance contracts are still subject to cancellation, with or without notice, by the insurance carrier, unless they are the standard contracts that are found in this bill or unless the contracts provide within their own framework that they are non-cancellable.

A lot of people have the idea that when this legislation comes into effect the insurance that they buy will be non-cancellable, that is, the insurance they buy from private carriers. As I understand it, if a private carrier makes the slightest deviation from a standard contract as defined here, then he can cancel without notice, and I am afraid a lot of people are going to be badly deluded when they discover that can happen to them.

It should also be noted, Mr. Chairman, that this section, which is designed to protect the policyholders in the event of a company going out of business, only protects those policyholders who have standard contracts or have contracts that are within their own terms non-cancellable. Anybody else's contract just goes down the drain.

Again, it may be a contract that has only a very slight deviation from the standard contract, but sufficiently different that it could be held not to be a standard contract.

I hope the public will not get the idea that they are now protected from arbitrary cancellation because this legislation is coming into effect or that they are protected against the company going out of business. I hope that the public will realize that they are protected only if they have a standard contract, or one that provides in itself that it is non-cancellable. I hope they will be very careful to make sure that what they get are actually standard contracts and not some mishmash that the insurance company draws up that is not a standard contract. It may look like one, but the consumer should be

hep to insist on getting a genuine standard contract.

Let us bear in mind that insurance policies baffle most people; they just do not comprehend them at all, they take whatever the agent says. Some agents disclose the whole truth to them and some do not. I think it is going to be pretty important that consumers should be able to identify a standard contract as being genuinely a standard contract not subject to cancellation, and not merely one that they were told was just as good or even better.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out here in connection with this matter of going out of business—you might gather from the Opposition that insurance companies are going broke and going out of business, but that is not the case. I think the public should know that if an insurance company decides to withdraw from this medical insurance business because it is unprofitable, that is all there is to it. The insurance companies cannot go out of business as such because, by law, they have to put up deposits in Ottawa and payment of claims is guaranteed by the government, so there is no problem there.

The hon. member mentioned insurance salesmen selling mishmash to people—mishmash, whatever that is I do not know.

Now, if this hon. member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: A little louder!

Mr. Sopha: Where does it say that payment of claims is guaranteed by the government? Will you refer me to that statute?

Mr. Cowling: Yes, later on. Just sit down for the moment.

Getting back to the mishmash—and we have had an awful lot of it the last few days—mostly mishmash.

If the hon. member had ever tried to sell insurance to some of the discerning members of the public of Ontario, he would definitely find out, and would get a rude awakening, that they do not buy mishmash. Our people are too smart and too clever. They buy what they think they need and what is going to get them the best value for their dollar. So, my friend, do not ever think that it is a mishmash of insurance that they are buying.

If you will notice under section 3—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cowling: What are you mumbling about over there?

Mr. Sopha: It is a violation of The Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. Cowling: Just sit down!

Mr. Sopha: You are liable to a fine of \$200 a day.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, you are right. Just keep quiet there.

Section 5 of this Act, in talking to the amendment, says in the last part:

And the licensed carrier shall refund on a pro rata basis any unearned subscription.

So that the individual who has a policy terminated is not going to lose any money and has an opportunity of applying to another company in the business of selling this medical contract.

The cancellation feature—we sometimes feel that it is a one-way street, but it is not. In other words, the company can cancel an insurance policy, but remember, Mr. Chairman, that the individual can cancel his policy, too, any time he wishes. It works both ways.

I cannot support the amendment, because all the sections of this section 21, and the subsections really, cover the whole situation. The public will be well protected because, as has been pointed out here, in the Canadian health insurance association there are some 200 members and I can assure you that if some member of that group should decide that they do not want to continue in the medical business, I am sure that any one of the other 199 would be glad to pick up that business, because in the long run they are interested in making a profit. That is why they are in the insurance business. They are going to guarantee that people have the protection. So I—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cowling: A little louder!

Mr. MacDonald: If you have anything to say, go ahead and say it.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for High Park has the floor.

Mr. Cowling: I am just putting you on the track insofar as this section is concerned. I have been telling you why you should not support the amendment, because it does not add anything to the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have clarification from the hon. Minister regarding the point that my hon. colleague from Woodbine raised, that only

the standard policies are non-cancellable. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: By this Act, this kind of policy is non-cancellable. But I am advised that a great many health insurance contracts, a greater number, are steadily becoming non-cancellable. But by this Act, only the standard contract is non-cancellable. We have no authority under this Act to—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have a minor complaint to make that within the secrecy of our own caucus I was not even informed of this, and secondly, this is another astounding feature. I am convinced that the people of the province of Ontario believe that when this bill goes through, any insurance policy that they buy with regard to health is not going to be cancellable.

The hon. Minister, with his great and generous gesture, says the government is going to protect the people. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that only a percentage of the people will be on standard policy. I now have made a discovery with equal shock to the discovery yesterday with regard to the sick and the aged being at the maximum premium. Now we discover this further revelation, that this government has certainly so staged the thing that it has misled the public.

Mr. Chairman, I have said up until now that one of the few advantages I saw in this bill was that it removed this abuse that insurance companies have indulged in for years, namely, when it suited their purpose, they cancelled policies. Now let the people of the province of Ontario recognize the fact that even that is going to continue as an abuse.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not under this Act.

Mr. MacDonald: Except for those who are standard policies. So apparently even the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is not aware of the real sleepers to be found all throughout this bill.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Sleepers?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, sleepers. You were not aware of that either?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Many, many people were not aware. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions still thinks it is in the bill, because he has been arguing with me over here, which just shows you how confused is the issue right within the Tory

ranks, right within the Cabinet. This just confirms in my mind, what a useless, misleading kind of legislation we have got before us at the present time, and if I ever had any qualms about the amount of time that the Opposition has put into fighting this bill clause by clause, they have completely disappeared. What we are doing, is just getting the truth across to the people of the province of Ontario, before they get hoodwinked.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When it is all over, read the explanation.

Mr. Sopha: Our qualms have hardly disappeared, because we are finding out so much about the details of the administration and the nature of the contracts. I should like to ask the hon. Minister, after he finishes getting advice from the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Never deal with an arrogant Opposition.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I am deeply indebted to you for those few kind words. I want to ask the hon. Minister a question. I should like to ask what happens to the health and accident policies that have a life insurance feature? Will the standard contract have a life insurance feature attached to it, or will the ones that now have a life insurance feature disappear, when the standard contract comes into effect?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to discuss this bill seriously. I am almost certain the hon. member must be facetious. Of course this will not have a life insurance factor. This is medical services insurance and this will not interfere with any sickness and accident policy that has a life insurance factor. It will not interfere with any of these things.

Mr. Chairman, let it be clearly understood that the intent of this bill was never to interfere with existing insurance, but, in the event that one's existing policy is cancelled, then the same carrier who cancelled, if remaining in the business, must provide a standard contract. We chose the standard contract, because, if you will read the schedule, as I stated in the outset, it provides the medical, surgical and obstetrical care, in home, office and hospital, usually required by the average family in a normal lifetime.

This is the principle underlying all of the government involvement in this, at least the

provincial government's. The standard ward is provided under the hospital care insurance plan. This standard contract is a comparable thing, and the public of Ontario understood this far better than my hon. friend from York South, who has left his seat now. Mr. Chairman, he must have been the sleeper, because it is plainly and clearly defined in the definition section of this bill, what a standard contract is, and all through the piece we have talked about a standard contract.

I stated in my remarks in answer to the hon. member for Parkdale—when he criticized the bill on second reading and when he said that if the government did not get into the field there would be no choice—that the great, broad, wide and varied choice of policies now available will continue. Every one of you hon. members, involved in labour union contracts and various other contracts, knows perfectly well the great choice of contracts made available to you and we have no intention of interfering with this. But if, for reasons beyond the control of any one of you or your members, the present contract is cancelled, then the carrier must, at your request, sell you a standard contract. If not, he is subject to losing his licence.

Mr. Sopha: That is exactly what I am afraid of. Nowhere in the whole of the piece has any spokesman of the insurance industry come forward and said to the public—and you could not think of a more opportune time than right now, when this bill is being debated in this Legislature—what will happen to the types of policies they now sell, and I am very concerned about it.

It may be that the life insurance carriers will feel that they can make sufficient profit out of selling standard contracts so that they will dispense with the sale of the other types. I speak on behalf of all those who buy this type of insurance, because they can get the life insurance feature in it. There are a good many people in the province who cannot purchase life insurance and they waken up to that fact long after the need is there for them to have it. They buy this type of policy in order to get the group coverage of life insurance without a medical examination.

I have a real fear, in the absence of a very definite statement by the insurance industry, that the companies, after this Act comes into force on June 1, 1966, will dispense with the sale of these policies, where there are many added fringe benefits in which they give benefits that are away and above the ones stipulated in schedule A to the standard contract.

In the absence of an assurance from the

hon. Minister, I would hope that somebody, on behalf of the insurance companies, will let the public know what their attitude is going to be toward insurance coverage after this Act comes into force.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member can put his fears at rest, and I am quite certain he knows himself that his fears are completely groundless. We stated that nothing can be added to the body of the standard contract, but they can sell as much additional as they like so long as it is attached to the contract as a rider, because the standard contract will be clearly and definitely identifiable.

There will be no doubt. We believe it will be identified by the use of a certain type of paper which can only be used for that purpose, probably of a special colour, although the printers tell me that this is difficult. We can assure you that the standard contract will be printed on a type of paper that cannot be used for anything else, and will be clearly identifiable as a standard contract approved by government as such.

If the corporations, or the non-profit bodies, or anybody in the field want to sell you life insurance or any other kind of insurance, they are still at liberty to do that. They can have all the benefits they like but they must not tamper with the provisions of the standard contract. They can attach them as riders but they cannot write them or type them into the body of the contract as is sometimes done in ordinary contracts now. I do not think there is any question about this; there certainly is no question in my mind, and I am not speaking for the insurance companies because I never asked them about this.

Again I repeat, they are grown up, they are mature, they will look after their own business. But they are in business. Indeed it is rather odd, Mr. Chairman, to hear the hon. member for Sudbury say, "I expect they might think they will make so much money selling the standard contracts." A little while ago they were telling me all the dreadful things about selling this and how they would not bother selling it and all the rest of it.

Mr. Sopha: Who was telling the hon. Minister that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, there have been so many things said by so many people it is impossible to identify them until I read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Sopha: You know, some of it ought to get through to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The original amendment which the hon. member for Sudbury made, and I did not get the full words, was to the effect that the corporation should place the insurance elsewhere in the event of a company cancelling its business. I think his closing words were "as it may deem fit." This, Mr. Chairman, is the very reason for this section of the Act. We believe that each subscriber should have the right to elect where he shall have his coverage.

There is no doubt in my mind that there will be plenty of opportunity. There are so many people in the insurance business, and it is a highly competitive field. I am quite certain that there will be plenty after the person who has cancelled. If a company cancels its business, I have no doubt at all that other companies will be hot on the trail of all the subscribers to see that they get the opportunity to be signed up. Really, I think to adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. member would be a hardship—not necessarily a hardship, but a disadvantage—to the subscriber. I think he should have the right to choose for himself, if he is paying for his own, from whom he shall buy.

It is stipulated that he must get 60 days' notice; and it is also stipulated that, if within that time he is reinsured, it will not be necessary to repeat the waiting period which has already been observed. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment adds anything; in fact I think it detracts from the terms of this section.

Mr. Sopha: I would leave it to the individual policyholder if he had any choice, but he has no choice. He gets the same contract from whichever licensed carrier that he chooses to subscribe with. It is like buying beets from two greengrocers at the market. Beets are the same whether you buy them from one or the other, they are pretty standard.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If he wants to buy the standard contract.

Mr. Sopha: If there was a choice, I could see that it ought to be left to his own discretion, but there is no choice. It is a standard form of contract and I am just afraid that, in the dislocation created by a company going out of business, many people will not bother to reinsure themselves. The letter will come and the letter will become lost or mislaid, and they will end up not being insured. If the responsibility was left with the corporation to place the insurance, then without any dislocation whatsoever the insurance would move from carrier A—which is going out of

business—to carriers B, C, D or E. There would be no inconvenience, no risk and no anxiety caused to the policyholder at all. That is why I put forward this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I submit, Mr. Chairman, has the hon. member thought of the possibility that carrier C might offer the same standard contract at less than carrier A or B? This is quite possible.

Mr. Sopha: No, they are all going to charge the maximum as far as I can see. Then they are going to ask once a year for an increase.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, just on this point, there is an article in the *Globe and Mail*—goodness knows, we have had hundreds of them in the last few days and another one will not make any difference—that is right on this particular point. It might be of some interest to the Opposition, who seem to be concerned about the situation. It is a statement by the Canadian health insurance group and the officials say:

Insurers, while remaining free to offer existing plans, must now make available the government's standard medical services insurance contract to anyone who applies, regardless of their age, state of health or place of residence in the province.

Now that is the answer to the hon. member for Sudbury. It continues:

Although the government will be paying premiums for those unable to afford their own coverage, the insurance companies themselves will now be providing services for many high-risk applicants who could not qualify for previous plans. By no means will all the high-risk applicants be in the subsidized group. Insurers, generally, will therefore be providing coverage for many applicants outside the subsidized group.

The statement went on to say:

That while maximum premiums will be set, past experience indicates that the vast majority of Ontario citizens can and will purchase coverage at less than the maximum.

The two-year-old Alberta plan, operated under similar principles, has less than 15 per cent of subscribers paying the established maximums. The health insurance industry has a record of achievement in Ontario with 82 per cent of the population already insured under voluntary schemes.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put a question to the hon. Minister with regard to contracts that are not standard

contracts and are not non-cancellable within their own terms.

Now, if one of those contracts was cancelled, is there any way—and let us say it is a private contract, not a group contract—whereby the individual can get a standard contract except by waiting for an enrolment period or else going through a three-month waiting period?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Bryden: Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I just answered it. If the contract is cancelled and that carrier sells standard contracts, as he would if he is licensed under this Act, he must provide or sell the standard contract to the subscriber whom he has cancelled.

Mr. Bryden: Where is that provided?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Where the waiting period has already been gone through, that is, if such a thing existed in the cancelled contract, there would be no further waiting period. I do not think it is spelled out in those words, but the principle is involved here that you may move from one carrier to another.

Mr. Bryden: I can see it if you are in a group contract, but I am wondering about the case where a person just has an individual contract.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The same thing would apply which applies in 15 (1).

Mr. Bryden: Wherein is it stated that it applies?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is transfer from group to a standard contract, but the same terms would apply.

Mr. Bryden: Well, where does it say that they would apply? That is all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is inherent in the principle of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, I get sick of that. After a law goes through, one has to deal on the basis of the law and nothing else, not on the basis of what the hon. Minister says he thought it meant. This is the answer he has been giving us day after day with regard to this bill when we point out the obvious gaping loopholes in it. He says he means something different. Well, I suggest to him that if this—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the hon. member, it is in subsection 4 of this paragraph.

Mr. Bryden: Where?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Rights to other insurance.

Mr. Bryden: Of which paragraph?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of section 21, the paragraph we are dealing with now. I knew it was here some place, but I did not think it was spelled out so distinctly.

Mr. Bryden: Well, this section relates only—

Mr. Cowling: Read it; read it out loud.

Mr. Bryden: Section 21 relates only to cancellation in the case where a carrier is going out of business.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does not matter. It does not say anything of the kind, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: That is exactly what it says.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I will read it, since the hon. member seems rather coy about it.

Any licensed carrier that cancels its medical services insurance contracts under subsection 1 shall, in the notice of cancellation thereunder, state that the covered person may, within a period of 60 days from date of the notice, make application to any other licensed carrier for a standard contract. And such other licensed carrier, unless exempt under clause (b) of subsection 2 of section 2 shall, upon receipt of the application subscription therefor, issue a standard contract and the waiting period and limitation of benefits with respect thereto shall be calculated from the effective date of coverage of the covered person under the prior medical services insurance fund.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at this. Subsection 4, as I read it, says—and I will quote just one-and-a-half lines of it:

Any licensed carrier that cancels its medical services insurance contract under subsection 1—

And what does subsection 1 say? I will not read the subsection—I will read the marginal notes:

Cancellation of contract for carrier going out of business.

Now, why do we get loud howls from over there when we try, with great difficulty, to get the hon. Minister to understand what his own bill provides? We are constantly faced with loud howls of protest. Subsection 4 covers the situation, I will agree with the hon. Minister, in relation to cases where contracts are cancelled because a carrier is withdrawing from the field or going out of business altogether. But I want to know—I am just asking a question—where does it provide in the bill that where an individual contract is cancelled by the insurance company, the person who holds the contract will be able to get a standard contract other than by going through the waiting period or waiting for an enrolment period?

If it is there, I would like to see it, because I think it should be there. The reason I am asking is because I have been searching for it and cannot find it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury's amendment.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister, I think, is trying to obtain the information for which I asked.

Mr. Cowling: I think, Mr. Chairman, that if you refer to the explanatory note at the first part of the bill, in the fourth paragraph, you will find the answer. It says:

The bill also establishes a corporation composed of the Medical Services Insurance Company. The function of this corporation will be to regulate the technical and administrative operations of the companies concerned.

That is very simple, Mr. Chairman. Why does the hon. member not read that? Why does he not read those things?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am quite satisfied that this section does apply

and that the hon. member is splitting hairs in defining it as narrowly as he does.

Mr. Bryden: I submit to the hon. Minister that it is not a matter of interpreting it narrowly at all. It is a matter of interpreting what the words say. The words say "cancelled under subsection 1."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury's amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is obviously in consultation with his advisers on this thing. The bill does not state it, regardless of what the hon. Minister would like it to say. I would ask him that he withhold this for a moment and examine it. I think his intention is that if any individual's policy is cancelled for reasons other than the company going bankrupt or out of business, he should be able to renew it without having to go through the waiting period. If that is his intention, let us have the specific indication in the Act. At the moment, I do not think it is there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hold this—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister is getting an answer, because if it is not here—it should be here. This is the point.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 10, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 10, 1965

A certain dispute between the Toronto electric commissioners and Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees, bill respecting, Mr. Robarts, second reading, third reading	4007
Royal assent to Bill No. 167, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor	4040
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	4040

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The fifty-fifth order.
Second reading of Bill No. 167.

TORONTO ELECTRIC COMMISSIONERS AND LOCAL NO. 1, CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves second reading of Bill No. 167, An Act respecting a certain dispute between the Toronto electric commissioners and Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill, I propose initially to outline to the hon. members of the House, the history of negotiations as they have taken place to date between Toronto Hydro and Local 1, Canadian union of public employees.

At the outset, I would like to point out that there has been a history of long and successful collective bargaining between these two parties and I understand that this is the first time in the history of their relationship that they have reached a complete deadlock.

In this present series of negotiations they began bargaining for a new agreement in December, 1964, and held five meetings before the union applied to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) for conciliation services on January 25, 1965.

The conciliation officer met with the parties on two occasions in an effort to assist them in reaching an agreement. On February 26, 1965, he reported to the hon. Minister that he had been unable to effect an agreement and that the parties were apart on 51 issues. He recommended the appointment of a board of conciliation and it was subsequently established on March 24, 1965. The board consisted of Mr. W. H. Dickie, chairman; Mr. Michael O'Brien, the employer nominee; and Mr. Thomas Paton, the union nominee.

This board met with the parties on eight separate occasions and in their majority report Mr. Dickie and Mr. O'Brien had this to say, and I quote from the report:

The board reviewed each of the issues in dispute. While 51 matters are referred

to this board, this number represents more than 100 items at issue along with 101 job descriptions. In order that we might begin some effective mediation of this dispute, the board made every effort to persuade the parties to reduce significantly the large number of outstanding issues, particularly in non-monetary areas.

We suggested several approaches that would serve as a key to proceeding with discussions on major issues. We regret we were unable to establish procedure and climate favourable to working out a settlement.

In view of the excessive number of issues still outstanding and the incomplete discussion on most of the important matters, this board is not in any position to make recommendations.

That is the end of my quote from that report:

The board's report was released to the parties on May 17, 1965. Under the provisions of The Labour Relations Act, the union was free to strike and the employer to lock-out seven days after the receipt of this report.

On Friday, May 21, 1965, Mr. J. B. Metzler, the deputy Minister of Labour, and Mr. A. C. Dennis, director of the conciliation branch of The Department of Labour, convened a meeting of the parties in The Department of Labour quarters. After an appraisal of the situation an attempt was made to bring together, as a "package," those items in dispute which were considered vital to a settlement. These issues were discussed and weighed as to their relative importance in the dispute.

On the same day, the officials of the department met separately with representatives of Toronto Hydro and asked them to prepare an offer of settlement. They agreed to consider this request and the meeting was adjourned until Tuesday, May 25.

Upon resumption, the employer representatives made an offer in writing to the union in the presence of the departmental officials. The offer was subject to acceptance on or before May 31, 1965, and while some items in the offer were acceptable to the union others were not.

The meeting was adjourned until Wednesday, May 26, and the parties were urged to reconsider their respective positions.

On May 26, after both parties indicated that their positions had not altered, the labour department officials requested that the commission's offer be presented to the union's membership meeting scheduled for Thursday, May 27. The offer was rejected by the union membership at this meeting, and at the same time June 2 was set by the union for the taking of a strike vote. The vote on June 2 was overwhelmingly in favour of strike action and June 11 was set for the walkout.

As part of the continuing effort to resolve this dispute, the hon. Minister of Labour met separately with each of the parties on June 3. In order to establish a new basis for negotiation both the union and the commission agreed to send—and by the commission I mean the Toronto Hydro commission—agreed to send two representatives to meet with the labour officials in an attempt to delineate the issues leading to a settlement. As a result, negotiations were resumed that afternoon. At this meeting 33 issues were discussed and clarified. The progress that was made indicated a further meeting should be held and it was set for Sunday, June 6, at 1 o'clock.

Prior to this Sunday meeting, one of the spokesmen for the union advised Mr. A. C. Dennis that he was not in a position to continue in his capacity. He withdrew all of his statements of position made at the previous meeting and left The Department of Labour building. The other union representative presented a list of the items in dispute indicating his view of their relative importance to the union and stated that he was unable to attend the meeting alone.

Considering that the strike deadline was approaching and in view of the breakdown of the meetings of the last weekend, on Tuesday morning of this week the hon. Minister of Labour requested the union committee to meet with him to discuss the next move in the situation. After some discussion, the union committee agreed to meet immediately with representatives of Toronto Hydro, and the hon. Minister directed the deputy Minister to bring the parties together.

Negotiations began at 11 a.m. the same day and continued through until 1.30 on Wednesday morning. The whole situation was reviewed in detail. This exercise led to bargaining and the eventual settlement of a number of the lesser issues. As well, a list of the remaining issues which separated the parties was developed.

Yesterday morning the parties resumed

their meeting and an effort was made to tackle some of the key items which divided them. At 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon it became obvious that a complete deadlock on the unsettled issues existed and the meeting was terminated.

In a final effort to avoid the necessity of applying compulsory arbitration by legislation, the hon. Minister of Labour, in his last meeting with each party, appealed to them to submit the dispute, voluntarily, to binding arbitration. The Toronto Hydro accepted this proposal but the union committee rejected it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): What was the date of that?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That was yesterday.

After receiving a full report on the situation, as I mentioned when I introduced this bill last evening, it was clear to me that all approaches to settling this dispute by negotiation prior to the union's strike deadline had been exhausted. The conclusion was inescapable that no hope existed for a peaceful settlement of this dispute before the strike deadline of midnight tonight short of compulsory arbitration and legislation to effect compulsory arbitration was the only course of action which appeared to be available.

Let me deal for a moment with the staggering implications inherent in a strike involving an electric utility which provides for the needs of three-quarters of a million people. All of us must—and I am sure do—realize that hydro-electric power is vital for the continuing supply of other essential services including water, natural gas, transportation, hospital facilities and communications. The everyday operation of a home, an office or a factory depend on electricity.

To nourish and care for the daily needs of the people of Toronto, millions of dollars worth of food, drugs and other essential commodities must be kept on hand under proper cold storage conditions. It is clear that a discontinuance or interruption in the supply of electric power would seriously threaten the health, welfare and economic well-being of over 10 per cent of Ontario's population. Even if a power interruption is restricted to a limited area of the city, the individual resident would be without means to maintain his normal life. All industry and business in that area would grind to a halt and would be forced to lay off their employees.

In the face of these implications, any offer of the union to provide repair crews on an emergency basis, raises the difficult question

of how the term "emergency" is to be defined. If the union members are to maintain an effective strike, obviously they would limit their emergency service to correcting only the most serious and dangerous breakdowns. Such a definition of "emergency" could lead to disaster, while a broader definition could render the union's strike action ineffective.

Let us look at the position of Toronto Hydro in the event of a strike. Since the 55 non-working foremen in Toronto Hydro are members of the union and form part of the total bargaining unit of 550, they would not be available to the commission for the emergency maintenance of power. In addition, as retail distributors of electric power, not as producers as in the case of Ontario Hydro, this commission does not have a sufficient number of engineers and other technical personnel who would be able to assure that emergency requirements are met.

Considering that the disruption of electric power can emanate from a variety of everyday occurrences, such as an electric storm, an underground explosion, a construction mishap, a fallen tree or even an automobile crash, the demands for basic maintenance of power are constant.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to examine for a moment the problems surrounding the application of compulsion in resolving collective bargaining disputes.

In an ordinary industrial dispute, public interest is limited and the parties are free, once they have complied with all the provisions of the labour legislation of the province, to resort to economic action as a means of achieving their ends. This principle is inherent in the concept of free collective bargaining. The risks involved in attempting to gain an agreement through the application of economic pressure fall mainly on the parties themselves.

However, in this particular dispute, the risks inherent in the application of economic action are not limited to the parties. They impinge upon the whole of our society. Why should the people vitally dependent upon this public utility become the victims of the disputing parties? Since the parties themselves have failed, the people affected have only one means at their disposal to resolve this dispute and that is to turn to this Legislature. Can we fail here to accept the responsibility? I think we can not.

Yesterday, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson), in his remarks, suggested that we emulate Sweden as a model jurisdiction in the labour relations field. I am sure that he would not want to leave a

false impression with respect to Sweden's attitude toward compulsory arbitration. I should like to refer him to the recent report of the Bennett commission on hospital disputes. Page 38 of that report says as follows:

Sweden has had compulsory arbitration legislation for 20 years, though it has never been invoked. A threatened strike of nurses and another by officers of the merchant marine fleet have been the only two circumstances in which the government has contemplated compulsory arbitration during the 20 years of the law's existence.

Mediation is really the key to the Swedish labour scene. However, compulsory arbitral machinery exists. The law stipulates that an official arbitration court, whose decision cannot be appealed, may be appointed in cases of complex labour conflicts deemed detrimental to the nation. Such a court of arbitration can be appointed only after the decision to do so has been made by the Swedish Parliament.

In general, both employers' and employees' organizations have opposed compulsory arbitration laws. The threat of the appointment of an arbitration court by Parliament has been enough to make the parties come to a settlement themselves. The Swedish law providing for compulsory arbitration is extremely restrictive, so much so that a situation such as the 1959 steel conflict in the U.S. probably would not be cause for using arbitration legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Sweden has recognized the need to have this type of legislation available to settle public interest disputes. The fact that the parties have been able to resolve their differences without the need to invoke the legislation, reflects on their maturity.

I would like to emphasize once again that this bill is limited in its application to this one dispute. Both a strike and a lockout are banned. A three-man board of arbitration will settle the issues between the parties. Under the legislation, each party will have the opportunity to nominate a member to the board. These members, in turn, will be required to agree on a chairman, but if they are unable to agree, the hon. Minister of Labour will appoint. The present members of the board of conciliation are not eligible for appointment to the board of arbitration.

Under section 3, subsection 13, the board is required to give the parties to the dispute full opportunity to present their evidence and make their submissions.

The Act comes into force on Royal Assent

and is repealed on the day on which a collective agreement becomes effective.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of this bill provide the best available machinery to assure a full and thorough investigation, weighing and ultimate decision, fairly, objectively and impartially arrived at. Through this legislation, the interests of the employer, the interest of the workers and the interests of the people of this city will be justly served.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister in regard to this bill. The hon. Prime Minister indicated this afternoon that he was not too enthused about our suggesting that he was a fair man; he was not impressed with that sort of statement. I am going to suggest right now, sir, that the remarks that he made in support of this bill were a bunch of noises signifying absolutely nothing.

He took off after my hon. leader and the remarks that he addressed to this House last evening, and suggested that the comparison with Sweden was hardly a proper one, because Sweden had on its statute books a compulsory arbitration bill which was there even though it is rarely, if ever, used. I suggest, sir, that at least in Sweden there is a public declaration of policy that the government had the courage to put on its statute books.

I suggest, sir, that this is a government that is weak-kneed and lacking in courage because it does not have the authority, the guts, to put on the statute books what it really means in labour relations. In the time that we have sat in this Legislature, my hon. colleagues and I who came in in 1959, we have seen this government move from crisis to crisis.

We have had the Ontario Hydro strike where the government weeps and wails and bemoans its fate and says, "What can we do? What can we do? We are going to have a one-shot effort at compulsory arbitration for Ontario Hydro. We do not believe in it, but we are going to do it. We are forced to. Those terrible people in the union are pressing our hands, they have a knife in our back and we are going to have to have a one-shot effort at compulsory arbitration."

Then we had the Trenton hospital situation. The government set up the Bennett commission. His Honour Judge Bennett, a very competent man, sat and studied and brought in a report, and the government, again beating its breast in self-righteousness, said, "We do not like it; we do not really

believe it; but—one-shot effort again—we are going to have compulsory arbitration in this very dangerous hospital dispute."

For some peculiar reason, they let the mantle slip a bit from this cloak of self-righteousness. Just a few days ago, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) brought in a measure, tucked away in his Police Act, that compels the cleaning women and the gardeners and the typists attached to police forces to arbitrate compulsorily. The government said: "We do not believe in it. We are not really treading upon the right to bargain. We really believe in the right of labour to bargain. But there is a danger that the whole process of the administration of justice might grind to a halt if those civil servants are given a free right to bargain, and all that it implies." My friend, the hon. Attorney General, a very clever man, and a man for whom I have the greatest respect, quibbles with words and says, "We are not taking away any bargaining rights."

Mr. Speaker, if we have to quibble with words, let us find out what the labour movement in this province thinks about when it talks about bargaining rights and when it talks about collective bargaining. Surely it must mean, and it must imply, the right of labour to withhold its work. No amount of equivocation, no amount of pedantics and no amount of splitting hairs is going to deviate from that principle one iota.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the time has long since passed in this province of Ontario when we should have a clear, public and unequivocal declaration from the government as to what it means in relation to collective bargaining. We have not got it tonight and we have not had it for 22 years from this government.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Tell us what you would do.

Mr. Singer: I will tell you what I would do. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this whole government stands condemned tonight, as it has stood condemned for the last half dozen years; dozen years; and 22 years, because it has never once been able to set its labour house in order. It has had a series of Ministers of Labour who have not the faintest idea, sir, of how to progress in relation to management-labour relations. They go around beating their breasts and complaining: "Oh, we believe in labour; we believe in collective bargaining; we believe in your right to withdraw your labour; we believe in all these things."

But look, Mr. Speaker, at 8.30 of the

clock on Thursday, June 10, just 3½ hours away from the strike deadline, we have Bill 167 presented to us for second reading. The hon. Prime Minister outlined to us the tortured series of negotiations. We tried, he said, we tried desperately. We had all these meetings. The hon. Minister of Labour himself sat down yesterday and tried to say: "Please accept compulsory arbitration."

But not once during these negotiations, Mr. Speaker, not even once was the Opposition called in. Was my hon. leader called in? Was the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) called in? Was the situation explained to them? No, sir, not until yesterday afternoon was the meeting hastily convened and the hon. Prime Minister announced to my hon. leader and to the hon. member for York South: "We have a terrible situation on our hands and with great reluctance—we do not want to do it—we are going to have to bring in a bill for compulsory arbitration."

Was there any explanation, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): What did Mr. St. Laurent do in 1950 when the railway—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I must admit I am duly unimpressed by the irrelevant rantings of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. His performance as Attorney General left something substantially to be desired, and if he wants to get into labour disputes let him get up and explain the record of this government in labour negotiations. It is a poor one. He knows it, I know it, and the people of Ontario know it. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get on with the debate.

Not until late yesterday afternoon did the hon. Prime Minister of this province venture to bring into his confidence the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the NDP. Not until yesterday afternoon was an attempt made by the leader of this province to inform the Opposition—a most integral part of the government—of what was going on.

To my knowledge, sir, even at this eleventh—the eleventh and a half—hour no real explanation has been given to the public. I listened carefully to the hon. Prime Minister as to the sort of damage that could well be anticipated; is in fact likely to occur. I have read very carefully today's newspapers. One of the journalists suggested that the normal services could carry on, but if there was a break in the service there was no ability to

repair it. I do not know, sir, even tonight, if a strike takes place at midnight this evening if the people in hospitals would suffer; if our young citizens would suffer; if our older citizens who need electrical facilities would suffer. I do not know any of these things and I suggest, sir, that none of us in this House know—from any words that come from government sources—what the likely results would be from such a strike.

I say, sir, that the government stands seriously condemned tonight as a result of its own action and its own inaction. I say, sir, that no one really knows—no one in the province of Ontario has the faintest idea—what the government means when it says: "We believe in collective bargaining; we believe in the rights of labour to bargain and if they cannot bargain successfully, to withhold their services." I suggest that the government has dug itself into a hole this evening by reason of its inability either to make up its mind as to which direction we can go in or it is because of its additional inability to advise all of the citizens of this province—including particularly the hon. members of the Opposition in this House—as to what, in fact, has been going on.

I suggest, sir, that it lies within our power here this evening—starting at 30 minutes past 8 of the clock this evening—to conduct a similar sort of debate such as has been going on in connection with the bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

I suggest, sir, that it lies completely within our power. Perhaps it might even be our democratic duty to discuss as fully and as carefully on second reading, clause by clause of this bill; as well as all the possible ramifications that lie within this. With the deadline staring us in the face, we would be less than responsible if we said: "We do not really care about what is going to happen to our people in hospitals; about what is going to happen to the little babies who need warm milk that has to be heated by electricity; and about all the possible ramifications of this strike." We have never really been told—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Crocodile tears.

Mr. Singer: It is not "crocodile tears." Mr. Speaker, I am not too amazed, really, at the tenor of the remarks that come from the government front benches. They are in a spot and they know it. They are in a spot of their own choosing; they are in a spot produced by their own absolute neglect. They have neglected to take a stand in labour-management relations; they have neglected to lay out a policy; and above all, administratively,

they have neglected to set up within the machinery of this department proper conciliation officers and proper bargaining procedure that has the confidence of labour and management.

There is nobody to blame, for the situation that faces us in this province tonight, other than those in the front benches of this government. These are the people that did it. These are the people that at 23 minutes to nine—a few hours away from the deadline—come to us, weeping and wailing and beating their breasts, saying: "Help us out of the situation; we failed miserably. We never took you into our confidence. We never had any policy, but help us out of the situation. We caused it, we created it, now, for goodness sake, get us out."

Mr. Speaker, we have not been told, and I listened carefully to the words of the hon. Prime Minister, that there is an emergency, really. He talks about a possible emergency. Surely the least we could have expected from a responsible Prime Minister was a clear delineation of what would happen if a strike would commence at midnight tonight. There has been no outlining of that situation at all. Can the Hydro go on? Will the electricity function? Will all these difficult and emergency situations be looked after, or not? We do not know.

I would hope, the hon. Prime Minister has spoken and according to the rules of the House we can only speak once in this debate, that one of his colleagues, perhaps the hon. Minister of Labour—we have not heard a word from him yet—would get up and say, clearly and unequivocally, what the exact situation is. We have not had an opportunity to talk with the labour leaders. We do not know what provisions the union can make. We do not know any of these things. I suggest, sir, that it is a real insult to the intelligence of the people of the province of Ontario that we are placed in this position because of lack of government planning and lack of government leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that at this point I can say much more in connection with this second reading. Many of my hon. colleagues are going to join in this debate, but for the moment, sir, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, we are going to wait and see what facts this debate reveals. I hurl the challenge at the government to stand up boldly and say what this situation is, why has it come about, why were they so negligent that an emergency exists tonight?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview

said of the hon. Prime Minister that he had listened to a lot of sound and fury that signified nothing. I have just listened to a hurricane of sound and a cyclone of fury, which adds up to nothing. Where does the Liberal Party stand on this issue?

Mr. Singer: The hon. member will hear before the night is out.

Mr. MacDonald: I will tell the House where we stand before I am finished. But the Liberal Party, once again is sitting on the fence like a mugwump, with its mug on one side and its wump on the other, and we do not know where it stands.

The Liberal Party referred to the government as gutless. I will get around to proving that they are right that the government is gutless, but if there is anybody more gutless than the government it is the Liberals, and they have proven it once again. As far as they are concerned there are no principles involved in this situation at all. They are just playing politics throughout.

Mr. Singer: Having delivered himself of all that, what is the hon. member going to do?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: I just wanted to unmask the sound and fury, but there will be a little more substance in my case and before I sit down I will present a positive alternative, which could have gotten us out of the mess we are in at the present time. This is what we could have expected from a responsible Opposition facing a so-called irresponsible government—using your terms. But the hon. member has matched their irresponsibility with his own.

Mr. Speaker, let us get down to the substance of this issue. It is a very serious issue, an extremely serious issue. I trust that the flippancy of the interjections that were made here yesterday, and we have had already a bit here tonight, are not going to lower the tone of a debate which is dealing with the fundamental rights of a free society.

My first point, Mr. Speaker, is one which, in the flexibility that you granted yesterday on first reading, I made at that time, but I want to reiterate it.

Some time soon, Mr. Speaker, we have got to start practising what we preach. This government consistently says: We are opposed to compulsory arbitration; labour is opposed to compulsory arbitration, management is opposed to compulsory arbitration. Yet with repeated frequency, this government comes in and imposes compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of inconsistency begins to border on hypocrisy, because we have had another example of it in a bill that has been brought before this House. Let me take this House back to a debate that a good third of the House will not have had an opportunity to have heard. It was the debate the last time we had to face this kind of an issue, in precisely this kind of circumstance, on the eve of a strike in which the arbitrary exercise of legislative power was going to strike at the basic rights of human beings, rights to which the government pays lip service.

I am referring to the debate that took place in this House on black Thursday, April 5, 1962. I want to quote just two brief passages from my own comments at that time. It is to be found on page 1952 of *Hansard*:

Since there is a growing body of opinion, including some sections of the trade union movement, which is at least open-minded in considering that there are certain areas of our economy where arbitration of disputes might be entertained, then there is an obligation on the government to give leadership through consultations with labour and management in seeking to define clearly what those areas are, and the conditions under which arbitration would be acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, there is a vital difference between the use of arbitration on a shotgun basis, such as this government proposes to do in this bill, and deliberations among all concerned to seek prior and voluntary extension of the principle of arbitration in areas beyond those where it is now accepted. This kind of action would represent a constructive approach to this problem, it would open up the possibility that we are not going to be faced with a series of ad hoc bills such as this one, each representing an arbitrary exercise of legislative power to destroy the normal rights of free collective bargaining.

That is the end of my quotation. But, Mr. Speaker, just to show you how seized people of all political complexions were with the seriousness of the government action in 1962, let me quote briefly from an editorial of the *Toronto Telegram* the day after the government introduced its bill in 1962 so that it was available for me to use it in the debate. I quote one paragraph from the *Telegram* editorial:

In any case, compulsory arbitration is not a principle that should be adopted in the conditions of haste and conflict that exists in the 11th hour of dispute. If the On-

tario Legislature in its wisdom decides that the right of Hydro workers to go on strike should be restricted then the Legislature should have reached the decision with due deliberation. It should have brought in legislation when there was no duress and when the issue could be debated in principle without a critical dispute hanging over it. An issue that involves curtailing the rights of any section of the population of Ontario should not be decided by hurriedly passing legislation at the last minute.

That is the end of the quotation from the editorial of the *Toronto Telegram* in 1962.

Mr. Speaker, that was the government's action then. They have not only the pleading of us in the House, but they have the pleading of the press, and I could have quoted from the *Toronto Daily Star*. They have the pleading from such regular supporters of the Tory party as the good old *Tory Telegram* saying that you do not trample on these principles under such circumstances. You do not do this again. You sit down and you consider the circumstances under which it might be legitimate to use compulsory arbitration, but you do it in the quiet of rational consideration, not in the 11th hour, on the eve of a strike.

What has this government done, Mr. Speaker? What has this government done in the last three years?

The answer to that is one word—nothing.

Well, perhaps I am unfair. Perhaps they have done something.

Let us recall another little episode, because if the hon. Minister of Labour wants to know something of the background of the problem he has had to cope with in this, he has to harken back to a situation in which he was very intimately involved. This government has done something.

We had a situation in the Trenton hospital, a roughly comparable situation in that it was a public service in which the public welfare was going to be threatened, so it was said, if the workers went on strike. There was a deadline at the end of September, 1962, I think was the year, or maybe it was 1963. This hon. Minister of Labour called in the union and said to this union, "If you will agree to postpone your strike, then I give you a guarantee that at the next session of the Legislature we will bring in a bill to arbitrate this single dispute."

Here was a union that was willing, Mr. Speaker, to accept voluntary arbitration. It said so. The hon. Minister of Labour, over the signatures of two respected civil servants in this province, Louis Fine, for years a chief

conciliation officer, and Tom Eberlee, the assistant deputy Minister of Labour, gave the union a guarantee, the word of the hon. Minister, that if they were to postpone strike deadline and if they pursued negotiations and did not get a settlement, this government would bring in a bill for arbitration of the dispute.

You know what happened, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps hon. members have forgotten. The Cabinet doublecrossed the hon. Minister of Labour.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We've heard this story before.

Mr. MacDonald: I invite the hon. Prime Minister to get up and tell me exactly what happened, then.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have heard this speech from the hon. member six times.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly, and the hon. Prime Minister is going to hear it once more right now.

The fact of the matter is that the hon. Minister of Labour gave his word of honour and the government, the Cabinet, the hon. Prime Minister—who, I do not know, but collectively they have the responsibility—refused to back up the hon. Minister of Labour and his word was not worth a snap of the fingers. I said to the hon. Minister of Labour at that time, that any time he tries to suggest to a labour group in this province that his word should be accepted at some of the delicate stages in settling a labour-management dispute, he should not be surprised if labour says, "Why should we accept your word?" Once bitten, twice shy.

And then what did this government do, Mr. Speaker? This is very interesting and I wish the hon. member for Downsview had not gone out.

Mr. Singer: I am listening.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. I wish the hon. member for Downsview would listen rather carefully then.

Mr. Singer: Just mention my name and I will even come back and sit down and let the hon. member know—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this government had a way to solve the situation in Trenton. If there ever was a clear-cut case of management refusing to bargain in good faith, it was that case. There has never been a more clear-cut case. Everybody was opposed

to management because of its intransigent stand—the hospital association, the government, the union, the public, everybody. Yet there is a clause in The Labour Relations Act that says you must bargain in good faith. Did this government have—and I borrow the good proletarian phrase—the guts to enforce its own labour relations Act? The answer is no. What did it do as an alternative, Mr. Speaker? It brought in a bill which imposed compulsory arbitration, not only on Trenton but on all of the hospitals across the province of Ontario.

In other words, because it did not have the courage to enforce its own labour relations Act, this government, which professes to be opposed to compulsory arbitration, brought in a bill which imposed compulsory arbitration from this day forward across the board in the hospitals. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, when it brought in that bill, just to show how much was sound and fury tonight and how much was substance, the Liberals supported it, two to three months ago in this session.

We are back once again to the proposition of how the government acts and how it conflicts with your preaching. I will say to the hon. Minister that he has had a tough situation in this dispute. I would say to the hon. Minister that there has been a degree of intransigence on both sides. When the hon. Minister finds himself in the middle under circumstances like that, the situation is not easy. But what the hon. Minister has to do is to resolve every conceivable alternative before he resorts to something that he professes to abhor—compulsory arbitration. And did he? Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you that he did not.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, this is an incredible proposition. Here is a union that has been in negotiation for quite some time with the Toronto Hydro commission. Mr. Speaker, do you realize that at no stage, even now, the eleventh hour, three hours before a strike deadline, has the negotiating committee of the union had an opportunity to sit down with the commission? Here you have a group of public servants in this city.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Would the hon. member just repeat that, I missed part of it.

Mr. MacDonald: I said at no time has the union's negotiating committee had an opportunity to sit down with the commission itself. The commission is not big business, it is not Stelco; the commission is a public body, it is made up of men who are paid out of the

public purse, it is a body about which, tragically, the city council in Toronto did not see fit to continue the historic right of labour to have one representative on it, and bolstered that commission with a good old, solid, reactionary, Tory base—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Let us not impute that to me, if the hon. member is talking about me; that is not my Act.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the commission.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is not my commission.

Mr. MacDonald: All I am saying to the hon. Minister is, this is a commission of people who are public servants, who are being paid out of the public purse, who are driving around in Cadillacs at the cost of the public, and not once during all of these negotiations did the workers have an opportunity to sit down with these public servants. Yet did the government do anything to insist that they would have an opportunity to sit down? No, it did not. I come to the conclusion therefore that the government did not exhaust all of the possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add one more thing, and it is something that the House is not aware of. To my mind it is a significant confirmation of the fact that this government did not do everything that was possible to solve this strike without compulsory arbitration.

When this bill was introduced here yesterday, I was just as unhappy as the government professed to be unhappy; indeed, I would suggest, more so. Last night I went home and I got in touch with a number of people, as a result of which this morning, Mr. Speaker, the organizing committee of the union sat down with David Lewis, QC, who is universally recognized as one of the top labour lawyers in this country, and as a result of that session this morning, at noon of today the union met with the hon. Prime Minister of this province and presented a proposal to him. I want to read to the House what that proposal is, because I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is an eminently fair proposition which would have avoided the use of compulsory arbitration under the circumstances with which we are now faced. This was a proposal that was made to the government by the union at noon of today:

That the present bill to be—

Mr. Speaker, let me stop right here, because there is a very important factor I forgot about.

The union gave the government its assurance that it would postpone the strike deadline as of midnight tonight if the government would adopt this proposal. Just let me pause and emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, for hon. members of the Legislature to grasp. The union involved, as of noon today, agreed to postpone the strike deadline, so that in fact we would not be faced with a strike at 12 o'clock tonight.

Some hon. members: On what terms?

Mr. MacDonald: On what terms? Fine. I shall read them:

The present bill to be withdrawn and a new bill to be introduced to provide as follows:

(a) The old collective agreement between the parties to be reinstated until a new collective agreement is executed.

(b) The government to appoint a mediator with the duty of seeking to reach a settlement between the parties on all outstanding issues.

(c) The mediator to have 60 days within which to seek such settlement.

(d) If, at the end of 60 days, there remain any issues still unresolved, then those issues to be submitted to final and binding arbitration without delay.

(e) The submission to be to a board of arbitration of which the mediator shall be chairman and to which each of the parties shall appoint a nominee within seven days after the end of the 60-day period. If either of the parties fails to make such an appointment the Minister of Labour to appoint someone who shall have the same position as if he had been appointed by the parties concerned.

(f) The government to pay the fee and expenses of the mediator and chairman of the board and each party to pay the fee and expenses of its own nominee to the board.

Mr. Speaker, could I just go back a bit to the interjection of the hon. Prime Minister, in comment on an observation of the hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday that in Sweden they have compulsory arbitration? "But," said he, "there is a heavy element of mediation in it." Quite true, and there is a heavy element of mediation in this. Indeed, it is mediation. Now, what happened? I am authorized by Mr. David Lewis to say that, when he talked with the hon. Minister of Labour this afternoon, the hon. Minister said that this was acceptable in principle to the government if it was acceptable to the

Hydro commission. The proposition was put to the Hydro commission, which refused to accept it, and demanded its pound of flesh in terms of—

An hon. member: They wanted voluntary arbitration.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes—to be accurate, the commission said it would accept voluntary arbitration. Whether or not this is voluntary arbitration, at this stage, is a very nice point.

So there we have, Mr. Speaker, a very fair proposition put to this government as an alternative. A proposition in which the union said that it would postpone the strike deadline, accept the government-appointed mediator and would, within 60 days, sit down with that mediator and sort out all these unresolved points in the labour-management dispute. What remained at the end of 60 days would be referred to an arbitration board, which would be chaired by the mediator, and to which each of the parties would appoint somebody. If either of them began to play a dog-in-the-manger role, the government would have the right to make an appointment on its behalf. The majority decision that the board came up with would be final and binding. This was accepted by the union and refused by the Hydro commission.

I would suggest to this government that it should not be like the Liberals and just sit on the fence in an issue; that it should exercise some of the power that goes with its office.

Now, if you have as eminently fair a proposal as this—a proposal in which the union has agreed to negotiate with the assistance of an arbitrator to sort out as many of these as is possible so that, in the final arbitration, there will be as few points as possible left—this is surely retaining as much of the free collective bargaining process as is possible; instead of handing the whole thing over to an arbitrator who is just going to go off and come back with a decision which is final and binding, and nobody has had an opportunity—neither party—to have a say in the process.

This, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: That is wrong. There are three members of this board—one appointed by each side.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this is in keeping with the kind of thing that the hon. Prime Minister, perhaps unwittingly, extolled in the instance of Sweden. What

saddens me, Mr. Speaker, is that this provided an opportunity for the government to avoid the shocking aspects of using compulsory arbitration in a bill in the fashion that they are going to do now. But, I suggest, it also offered the key to a long-term solution to this kind of problem; the kind of thing that the *Toronto Telegram* asked for three years ago—to sit down quietly when there is no specific crisis with labour and management and work out a kind of formula; presumably the kind of thing the Liberals were pleading for when they said that the government should work out their policy so that the public would know where they stand.

Mr. Speaker, I have presented an alternative—not only an alternative that is acceptable in this instance in terms of protecting the public interest and resolving this dispute—but I suggested an alternative which this government and this Legislature should study for future use in comparable situations so that we will not have ad hoc bills coming in every time this kind of situation arises.

Because the government has not seen fit to use its power under these circumstances, to make certain that this alternative was put into effect, we cannot support this bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Freeman, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word “that,” and substituting the following:

In the opinion of this House the proposal submitted to the government today by Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees, represented a fair and reasonable method of settling the dispute without a stoppage of work, which would have safeguarded adequately both the public interest and the interests of the parties, and thus represented an alternative preferable to the harsh, restrictive and undemocratic provisions of Bill 167.

Mr. Speaker: Moved by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Freeman, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word “that” and substituting the following:

In the opinion of this House, the proposal submitted to the government today by Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees, represented a fair and reasonable method of settling the dispute without a stoppage of work, which would have safeguarded adequately both the public interest and the interests of the parties, and thus represented an alternative preferable to the harsh, restrictive and undemocratic provisions of Bill 167.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have sat here and listened to one of the most deplorable examples of public dis-service and of irresponsible politics that I have heard in all my days in the Legislature. I refer to a man who has played politics with the essential services of the people of this province and who has wanted to be like a vaudeville act, hiding within his pocket some special little knowledge that he has until the last moment. It cheapened, to me, the whole emergency situation that we have. He stood up and talked about a hurricane and other things to us. I have seen him over the years, in his desperation, try to gain power and try to woo people. This is—not in the man himself, but in what he said—one of the most despicable demonstrations of irresponsibility that I have ever witnessed.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Who presented this? He said that he did, with David Lewis. The two of them get into cahoots together—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not say that I presented this, and I did not present this. I said, Mr. Speaker, that this was worked out by the union committee this morning and was presented to the government; and I suggested it as an alternative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member has been hiding things quietly to himself, having certain facts and getting up with the bluster for which he is so notorious. He starts condemning us because, at this point, we did not know any of these facts—not having been in cahoots with David Lewis. I challenge him to say that he has not seen David Lewis and talked to him. Having talked to him, he then suddenly produces this as a great champion. I say again, and *Hansard* will show it, that he said: "I present this." The unions presented this, not you.

Mr. MacDonald: And I offered—

Mr. Thompson: I suggest now, sir, that here in this House, when we have to make a very fundamental decision, let me read how all of the hon. members of this House have viewed this decision. I refer to the select committee on labour relations of the Ontario Legislature and its report, signed by the leader of the New Democratic Party. Let me say, section 25, essential services:

It is the recommendation of the committee that a model clause should be in-

cluded in the Act to be made part of all collective agreements which would provide that there shall be no stoppage of work by any employees who are responsible for the maintenance of essential services to the community at large, as distinguished from the employer.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, and I am still pleading for the model clause—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Now who is inconsistent?

Mr. MacDonald: I am not inconsistent about it at all.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say this, that we have viewed this situation with alarm and concern, because our understanding was that there was a deadlock and that there was no solution to this. We had that explained yesterday and I appreciate that the hon. Prime Minister had called both of us in. But there was no sort of solution when the hon. Prime Minister talked to myself and to the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. MacDonald: That was yesterday.

Mr. Thompson: He scurried out since yesterday.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Thompson: He held back through the tense moments, and now, at 9 o'clock, three hours before this situation would become a crisis for the whole of Ontario and particularly for the people of Metropolitan Toronto, smugly and with satisfaction he pulls this out, after castigating us and condemning us, because he says the government does not know where it is standing and is wishy-washy.

If this presentation represents the situation, and I presume it does, may I now turn to the government? Its members stood before us, told us there was a deadlock, and that there was no solution. Just at this point, we were suddenly getting certain facts. My hon. colleague from Downsview explained the pattern, in the past, the history of the government in connection with moving in with compulsory arbitration, the very dangerous tendency which we saw from the hon. Attorney General, affecting cleaning women and others to be covered in all-embracing compulsory arbitration.

Of course we hate the thought of compulsory arbitration. We had assumed that this had come to a deadlock; we had assumed that there was no solution to it and that men, women and children were going to suffer in hospitals. They were going to suffer, as

my hon. friend said, although he got catcalls or something from some of the government hon. members. He talked of children and the need for milk. Certainly this would mean a close-down of all those things. As I said last night, the welfare of the community, and the lives of children and of the people of this community override and are paramount in a situation of labour relations.

But we qualified what we were saying, because we had no facts. We qualified what we were saying, asking was this such a drastic emergency? We wanted to be sure of it. The other thing we wanted to be sure of was the fact that this was seriously a deadlock, from which there was no solution. As my hon. colleague from Downsview said, we are being left completely in the dark. We do not know what the deliberations were. We do not know what the 54 points were on which there is deadlock. All we know about the situation is, because of the indulgence of the hon. Prime Minister, to call us out yesterday at 4.30 and to explain to us that there is an emergency situation.

Let me be fair, Mr. Speaker, in this. The hon. Minister of Labour did talk to me two weeks ago. I assumed it was in confidence and I can say at this point that he told me that if there was a shutdown of Hydro, and he hoped there would not be, then this would involve many of the lifesaving services for the people of this province. He was working in order that this could be stopped, in order that a solution could be arrived at.

But we had not known of this solution. To me, it is a perfectly reasonable solution and if we had known it, of course, this would have taken on a different complexion.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Call you up to tell you next time.

Mr. Thompson: This is just the point I want to make—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would remind the members that we are on second reading of the bill and that the member speaking to the motion has the floor. It is contrary to the rules to speak directly back and forth to other members in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order once again, before the hon. leader of the Opposition persists in misrepresenting it.

This proposal was presented by the union at noon today. It was being considered by the government all during the afternoon and

I had a call from the hon. Prime Minister at five minutes to eight, before the House went in, indicating that the commission could not accept it and therefore the government had decided to proceed with its bill.

Mr. Singer: You had a call?

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Singer: It is fine for the NDP and the government to carry on secret negotiations—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, all this sound and fury—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Settle a strike by the NDP and the government secretly negotiating—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I just cannot help picking up a remark by one of the NDP backbenchers—the fact that, as I thought I heard it, it was, “We had the facts,” or something like this.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, I did not catch what you said.

Mr. Speaker: No conversations directly with another member of the House, please!

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry; I am getting these interruptions. What I really want to say is that it is a heinous crime, I suggest it is betrayal of trust, when there are such facts as these, and they are known either by the hon. Prime Minister of this province or by the leader of the New Democratic Party, and we are being asked to deliberate on this most serious situation without them.

Mr. Singer: It is a shame and a disgrace.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I mean this most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, because this is a situation in which I say the welfare of the community is above politics. There are times when, as a group of legislators we come together with our overriding concern being the welfare of the people of a city or a province, and we rise above trying to take political advantage of a situation. May I say if I had had facts such as these, I can assure the hon. members that I would have wanted to present them to the House, and not wait quietly as he did, until one speaker got up and then another

speaker, and have this display of utter partisanship, with him castigating the hon. member for Downsview who was asking for more facts, and smugly like a cat with a mouse hidden underneath its belly or something—a perfectly good English term used in Shakespeare—hide these facts from the rest of us so that he could produce them and become the great protagonist for some people.

I say I do not want to be the protagonist for any section. We are the Liberal Party; we are concerned with the welfare of the whole community. In this, we are not trying to garner some votes from a situation that can imperil the whole of this city. But I would say this, sir, that because we did not know of this representation that was made by the union through the government, this has changed the whole complexion with regard to our attitude. We no longer see this situation as the extreme emergency which at first we had understood it would be. I, sir, intend to read this and I would say that our inclination, in fact our purpose now, is that there is not this emergency which the government is portraying. We will wait to hear the hon. Minister of Labour justify to us that there is an emergency before we make the decision on which way we will vote.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the discussion about this bill, and being quite aware of the significance of the contents and the principles of the bill, I think maybe it is timely that I do so. However, I am not interested in getting into any altercation with either of the Opposition parties. I am sure they can look after their own respective situations.

In the light of the previous debate; maybe I should start in reverse, and so I will start with today. I was down here in the building at about 20 minutes to nine this morning. I have been within 100 feet of this Legislature for the entire day up to and including this evening, and there have been a number of events taking place which have required analysis and careful consideration.

From the remarks made by some of the hon. members here tonight it is obvious that they have no idea about the operation of government, nor the discharge of the responsibilities which a Minister has to bear if he regards his portfolio with any degree of seriousness. I tell you that quite frankly.

This morning at about 11.30 a telephone call was received in the office of the hon. Prime Minister from Mr. David Lewis, and Mr. Lewis said he had a matter that he wanted to discuss. We then tried to make arrangements so that he could be seen as

quickly as possible. Mr. Lewis explained in his initial telephone call that he had of his own volition volunteered his services and injected himself into this dispute. He also indicated that he was in a ticklish position because he did not know anything about the relationship with the previous lawyer, Mr. Levinson. Of course, these were the situations that he was discussing and it was finally made clear that he said he was acting without fee in the matter and that he was a voluntary consultant, if I could put it this way.

An appointment was made and we said that we could see him and the bargaining committee at about a quarter after one, when they arrived. We spent until about a quarter to two discussing the proposal which Mr. Lewis was advocating. The proposal we were told had the union's full support. The question of the direct approach—and the timing of the approach, of course, on the one hand is of concern and on the other hand is of no concern. As far as this government is concerned, in a matter of this nature the door is always open right up to the 11th hour and 59th minute pertaining to any representation that someone wishes to make. This proposal was treated on that basis, and whatever Mr. Lewis and the committee cared to advance was given very careful consideration.

There were various discussions with Mr. Lewis, who spoke on behalf of the committee and in their presence, and reference was made to the question of the various alternatives. We dealt with such matters as were directly concerned with this proposed amendment, this new proposal of procedure, and indeed went back to another point involving the question of voluntary arbitration. Then at about a quarter to two we left so that we could have a conversation, my deputy and an official from the hon. Prime Minister's office and one from my own office.

Having met these gentlemen, at a quarter to two we adjourned so that we could catch the hon. Prime Minister before he went into the House, which we did about three minutes later. We discussed the matter and I looked into certain other aspects of it and I reviewed it privately myself.

I then talked, at exactly a quarter to three, to Mr. Lewis at his office. I informed him that as the Minister I was prepared to recommend this proposal, but in the light of the circumstances of the time and of the intransigent position of both parties up to this moment I felt an amendment by consent or an alternative of this sort, would come best from both parties.

We discussed whether I should call the commission or its representatives, or whether Mr. Lewis should. My view, frankly, was that Mr. Lewis should and I told him so. Mr. Lewis then proceeded to make his contact with the commission and in these circumstances there would have been a proposal bearing the consent of the parties, which I regarded as a very meaningful step forward. Possibly the step forward that we had been looking for in this whole matter.

Now, subsequently, there was some delay. While Mr. Lewis was endeavouring to reach the representatives of the commission, he called me back again. We had a further conversation, cordial as usual, and it covered a range of subjects, since Mr. Lewis had 20 minutes to wait before he could make the contact he wished to achieve. During that conversation Mr. Lewis advanced various matters with relation to this dispute and I discussed them with him in the hope that some knowledge or information bearing on the subject matter would come forward. It is out of such discussions as these that solutions come. There is no exact scientific approach to the solution of labour relations problems. The solutions come from the most unusual places and at the most unexpected times. People in this business have to be alert and aware, ready to latch on, if I may put it this way, to whatever solutions may develop or appear available so that they may advance toward a resolution of the overall issues.

Now, at about—it was some time after 5 o'clock—another message came from the parties. It was partly from Mr. Lewis and it was partly from the representative of the commission and it was the commission's answer. Apparently contact had been made. This is the only way I know that they had contact.

The message that was given to me, and I think I shall read it if I have it—I had it somewhere—in any event, the version of it was a telephone call saying that the commission would try to meet the request, I think it was, of the union and would consent. Now, at this point the message, from this secretary in this office downtown, I thought had something missing. But we could not contact the author of the message to get clarification.

I tell hon. members, quite frankly, we spent some considerable time trying to decipher it, because there is a closeness in the meaning and relationship of the words and to suggest exactly what the answer from the commission was, because it had to do with either a counter offer, which meant that they would turn down the injection of the 60-day

request. This is what the union position is—apart from the wording in that memo—the position of Mr. Lewis is that there is a 60-day period injected into the present proposal and that the binding arbitration is deferred 60 days. That is the meat of it.

We finally got back to Mr. Lewis about 5.20 or 5.30 and said, "Look, is this the message you received that was relayed to us?" And he said, "Yes." And we said, "We think there should be some clarification and something more specific in it." Mr. Lewis said, "I get the point, it means a counter offer." They turned down the formula which Mr. Lewis and the union had advanced and had come back with a counter offer to accept voluntary, binding arbitration. At that point, in effect, the issue was eliminated, because that was out. I was not speaking to Mr. Lewis in that last conversation, but it terminated, in effect, shall we say the attempt, to secure the commission's agreement on this point.

Now, the subsequent message I received—a further part of the message—had been a telephone call from the hon. member for York South to the hon. Prime Minister. I was not there, but I believe that they saw each other this morning and the hon. member for York South said—and this is hearsay from the hon. Prime Minister to me—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will explain that.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes. In any event, this is a proper approach and of course the visit had to do with Mr. Lewis's proposal and that of the union.

When the last conversation took place this afternoon with my office and Mr. Lewis, he made reference to his earlier conversation with me in which he said he had proposed and had urged on the union to try to settle this matter quietly. Whatever progress was possible through us, as I told Mr. Lewis, we could do best quietly, rather than in the press. I said that to him and he reported back that he had honoured that commitment or understanding with me. Then he added that he had honoured that and had reported the information to the hon. member for York South, and that is exactly the sequence of events as they took place today.

My own position? I have been asked 50 times today by various people and the press, and I did not say anything. I then came into the House at 8 o'clock and we are now here.

Let me now revert to this proposition.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister left out one part.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Is it correct that the telephone call took place at five to eight between the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. member for York South?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Thompson: On the proposal that Mr. Lewis made in his conversation with the hon. Minister, they both had an agreement that this would be kept out of the press and confidential—am I correct on that?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not think the last word was used. I think there was a suggestion that the union might want to make a statement at an appropriate time. My view was that until the answer had been obtained from the Hydro commission that it would be helpful in all the circumstances, if it were not done.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask, sir, did the hon. Minister know that the hon. member for York South was going to break this proposal to the House?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, I did not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go back to this proposition, and this is really what the point is. It hinges around why I wanted both parties to take this formula and approve it and get the commission's consent. In those circumstances I would have recommended to the government that the formula be acted upon.

Throughout this entire dispute it has been obvious that feelings have been running very high between the parties. I have watched this dispute during the past month as I watch, to the best of my ability, all other matters which are current of this nature in the province, and I may tell the House that there is nothing new tonight, nor was there anything new last night to the people of this city or of this province about the existence of a possible strike at Toronto Hydro. This is a matter of public knowledge, known to those sitting hon. members of the Opposition of both parties, and certainly known to the members of the public.

I will go back to the first of this week. Let me go back to the day when the crisis really was brought to a head, when the union held a meeting and said "We are going to have a strike at midnight, at one minute past midnight, in the early hours of June 11." It was at that point that decisive action had been taken which brought the whole issue into focus.

There was not anything new that was being brought to anyone's attention, but the opportunity and the timing factors then became definite. I told Mr. Baker and his committee that I thought their decision had served a useful purpose. It had brought the thing into focus and in the labour relations business, these definitive steps put the thing into perspective so it can be viewed and considered by all those who may be concerned with the dispute.

I told Mr. Baker—and he is up in the gallery here—I told him about the date and that I must be cognizant of it and that in my own view I thought it served a very useful purpose. I was glad to see the matter being brought up tight, as we say, being brought up short, as it were, so that everybody knew where they stood, thus taking the mystery out of it.

These are the considerations that go on with any dispute of this kind. Many of the hon. members of the Opposition must be fully aware of the nature of the factors I am stating here tonight.

However, following the day of the strike vote, I then made certain inquiries. It was timely to move in certain directions and I arranged for the union to come in and see me, with Mr. Baker, early on the following morning.

Mr. Sopha: Who is Baker?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Baker? He is the head of Local 1 of CUPE—the Canadian union of public employees—and has the bargaining rights of Toronto Hydro.

Mr. Sopha: I hope that he is not offended that I did not recognize the name.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He does not know the hon. member either.

Mr. Sopha: How does the hon. Minister know that he does not know me?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I see no point in going into all of the gruesome details, but there are some pertinent matters that I would like to report to the House.

We had a pretty good meeting with the union in my office upstairs here that day. It was a week ago this morning. Mr. Baker had with him Messrs. O'Keefe, MacKay, Houle, Rosen—I think I have covered them, there were five all told. We had a pretty good meeting and we agreed time was a factor and we did not want to wreck it, we wanted to get at the present situation as they

saw it. I will be very frank and tell the House that it became obvious very quickly, in that meeting, that a stone wall existed between Toronto Hydro and this union and that there was a clash of personalities. Now this is well known in the business and it is well known in this city.

Naturally, the union felt that certain people at Hydro were at fault, and there it is. Now as the Minister, it is not for me to determine on the merits whether that is right or wrong. The very fact that the union felt that an impasse was being created, by their explanation I must accept that; and I do, quite frankly.

Later that day, when I met the Hydro commission, they had the same view, that there was a stone wall, no progress was being made. They in turn laid it off against the union. So here we have the key point, that a stone wall existed, leading to the futile and abortive discussions that were held from time to time, to the futility and the non-productivity of the efforts of the department, of the conciliation board under Mr. Dickie, and indeed of all of the efforts. They had not even got to the point of sorting out the issues.

Now this is from both sides. They both say the same thing. Each say, we cannot get on with the other at all. So we tell them that, of course, you had better settle down and get down to business.

Mr. Sopha: Who are these two people?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, it would not advance anything; I do not think it would. They are two senior officials, one on the union side and one on the commission side. Disposition of intransigents has continued until this day. Now, the first step then is to keep thinking in terms of where do we go from here; where is this thing going; where is it going to end? This, frankly, is always in our minds.

I then approached the parties and told them I do not want to interfere with the atmosphere of bringing talk of any compulsory arbitration or legislation before them, but at this point—meaning Tuesday of this week, I think it was Tuesday morning—I said: “I must put this question to you; I cannot wait any longer. Will you recognize the desirability of a peaceful settlement?” And, of course, both sides say yes to that. We want a peaceful settlement.

The Hydro commission said it would accept and be bound by voluntary binding arbitration. The union said it would have no

part of it. I tell you that. A businesslike decision.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Well you are the Hydro commission.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, the Toronto Hydro has nothing to do with me or this government.

Mr. Sargent: Indirectly it has.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not at all. Any more than the Owen Sound warehouse has anything to do with us.

Mr. Sargent: Indirectly it has.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: So here we at—

Mr. Sargent: Get to the point.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Have you anything you would like to offer in this debate? I cannot get joint agreement on voluntary binding arbitration and that is all there is to it. I cannot get it. However, we went back to the bargaining table. When the negotiations finally broke up at 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon, the deputy Minister who was chairing the meeting put the question again. The union again said it would not consent to binding arbitration. Frankly, a voluntary arbitration is something that is done every day of the week in the labour relations business. There is nothing new about it.

So time was running out, and finally the bill was introduced last night. We did not want the bill introduced a week ago, as had been indicated by some hon. members of the Opposition. I tell you that frankly; this was the word I got. I did not want to put the shadow or the curse of a strong arm over either party. That is why it was not introduced, or mentioned by me, until Tuesday of this week.

Now, the position of a Minister of Labour is that he is damned if he does and he is damned if he does not. So he cannot possibly win in a situation like this. If we had not brought the bill in, having in mind the public interest of the people of this city, we would have been accused by the Opposition over there that we let the thing get out of hand; you did not know what was going on; and all of these things.

On the other hand, when we do bring in a bill, which is a protective device, it is secondly for the employers and the employees. This bill is primarily directed for the benefit of the people of this city, because interests of the people of this city—three quarters of

a million in number—transcend beyond any shadow of a doubt the private interest area of an employer of 550 people, or the 550 people themselves.

The desirable thing in any labour dispute is for the parties to settle the thing together at the bargaining table. But we cannot when both parties are intransigent—and as they both admit, a stone wall exists—and all of this is confirmed in this way; that right up to 5.30 this afternoon—even on a procedural matter as to whether an extra 60 days should be inserted into this proceedings—the parties themselves cannot agree upon it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Before we leave the point you were making a moment ago, who in the Opposition requested an introduction of the bill a week ago?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, no, I did not say that.

Mr. MacDonald: I thought you said somebody in the Opposition favoured the introduction of a bill a week ago.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I said information reached me, as it floats around the corridors of this building—

Mr. MacDonald: Oh!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: —that oddly enough, some of the hon. members in the Opposition felt the bill should have been introduced a week or ten days ago.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You should have been more specific.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I know, I try to protect everybody. But there was the fact, and I do not lay any more importance on it; I just give it to you.

Mr. MacDonald: I can assure you it was nobody from our group when you said it was the Opposition who was saying it should have been introduced a week ago.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, I hear a lot that goes on.

Mr. Thompson: Well, Mr. Minister, I just want to clarify this. In these rumours that sweep around, I can assure you it was not any of the members of my party.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Your own supporters want to get home so anxiously that they wanted it introduced—the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are coming down to the deadline, to the final wire, and as recently as 5.30 today, the parties themselves cannot even agree on the procedure. A proposal was put forth. The other side turn it down and come back with a counter-proposal, which is turned down by the union. I make no criticism whatsoever. This is their privilege. I am not talking about the merits; my prime concern is about the procedure that will lead to a settlement of this dispute.

Now here is the situation we find ourselves in, and I ask the hon. members of this House to consider this very carefully. In the development of management-labour relations in this province there has developed a characteristic with respect to conciliation boards. A conciliation board invariably endeavours to mediate a dispute as a preliminary to simply achieving a report. This practice in this province is a very desirable thing. Some of our important settlements are reached in the mediation stage and, quite frankly, Trenton hospital was mediated in the course of that Royal commission hearing; you will remember that.

I do not want to be too formal about this, but I am trying to recall the exact words I used earlier this week in defining trends in labour-management relations. But the fact is that on this continent and in this country there is a growing trend to the reference of items in dispute after they have been isolated. It has been agreed that there is a pocket of items here and a pocket there, that if private decision cannot be arrived at with respect to those items, that they by consent be referred to experienced, trained—

Mr. MacDonald: The basic validity of the union's proposal—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This is right, this is part of my proposal. But these are my ideas, I delivered this speech early this week.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The point of it being that arbitration by consent is there and available to anybody at any time of the day or night, whether an arbitrator or an arbitration board is sitting or not. By the same token, during an arbitration, the parties by consent can ask for a deferment. There is a deferment provision in the bill that allows up to an extra 90 days. That is designed

to provide for private decision-making or mediation or whatever process the parties agree they want to adopt, and the arbitrator will step aside. This is normal practice. By the way, I gathered that the 60-day provision was Mr. Lewis's view; Mr. Baker thought 30 days would have been right.

I would just like to add to the report the fact that that is available to them right now in this bill. Indeed, why do the parties not just agree to voluntary binding arbitration and get on with the business and let The Department of Labour get on with our other problems that we have? I put it to the hon. members that way. Voluntary arbitration offers everything that meets the needs of the parties and the needs of the people in the city of Toronto. I tell that to hon. members of the House, quite frankly, but there is disagreement on it.

What are we after? We are after stability and security for the 750,000 people who live in this city. Security is an important word. In the light of the intransigent position which exists between these parties, and the absolute failure of the parties under any pretext to be able to make any headway—and I say this quite frankly, not critically of either, it is their business—this is an impasse. I say that in these circumstances, 750,000 people under a democratic process have first claim to protection. It is of them that I was thinking in terms of this bill when I entered the debate on the bill and when it emanated from my department.

No doubt a caucus is going on across the hall, too. I take it that because the hon. leader of the Opposition is not here, he is not interested in what we are talking about—

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, where is he?

Mr. Singer: Where was the hon. Minister when the bill was introduced? Was he not interested?

Mr. Sopha: Why did the hon. Minister of Labour not introduce the bill?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Because I had another assignment. It was perfectly proper. Once again, you are damned if you do and damned if you do not. That has been the position of the Opposition.

Mr. Singer: Stop imputing motives and there will not be that kind of talk.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We have listened to a lot of imputations from the other side in a lot of debates during this current session and

I would think that the hon. member who has just spoken would be the last one in the House who is entitled to take that position. I say that in a friendly way.

Mr. Singer: Just as much as the hon. Minister at any time.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: However, to get on with the matter, my concern frankly is not with some of the inept remarks I have had to listen to tonight. It is with the 750,000 people and the citizens of this province.

Some emphasis has been placed on the emergency that arises and exists.

Mr. Sargent: We will get the hon. Minister a medal.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The question of drugs looms very large. There are several million dollars worth of antibiotics in cold storage, for distribution not only in the Toronto area but in the province of Ontario. There is some \$30 million worth of fresh meat, at any given moment, either in processing or in cold storage in Toronto. I could go on and enunciate the economic and not indirect factors which are pertinent.

But the fact is that you have to look at the operation of the Toronto Hydro to see how an emergency can or may arise. This happens in this way, that whereas Ontario Hydro is a producer and is the source of power, it is then delivered and sold in a wholesale way over high transmission lines. Toronto Hydro is a retail distributing operation where the power is distributed through poles and cables, all of which are in the city of Toronto and in Leaside, for which Toronto has a contract to supply power.

This entire retail distribution is subject to the dangers which the hon. Prime Minister enumerated in his earlier remarks, such as automobile accidents that take out hydro poles. A switching operation with respect to hydro and the source and the direction of the hydro supply is then required. The Toronto waterworks is subject to electrical supply in its entire operation. I do not think I need mention to this House any more important item than supply of water, to which each citizen of this province and this city is entitled and not just for the reason that without water man cannot survive. As informed hon. members of this Legislature would understand, there is the question of the hospitals and other situations which would be endangered if there was no one on the job to take care of the breakdown.

This entire bargaining unit includes the foreman, and I will not comment other than

to state that the bargaining unit includes the foreman. Therefore 69 or 79 power divisions are involved and generally, apart from office staff, I would say the whole operation of Toronto Hydro, apart from the routine extension of the service, is a maintenance operation requiring the type of service which the members of this union have to offer.

If this is not a serious situation and if I should not have attempted and recommended this bill to the government, then hon. members should say so. On the other hand, I think it was proper, and a proper discharge of my responsibilities, to endeavour to the very best of my ability—and I give my word to this House that I have endeavoured in that fashion—to try every method known. The parties themselves have been unable to suggest procedures. We came up with new procedures, new meetings. They were held and even they were abortive. In all of these circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that the duty of the hon. members of this Legislature is to accept their responsibility. There has been far more done than I am able to report tonight. I am sure that those who have talked about the Minister of Labour were joking; I assume they were, because if they were not joking, they simply do not know what they are talking about.

On that assumption, I put this to hon. members, that here is a proper discharge of our responsibility. It is my own view, and I think in this debate I should express it and I will. I think that in the minds in which both parties are, the 60 days would simply be an abortive two months of talks. Even at 5.30 tonight, the parties could not agree upon procedures that would let us get on with the job, get the matter settled and let the men settle down. Most of all, why this must be settled is that if it is not settled in the immediate few weeks ahead, I fear greatly for any future relationships between the employees and the Toronto Hydro, wherever the fault may be, and this should be avoided at all costs.

I have volunteered my services to the union and I have discussed this with Mr. Baker. I have said, "As the head of an important union, operating in this area of employment, it is of the greatest importance, Mr. Baker, that you be on a working basis with the Toronto Hydro commission, and whatever is between you, if there is anything, must be resolved, and I will assist you by endeavouring to arrange the appropriate meetings to that end. Quite frankly, I have a very sincere position in this matter."

It is obvious that legislation or contracts are not going to settle it, it goes beyond it. It goes towards the attitudes of people

toward each other, all being human beings. My own view is that I would like to see this improved. But in all the circumstances, I think we should get on with the job, get everything levelled out and settled, and endeavour then to apply ourselves to an improvement of the relationship between this union representing some 500-plus men, and the commissioners of the system.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just take a moment or two to straighten out my position in the chronology of the events of today so that hon. members may understand how they came about.

If hon. members recall, it was my intention to deal with this bill at 2 o'clock this afternoon so that we would have a reasonable time for debate in the House. The events of this morning took place as the hon. Minister of Labour has described.

They came to my attention. The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party—and I cannot really recall the precise time, but in any event it was some time in the neighbourhood of 12 o'clock, I would say—came to my office and told me that he was aware that there was some activity on behalf of the union. I said in that event I would be quite happy to ask The Department of Labour to meet and see if, even at that stage, it might be possible to find some way out of this position which we were in which might render the introduction of this bill not necessary. Although it did seem to me that at that stage with a strike deadline such a short time ahead, it would be difficult to get assurances that would be meaningful, looking at the possible consequences, if what we did decide in this short period of time really was not firm and did not work out properly. Bear in mind we are pressing against midnight tonight.

However, when the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party came to see me and I gave him that assurance, he said he knew some moves were being made. I said all right, I will ask The Department of Labour to see if we cannot find a solution and at least investigate any possibilities there may be.

Now that is the reason, and I believe that I put this in a note to the hon. leader of the Opposition saying that we would go back into committee of the whole House. I forget how I worded the note, but I did send him a note concerning the affairs of the afternoon.

Mr. Sopha: At noon.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: At noon, in any event, as soon as I knew. I came back from my office, where I had found out that there was

some possibility of renegotiations. I made the arrangements for this to be done, I came back in the House and said we would not deal with this bill at 2 o'clock and would go into committee of the whole and continue with Bill No. 136.

My original intention was, of course, to proceed with second reading of this bill at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I believe I said that when the House rose last night. However, in the light of these events, that is what happened.

It was after the House rose this afternoon, because I was reasonably fully occupied in here during the afternoon and these various events were taking place during the afternoon, that I found out that as far as the government was concerned—without going through it, the hon. Minister of Labour has explained what in fact happened and the steps in it—these negotiations had failed. The parties could not agree, and as far as I was concerned we were back precisely where I had been at 12 o'clock.

I might say that I had been told that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party had been informed of this. However, in view of the fact that he came to see me at noon, I phoned him and simply said the parties are at a complete impasse, the negotiations have failed and we will proceed with second reading of the bill at 8 o'clock. I believe he said, very well; in any event he said very little more than that.

So that puts the matter into perspective. I would point out that I did not discuss, nor did the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party discuss with me, the motion that he made tonight or any procedure that he might follow. We left it simply that at 8 o'clock the House would resume. As I say, as far as the government was concerned, at 6.30 tonight we were exactly where we were at 6.30 last night. While there had been action and activity during the day, it had been fruitless and it had achieved nothing. The point really is, as the hon. Minister of Labour has said, if we had introduced the bill a week ago, of course it would have meant that the bargaining that went on, the negotiations between the parties during that week, would have had the possibility of this bill hanging over it. On the other hand this afternoon, or at noon today, when there was any possibility whatsoever, however remote, that a solution could be reached, we went after it. We tried to find it, we explored it. We went through it with the parties and it proved impossible. So here we are tonight, dealing with the bill.

I just give this explanation. I believe I told the hon. leader of the Opposition at 6 o'clock, when the House rose, that we would be going on with this at 8 o'clock. So that is, sir, the chronology of events of this day.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Labour permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: I must point out to the member that we are really on second reading of the bill, and although I intend to use considerable flexibility in discussing this bill because of its great importance, I do not want to allow the debate to get into a question-and-answer period. However, if the Minister will answer a question, I shall allow you to ask it.

Mr. Renwick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the hon. Minister tell the House whether there was any communication from any member of the Toronto Hydro commission with the hon. Minister or any other hon. member of the government from the period 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon until the House reassembled tonight?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: In answer to the hon. member's question I would have to say that from 3 o'clock on, yesterday afternoon, there has not been direct communication with me and I do not believe with the government. But there have been many communications with the members of the commission, there have been various meetings held throughout these entire proceedings. I would think that they have been informed—I know that they are informed—on practically a minute-to-minute basis, just as the union is informed in their own way, of matters.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. leader of the Opposition became so upset a little while ago in respect to this matter. I think he felt that somehow or other we had left him out of things—I do not know by whom—and that somebody was trying to take political advantage of him. I do not know and I do not suppose there is any point inquiring into the basis of his outburst. All I would say is that I hope that he is now no longer upset so that he will look carefully and calmly at the alternatives that are now before the House.

There is, on the one hand, a bill from the government, and on the other hand, an amendment—what is now our proposal. It is essentially a proposal that Local 1 of the Canadian union of public employees made

earlier today to the government—and I take it, from what the hon. Minister says, to the commission.

There was an implication—and it amazed me—in the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition that my hon. leader had been engaged in something disreputable, some sort of conspiracy, when he was trying to find a way out of the impasse in which we all found ourselves.

I will say, and I think I should be frank about it, that we were unhappy, as I believe everybody in this House was, when Bill 167 was introduced last night. We had a caucus immediately following its introduction—since the House had been adjourned in any case and there is no doubt that other parties did the same—and we came to the conclusion that though we were quite opposed to Bill 167, we were not going to get ourselves into the position where we would merely berate the government. We felt that if we had any responsibilities as elected representatives of the people at all and if we were conscious of those responsibilities, we should attempt to do anything we could to try to get the matter settled in a way that would be as satisfactory as possible to everybody under the very difficult circumstances which then existed.

We were well aware that the circumstances were difficult and I will say that from what we heard, we felt that the hon. Minister of Labour had been doing a tremendous job in trying to avoid this impasse. We felt satisfied of that but we did not feel that up to that time everything possible had been done. However, we just could not see any point in blasting the government from stem to gudgeon.

I do not know how we were then going to vote on the bill; we had not even made a final decision on that. We were more concerned about what we thought were more immediate issues. As a result of our deliberations, our hon. leader took the action that we suggested.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that whether rightly or wrongly, we prided ourselves on thinking that there were some people involved in this dispute with whom our hon. leader might have some influence. There were many with whom he was hardly acquainted at all, but there were others whom he knew well—whom we all knew well—and with whom some of us were on friendly relations. We considered it possible that our hon. leader might have some influence in the situation as it then existed. We could not see that anything he would do could do any harm and

there was just a possibility that it would do some good.

I think it did a lot of good. Unfortunately, it does not seem to have produced the results that I thought might be possible, but he got in touch, among others, with Mr. David Lewis, whom we all know and who has some influence with various people in this dispute. We thought it might help. As the hon. Minister of Labour said, Mr. Lewis was not the counsel for the union in this matter; he was acting simply as a citizen and doing what he thought was best to try to find a way out of the impasse. As a result of these efforts a proposition was put before the government at approximately noon today.

We thought it was a good proposal and we still think it is a good proposal. We thought, and we think, that it is a way out of the impasse. I do not know what the hon. leader of the Opposition thought we were going to do at this point. I can tell the hon. members that we were most careful to caution each other not to say a thing about this to anybody. Most of us have been involved in ticklish negotiations of this kind before and I would say that rule number 1 is that when a critical stage is reached where there might be a break, it is imperative to keep one's mouth shut, to refrain from talking to anybody—to stay out of it.

Our hon. leader went to see the hon. Prime Minister to tell him what he knew and then we stayed out of the picture. The last thing we wanted to do was to upset any possibility of a settlement by premature talking. If the hon. leader of the Opposition feels that we neglected him in that situation, I regret that we could not help it; we did not talk to anybody.

I will say, however, that late this afternoon a comment made to me by a gentleman of the press led me to the conclusion that he had heard about this proposal. I do not where the press heard about it, but the gentlemen of the press are pretty sharp in finding out things, we know that. Certainly some of the comments they made led me to believe that they knew about this proposition. Frankly, by then, I thought the Liberals probably knew about it, too.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did not know about it until noon when I received the call from Mr. Lewis. I am informed that there was a news item on the early morning radio that the news was on the street at that time.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps it was a matter of public information by then. We did not know that; we were not listening to the radio; there were other things going on.

At any rate, I am talking about 5 or 6 o'clock this afternoon, at the time the House adjourned. I got the impression that the press knew about this proposal but, of course, as far as we were concerned we were not talking about it. I did not think, and none of the people in our group thought that we were at any liberty to talk about it at all. For all we knew, this might have been the basis of settlement. We thought it possible—indeed, we hoped that we would come into this House and hear the announcement, not from our hon. leader, but from the hon. Prime Minister. We hoped that he would say that the bill introduced yesterday was not going to go ahead; it was going to be revised along the lines of this proposal. That certainly would have been a happy solution to us.

We would have accepted it immediately and would have been perfectly glad to let anybody take the credit who wanted to take it. It was not until we heard the hon. Prime Minister's speech in its entirety that we were absolutely sure what the situation was. I believe that a few minutes before, my hon. leader got a pretty good idea, but it was not up to us to start making announcements. The hon. Prime Minister is the head of the government and it was up to him to state what the government's policy was at that stage. The government's policy at that stage was as it was yesterday.

At this point, we felt that it was now proper to announce the proposal—since the hon. Prime Minister himself had not done it—that had been put forth at approximately noon today, and in my opinion it would have been highly improper for us to have done so one minute earlier than that. At the first opportunity when it was proper to do so, my hon. leader arose in this House and stated that this proposal had been made, stated further that we thought it was the best alternative, and formalized that expression of opinion by moving the amendment to that effect.

That brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the proposal itself. I will not go into the details; I think it has been well outlined on both sides, by the hon. Minister of Labour and by my hon. leader. But I regret that the government has not seen fit to accept it as its own policy.

The hon. Minister of Labour gave us quite a frank and full description of the events of this afternoon. I do not in any sense wish to criticize him—in situations like this one has to make snap decisions and it is awfully easy to be right after the event—but as I listened to his recital I felt a twinge of regret that it had been decided by him and

Mr. Lewis, I believe, that this proposition be put to the commission by the union representatives rather than by the hon. Minister. I have a feeling—it is just a feeling, how can you ever prove it?—that if it had had the prestige of the hon. Minister behind it, it might have found acceptance more readily than when it was merely presented by a party whose position vis-à-vis the commission had become one of total deadlock. I think it might have been accepted.

At any rate, the point that now divides the commission from the union, according to the hon. Minister's description, is simply the 60-day period. The commission, in the little time that was available—and they did not have much time to think about the matter or consult about it, we have to admit that—they, I take it, wanted to go ahead with arbitration immediately. The union felt that it would be advisable to put in a period of 60 days of mediation. Well, this is a policy decision on the part of the government. At this point the parties had not agreed to anything and the government had to decide on the best policy.

I submit to the hon. Minister and the government that the best policy is to put in a period of mediation, whether or not it is 60 days is not the point; but a certain period of mediation before the matter comes right down to arbitration. I think, in view of everything that has happened up until now, that if a period of mediation was inserted there would be very little—if anything—left to arbitrate after that period was over. It is true that the parties were in a position of total deadlock and had been there for some time.

But situations are always fluid; the parties had gone through that period of bitterness and I think this was the time when we could have opened up a period of co-operation. This was the time to move in with mediation again, after they had got everything off their chests and therefore might be ready to get back together again and talk things over. The hon. Minister said that the most important thing in this situation—and I think he is right—is the future relationship between these parties. Well, unfortunately, I think that the bill which the government is putting before the House, and which it has apparently decided to pursue, is not going to contribute anything to good relations in the future.

I think a proposal along the lines that was read out by my hon. leader would do much more in that regard. I have not talked—well, I said "hello" to a couple of members of the union negotiating team when I was walking

across the park here, but apart from that I have not talked to any of them. But from what I know of trade union members—and I know a lot of them—my feeling is that if Bill 167 goes through in its present form those members will feel a deep sense of bitterness. They will feel that they have been treated vengefully and vindictively; that the other side has won; that it has made its will prevail upon them. I am certain that is how they will feel.

I think, if I were in that position, that is how I would feel. They are now in a position where it is being laid right down to them; "you arbitrate" and that is it. The alternative proposal, I think, would have created a basis for genuine understanding. I think it would probably have created a situation where arbitration would not even be necessary. Certainly it would have been reduced to one or two issues.

I do not know how many issues are now outstanding, but I believe it is a very large number, and arbitration is extremely difficult with a large number of issues. The whole proceeding is so complicated that it gets to the point where most of the people do not understand what it is all about. When you get an arbitration settlement that affects 40, 50 or 60 issues, the parties are almost certain to feel they got a raw deal.

The only time arbitration works well is when there are one or two pretty clear-cut issues that can be argued one way or the other. However, the government seems to have made up its mind. I regret that it has done so. I regret it has not accepted what I think is a really constructive alternative.

When the hon. Prime Minister moved second reading of this bill tonight, he made a speech that was essentially the same as the speech he made yesterday on first reading. He repeated all his description—and it was quite a terrifying description—of the disastrous consequences of a strike in this industry. Under the situation that now exists, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there was no necessity for that recital; no necessity to repeat all those harrowing details. The only conceivable effect of what he said would be to create an atmosphere of panic when it is no longer necessary to operate in an atmosphere of panic. At approximately noon today, the strike deadline was off. I think the hon. Prime Minister should have advised the House of that before he made the statement. It should not have been left to my own hon. leader to let the world know that.

I think that the reaction of many people might have been different if they had known

that the strike deadline no longer faced us. It was not necessary to talk about the millions of dollars worth of antibiotics that were going to be destroyed; the children who were going to suffer; and the hospitals that were going to be shut down. We did not have to talk about those things at all. That sense of panic did not have to hang over our deliberations at all. I regret that the hon. Prime Minister put this matter forward in that context again, when it is now a matter that could be, in my opinion, considered much more calmly; in an atmosphere of reflection; where we could have taken the two alternatives and decided for ourselves which one we think is the best.

As far as we are concerned, we think there is no question about it for reasons I have already given. The alternative put forward today at approximately noon by Local No. 1 is the better alternative. It is far better than Bill 167 which we say is undemocratic, which involves an arbitrary invasion of democratic rights when it is not necessary to invade those rights. If it had been absolutely necessary—if there had been no other alternative—it is conceivable that we might have gone along; but when it is not necessary now to take this extreme action, we say that it should not be taken.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will vote in favour of the amendment. I do not know what procedure we are following on this type of amendment now, but if subsequent to that we have to vote on the bill, we will vote against the bill; not because we think there should be a strike, but because the threat of a strike has now been lifted and there is a proper alternative that makes the bill unnecessary. That is the position we take. We think it is a fair and responsible position and, notwithstanding the comments made by the hon. leader of the Opposition when he became so upset, I submit that the conduct of our party and of our hon. leader throughout was a fully responsible one; and one that, I think, offered constructive alternatives in the total situation.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, one notes, of course, that the problem involved in this bill is a Toronto problem and affects the lives, convenience and safety of the citizens of Toronto. Up to this point, all of the hon. members who have spoken in the debate represent Toronto constituencies. Indeed, the hon. Minister of Labour himself, by coincidence, represents a Toronto constituency. The only person who has spoken at this time who is not representative of Toronto is the hon. Prime Minister himself. But then again,

in virtue of his office, he is representative—more than any of the rest of us—of all constituencies of the province.

Therefore some may wonder why—as the third speaker in the debate—I, from the backwater of Ontario; north of the French River—the wilderness to come, am so presumptuous as to engage in a discussion of the important problems in this bill.

Let me say, sir—I would say it humorously if the problem involved was not so serious and did not have such serious repercussions for the whole of Ontario; indeed, the whole of the labour movement—that I would be almost moved to invite Nathan Cohen to come up and do a criticism of the comedy in nine acts that has been performed here tonight. Indeed, as revealed in some of the nine acts that took place this morning and this afternoon.

Now my excuse for attempting to make a contribution consistent with my meagre abilities is that I represent a community which is very labour oriented. The problems inherent in mediation—the arbitration of this dispute, the methods adopted by the government and the suggestions that are forthcoming from other parts of the House—are of very serious import to the thousands of workers in my community, who in one way or another, will be affected by whatever decision this Legislature pleases to take. When the hon. Minister of Labour, feeling just a little bit of unease about his position—and I can tell, I have developed a very practised eye now, I can tell when a Minister of the Crown is getting near the point. In fact, he is almost like a drug addict when he gets near the point of needing a fix; but the Minister of the Crown gets near the point where he needs some support from the most champion desk thumpers in North America.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): In the world!

Mr. Sopha: In the world, as my friend says—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: I wish you would not interrupt me.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member would get back to the amendment or to the bill itself and not proceed with his remarks about the Minister. I do not think it has any bearing really upon the bill. The hour is getting late and I think we would be better advised to stick to the contents of the amendment to the bill before the House.

Mr. Sopha: May I say to you, with the greatest respect, that I wish you would not interrupt me.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. If I wish to interrupt the member I shall interrupt him and if the member does not wish to obey the rules of the House, I will have no alternative perhaps than to name him. Please proceed!

Mr. Sopha: I will comply with your wishes, of course.

The hon. Minister of Labour got to the point where he said he was acting on behalf of all of the people of Ontario, or of this community, all of the people in this community in urging this legislation upon the House, and the faithful thump their desks. But I say to the hon. Minister of Labour that he also affects all of the people of this community if he takes away the rights of even one member of the community.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: What about the rights of 750,000 people?

Mr. Sopha: All right! But the rights of a minority must be weighed against the rights of 750,000 people. There must be a balance achieved between them, for I say that if the hon. Minister of Labour, and the government at his urging, takes away the rights of 545 people, then he takes away the rights of all. He takes away the rights of all in like position. He takes a step towards the whittling away of the rights of those who bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

Really, it is trite to say but I say it for the benefit of those who are not engaged in labour relations, it is trite to say that the only weapon that labour has is the hard-fought-for and the hard-won right to take away its labour. That is the final weapon that it has. It has no other. Labour unions do not have the resources of capital behind them. They do not even have the discipline that management has in control over those who are in the management group. They do not have the resources of publicizing their position. They do not have the public relations personnel that management has.

Finally, when all is said and done, the working man in striving for justice in the economic world, has but one weapon. That weapon is to take away his labour, to discontinue his service. If the hon. Minister of Labour and the government he represents continues to whittle away at that right, then soon will come the day when he will be in this House with a bill in relation to some other industry than an essential service.

As a possible alternative and in line with

the report of the select committee on labour relations, of which, indeed, the hon. Minister of Labour was a member under the chairmanship of the late James Anthony Maloney. Ernie Jackson, a leading figure in the political life of this province; Robert Macaulay, Donald C. MacDonald, Ellis Morningstar, Raymond Myers, Arthur Reaume, Leslie Rowntree, George Wardrope, the late Albert Wren, great spokesman for the working people of this province; John Yaremko—interesting to note the advancement of the people that sat on this committee in the ranks of the government.

A member of that committee recommended that a model clause be introduced into The Labour Relations Act to deal with the discontinuance of essential service through the withdrawal of labour. How many years now? That committee sat in 1958. Here we are in 1965, seven years later, and we are still waiting for the introduction of that model clause.

Perhaps the model clause would have appended to it, as an appendix to The Labour Relations Act, a list of the industries that are considered to be essential services so that there would be no doubt whatsoever in the minds of the people and in the minds of those engaged in those industries that their right to discontinue their labour was prohibited by law. Instead, we have the patchwork approach, which in the words of my hon. leader is very adequately and admirably summed up as being progression from one crisis to another.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Did the hon. member ever look at the thousands of disputes that are settled in this province?

Mr. Sopha: I am very grateful for having had the opportunity to assist in the settlement of some of them.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The record in this province in relation to the amount of industry is pretty good.

Mr. Sopha: Well, it is all right. The hon. Minister can make his own speech. He can give us the statistics about that. It is not incumbent upon me.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No, but I thought the hon. member would not want to forget it.

Mr. Sopha: To review the events that have taken place up to now, before my hon. colleague from Downsview got up to speak, because we could not give up our right to speak first in the debate, we have that right, being the largest Opposition party. We will

not surrender it. My hon. friend from Downsview was selected to be the first to take the floor and to exercise that right.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, for this occasion alone, we would have been content in this party to sit silent and let the New Democratic Party have the first right to speak. But we could not do it because we would not want to establish the precedent of doing it. We told the hon. member for Downsview before he got up that he was going to be abused. He was going to be roundly abused for what he said, because we had to adopt that tactic in this comedy of the hon. member for Downsview being noncommittal so that we could hear what this proposal was that had been put to the government.

We knew there had been a proposal, we knew there was some form of proposal.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member's hon. leader said he did not know.

Mr. Sopha: Our hon. leader did not know it, but at 10 minutes to 8, when my hon. friend from Downsview and my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Nixon) and the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) came back with me to the House, we were informed that there was some form of proposal that had been made by the New Democratic Party to the government. Accordingly it was eminent good sense that we not commit ourselves until we heard what that proposal was.

Then we hear and it is revealed to us, I think pretty clearly, that both the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party and the government are playing politics with this issue.

Who are the personalities involved? I have the greatest respect for David Lewis—David Lewis is a very public spirited man and he is a man who very sincerely, and very deeply feels the cause of the working man. I have the pride and honour to be associated with David Lewis in the context that both he and I share responsibility for advising Local 6500 of the united steel workers of America in my community. I am proud to be associated with such a man and the eminent counsel that he is. But having said that, I am not denegating at all from his part in this piece, I inform you, Mr. Speaker, that we are perfectly well aware in this party that David Lewis, QC, is also a politician.

Indeed he is! He is a politician and it has been my experience that, unfortunately, sometimes when the stewards of the rank-and-file membership of unions become directly involved in politics, when they become directly involved in political action,

sometimes the striving for political advantage overtakes the responsibility of stewards of the rank and file. Sometimes it does, so I think it is pretty clear that today, through the whole of the comedy, David Lewis was acting more as a politician than he was acting as a representative of the trade union movement.

One observes that David Lewis was approached by the leader of the New Democratic Party, or the leader of the New Democratic Party approached David Lewis. Then one observes further that throughout the relationship with the executive, the leaders of the Canadian union of public employees, the contact of that group, their interactions, were only with one political party in the House.

Now, let me say unequivocally to this party: This House has nothing to do with great and monstrous affairs of state. We do not engage in international relations. We do not deal with matters that affect the body politic of the whole country. We deal with relatively minor matters. But if I ever knew of an area where there might be a bi-party policy, where the government would take the main Opposition party into its confidence and reveal to it all the facts, as well as the minor Opposition party, then I cannot think of a more apt area, a more fitting area than that of labour relations and especially where a serious strike is threatened in an industry that will affect the welfare of so many thousands of people.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, we were put in an invidious position in this party and I would like the rank and file of the Canadian union of public employees to know it. I hope they get to know, somehow, that I said these words on behalf of the Liberal Party tonight—that we were put in a terribly invidious position by the fact that the executive of the Canadian union of public employees did not see fit to come to the hon. leader of the Opposition and make him aware that this proposal had been made to the government for delay of the strike that was threatened at midnight tonight—an hour and 20 minutes away.

Mr. MacDonald: Give them another lecture.

Mr. Sopha: On the contrary, it is not a lecture, it is just revealing some facts. But one also observes and I hesitate to go on with criticism. They have their own reasons for doing these things, but we also have our own feelings. We also have our own consciences to wrestle with. We also have our responsibility to the many hundreds of

thousands of people who voted for the Liberal Party in the last election in this province.

They have their own reasons but I think the rank and file should know that today David Lewis of the executive of CUPE Local 1 played footsy with the leader of the New Democratic Party. Somebody aptly said this: "We know these people, we know these people; we could contact them." Of course they know them. CUPE, I believe, is one of the unions that is committed to the principle of political support of one party, and I observed at a recent regional meeting of CUPE in northern Ontario that two or three of the delegates at the regional meeting, as was reported in the press, all of whom I knew, proposed at the meeting that that union disassociate itself from supporting one political party. Two or three of them suggested it, but that is a step in the right direction.

I am one of those who believes, and I have said it time and time again, and to union people—I have said it to the steel workers that Local 6500, with 18,000 members has not yet joined in support of that party—"If you are going to be union leaders you should dedicate yourselves full time to winning at the collective bargaining table better fruits for the labour of your people and stay out of the political arena. Leave the political area to the politicians; stay out of it. Do one thing or the other."

They have their own reasons that they did not come knocking at our door. Nobody knows; maybe we will never know what those reasons were. But they put us in a very invidious position that we had to use our strategy and we had to use our place in the Legislature from a tactical point of view. We had to put my hon. friend from Downsview up to be abused, and when the hon. member for Downsview, who can speak for himself and can always defend himself, came to the end of his remarks, I looked over at my hon. friend in the New Democratic Party, he was smiling like a cat that had just swallowed a canary. He was sitting on the edge of his chair; he could hardly wait to get up to start the stream of vitriol against my hon. friend from Downsview. And so he did, and he is a master at it such as no other person in this House will ever equal.

An hon. member: The poor, persecuted, little man.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, no. I am not persecuted. We wanted to have the opportunity to share decisions. That is all we want—the opportunity to share decision, if the facts are put

before us, if we are taken into the government's confidence, and if the government comes and tells us. We can expect that our hon. friends to the left will not come and tell us because they would be afraid that we would get some political advantage.

But I say on behalf of this party, and my hon. leader authorizes me to say it, that the government will find, if it takes us into its confidence and shows us the peril to the public and shows us the efforts that have been made to avoid the peril, that this party will ever act responsibly. It will. If the day—

An hon. member: For how long?

Mr. Sopha: —comes that it does not act responsibly in the face of public emergency, then I will be the first to walk around the corner and out the doorway from it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member has now.

Mr. Sopha: That is the undertaking that I give the hon. Minister of Labour.

Reference ought to be made to this remarkable statement by the hon. Minister of Labour that the people of Toronto have, to some extent, been put in the position in which they are endangered by the fact that there is a clash of personalities between somebody on the Hydro commission and somebody in the union. The thought immediately struck me that if there is a clash of personalities that inhibits the making of a reasonable collective agreement, then the thing to do by someone in authority—I have not heard who is in authority but I went over to ask if the mayor of the city of Toronto was on the Hydro commission, and I am told that he is ex-officio—is to do as a referee in a hockey game does when he is facing off the puck between two obstreperous players. If he cannot get them to attend to their business, according to the rules of the game, he waves them out of the circle. Give us two more—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, that very thing was done in this dispute. Two men were removed by me so that the heat would be taken right out of it.

Mr. Sopha: That may be so. I guess the hon. Minister of Labour was speaking about, as one of the personalities, the new chairman of the Hydro commission, no less a personage in the life of this province than Frederick Gardiner.

An hon. member: The hon. member is wrong, he is not the chairman.

Mr. Sopha: I want to say a word about him. I noted, and perhaps the hon. Minister of Labour will tell us whether this was an inhibiting feature toward a resolution of this—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It was not; it was another man.

Mr. Sopha: Just a moment. The hon. Minister should wait until he hears what I have to say. I note that it was a week or ten days ago that Frederick Gardiner himself urged, as was reported in the public press, compulsory arbitration. With a week or ten days to go before the deadline, Frederick Gardiner, the new chairman, was reported as saying, "We should get on with compulsory arbitration." This was long before the deadline. Is such a statement by the head person on management side responsible—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Mr. Gardiner is not the chairman of Toronto Hydro; he is a commissioner of Toronto Hydro.

Mr. Sopha: All right, sorry. I accept the correction. I do not think that I have sinned very greatly in regard to my description of him, but I say that a week or ten days ago, to reiterate, he suggested that we get on with compulsory arbitration.

I know that is not consistent with good bargaining relations with the other side; in fact, that is dismissing the possibility of any reasonable, peaceful solution to the dispute, because one side is saying to the other, "We cannot possibly settle this with you. Let us get on with government intervention and the imposition of compulsion."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, where was the government during all this time? Where was the government and what was it doing? We have never had any satisfactory explanation from anybody on behalf of the government about the efforts made by government to get these parties together. On that score—the issue of compulsion, which my hon. friends in the old historic party profess to abhor with such vigour—on that issue, I myself, as a citizen of this province, would much prefer in disputes of this nature a tough attitude by the hon. Minister of Labour and his deputy and his other senior agents to the imposition of this type of legislation. I would not mind if the hon. Minister threw his weight around a bit with both sides.

I have been involved in the conciliation process with some of the judges that are employed consistently by this department and I have seen them throw their weight around.

I have heard them use pretty strong language in attempting to effect a settlement, because those judges, those conciliators know what the consequences of loss are to people if the dispute is not resolved and a strike ensues. They adopt a pretty tough policy.

I would like to see the hon. Minister of Labour adopt such a policy. I would rather that he was tough—a little undemocratic—with the parties, the principal to this dispute. He gets tough through using the devices of government and the power of this Legislature to impose a statutory prohibition of a strike against a right that has been won only with blood and sweat and tears.

One cannot go into the history of the winning of the right to strike, and so I reiterate the suggestion to my hon. friend from Woodbine that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party was acting irresponsibly today. Indeed, he was. If the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party really wanted to get the resolution of this, if he was really interested in acting for the good of the people of Ontario, one of the very first people he would have sought out would have been the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Why should the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party and David Lewis sneak around at meetings with the hon. Prime Minister in the absence of the hon. leader of the Opposition? That gives the impression that in labour matters the only people who count in this House are the New Democratic Party. I would hope that union leaders in this province would soon discover that they are perfectly free and welcome to rap at the doors of the offices of this party and get the utmost sympathy from the hon. members of this party and every endeavour for assistance in trying to solve social problems of the magnitude that this one is that now confronts the people of Ontario, as well as this government and this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you—I am authorized to tell you—I tell you on behalf of the party, and I tell all hon. members of the House through you, sir, that we are going to vote for this amendment.

I abhor the verbiage employed—the verbiage is terrible and I will point out to hon. members why it is terrible.

It could have been put—this amendment, to achieve this purpose—it could have been put in quieter, softer and more reasonable terms. The same message could have been put across by employing much more reasonable verbiage than this amendment employs. I say to you, sir, that one of the regrets we have in voting for this amendment is that it is abusive.

We are not allowed to amend it, the screwy rules of this House do not permit us to amend this. One notes that in the House of Commons at Ottawa the free use of amendments is employed. If one Opposition party does not like the language employed by another party, why should they be bound to that language? We in this party, if we had the right to amend it, would soften the tones of the amendment.

Let me read it:

In the opinion of this House, the proposal submitted to the government today by Local No. 1, of the Canadian union of public employees represented a fair and reasonable method of settling the dispute without a stoppage of work.

I would have rewritten that. I would have rewritten that by making it in terms of urging on the government: "The government is urged to adopt the proposal submitted by the Canadian union of public employees"; rather than arguing the case as the first part of that does. It argues the case in saying that it is a fair and reasonable method of settling the dispute. It goes on to say:

Which would have safeguarded adequately both the public interest and the interests of the parties, and that represents an alternative preferable to the harsh, restrictive and undemocratic provisions of Bill No. 167.

I say to you, sir, that those last words are abusive: "the harsh restrictive and undemocratic provisions."

When I go into court and argue a case before the judge I do not get up on behalf of my client and tell the judge that he is a stupid old nut before I start to argue the case. If the New Democratic Party wanted the hon. Prime Minister to accept their amendment, to yield a bit, then the New Democratic Party could never hope to get the hon. Prime Minister to accept the amendment by calling a bill he introduced himself. Hon. members will notice that the chief citizen, the first citizen himself, unlike the Medicare bill, introduced this one. This is a matter of high government policy and the hon. Prime Minister himself introduced it. We cannot get the hon. Prime Minister—he is a human being, too—to accept an amendment when we tell him that a statute that he in his responsibility as Prime Minister walked into the House and introduced is harsh, restrictive and undemocratic.

So therefore I say to you, sir, in respect of this amendment: Very reluctantly, because we cannot amend it, we are going to support this amendment. But we only wish, again in a

bi-partisan spirit—that is the message I am trying to get across—in a bi-partisan spirit dealing with a matter of such emergent public importance—

Mr. MacDonald: They were left out and that is why they are so unhappy.

Mr. Sopha: This is hurting him; do hon. members notice? This is hurting him.

Mr. Bryden: It is painful.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Sopha: If it was not hurting, but when you pinch the dog, he yelps.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member has certainly been yelping.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: It is all right.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I often tell my clients, if you pay a dog to bark, let him bark; do not take up the case.

Taking a very reasoned position—I am going to re-emphasize that—if we ever meet the problem again where we have to deal with a matter of important public interest like this, I hope there will be an attitude of co-operation on the part of all parties of the House. Let us see if we cannot get together and demonstrate to the public of Ontario that we can, through the exercise of good common sense, mutual understanding and a yearning to understand the other fellow's point of view, come up with some mutual policy—in a bi-partisan spirit—that in times of emergency this Legislature can act with a high degree of responsibility; that it does not go skulking around the corridors with union leaders from outside, who have come in the capacity of volunteers; and that there is no necessity for these private telephone conversations between the hon. Prime Minister of the province and the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

The second important man in the House, in terms of parliamentary democracy as inherited from Westminster, is the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Bryden: Does he not have a telephone?

Mr. Sopha: —who sits opposite the hon. Prime Minister. He is second in importance in this House.

Mr. Bryden: He could have telephoned the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am not a person that bruises easily, like you. But I am just putting the facts. I am taking enough time to state the facts of what went on here, and I make no apologies for that.

Then I tell you, sir, that we in this party have come to a parting of the ways with the government on this matter of compulsory arbitration. We voted with it in the Hydro dispute. We voted with it in compulsory arbitration in hospitals. We have come to the point where we stop.

Mr. MacDonald: They have changed their mind again?

Mr. Sopha: We have stopped voting with the government, and we are going to vote against it on this bill. If that rule is interpreted tonight—one never knows how that rule is interpreted—there is going to be a vote on the principle of the bill. The main motion is going to be put—

Mr. Bryden: That is the principle for which the hon. member always argued.

Mr. Sopha: —if the amendment is lost.

Mr. Speaker: Order. So the member will not anticipate how the Speaker is going to interpret the rules tonight, I will tell him now that I shall interpret them the same as I have done in the past. We will have the amendment that is before the House and we will stick to the variation, which has been a precedent established over the last three or four years by then putting the main motion, which will be voted on forthwith, because we have not varied from this rule by speaking on the main motion. We have not done that.

In the very near future I shall bring in a ruling on this matter.

Mr. Sopha: Very well, sir, then when the time comes to be counted, we will stand in our places and we will vote against the principle of the bill, because we have come to the end of the road. One of the chief reasons—let it be clear—that we have come to the end of the road is the failure of the government, in an important matter such as this, to take us into its confidence.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Oh, rot!

Mr. MacDonald: There is pique if I ever saw it.

Mr. Sopha: One of the chief reasons, because I feel that had the hon. leader of the Opposition had the confidence of the hon. Prime Minister; had he been aware—

Mr. MacDonald: They have the public welfare at heart.

Mr. Sopha: Look, will the hon. member stop yelping so I can get finished? This bill has got to go through in an hour.

Had we been aware of the proposal made by this union and David Lewis—acting very responsibly, today, I shall say that—then maybe we would have had some friends that we could have contacted too, in order to try to bring reason between these two parties.

We are told—nonwithstanding that the union came forward with this proposal; that I take it by inference from what the hon. Minister of Labour said—that the Hydro commission rejected it peremptorily, out of hand. The Hydro commission took—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It was not done like that and I did not infer it.

Mr. Sopha: All right, that was the inference I drew. Maybe it was not done so peremptorily, but it was certainly rejected out of hand. The commission took the position that it would submit to either of two types of arbitration, either voluntary or compulsory, but would not submit to mediation.

Now, as one who has been engaged in the labour milieu, I cannot possibly conceive what responsible Hydro commissioners would have against the employment of a mediator. In fact, if I understand this proposal—and subject to correction—this is the Taft-Hartley formula. This is a formula from the Taft-Hartley Act. It was not invented.

This is a tried and true formula that has been employed for a long time in the United States of America in those industries that come under federal jurisdiction. It is no great creation that somebody picked out of the air by the exercise of the grey matter in the cranial spaces. It is an eminently sound proposal. It is a cooling-off period. I think that is what it is called in the American jargon, a cooling-off period, with the assistance of a mediator, to attempt to come to some form of solution.

Indeed, the government itself has employed this type. The government used it by the employment of Goldenberg in the mediation of the Royal York strike. So if it fits one bad labour situation, why is it not suitable for another one? Why is it not suitable for this one?

In any event, the Hydro commission—and I hearken back to the statement of Commissioner Gardiner—which rejected this proposal

is the same Hydro commission that said: "Let us get on with compulsory arbitration."

Now I think the people of Toronto should be made aware; they should consider that very long. They should consider all the implications of the fact that they have a commissioner who apparently is unwilling to negotiate, to talk or to bargain collectively with the representatives of the workers. Instead he wants to drop the guillotine; he wants to get on with compulsory arbitration. It must be said, of course, from the point of view that the management—in this case—has the most to gain from arbitration. That has been my experience, too, in the field of labour relations. It has been my experience that whenever a matter goes to arbitration, I say regretfully, somehow or other the union comes out with the short end of the stick.

That was the reason why the hon. Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, set aside the meagre sum of \$5,000 this year—the pitiful sum of \$5,000, a drop in the bucket—and gave it to Queen's University to study some of the effects of arbitration; for somebody down there to do some research into the problem of arbitration. This because the hon. Minister of Labour went to Sudbury with the Cabinet, in that celebrated meeting of October, 1964, and one of the vice-presidents of the steelworkers at a public meeting said to the hon. Minister of Labour: "You know, whenever we go to arbitration, or we arbitrate grievances under the collective bargaining agreement, we only win 22 per cent of the cases. We lose 78 per cent. Management wins 78 per cent."

The hon. Minister of Labour gave him a little argument, and that labour leader—that vice-president—came away a bit insulted by the attitude of the hon. Minister of Labour. Then, later on, the hon. Minister of Labour—and he is usually a very yielding man, a very considerate man, a very reasonable man—reconsidered his position and set aside \$5,000 as a grant to Queen's University to study this problem of arbitration.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: All right, he kept his word.

Mr. Sopha: The best way to get me to stand here until five to 12 is for you to keep exercising your larynx.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have no doubt that you are in love with your larynx.

Mr. Sopha: You keep exercising your larynx. I would feel that if I sat down in the face of your interruption that I was giving up some of my rights to you.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You would please the whole House if you sat down.

Mr. Sopha: You just want to reserve yourself until you present your estimates here, then you will hear me; I will be in full throat at that time—asking a few questions of you.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Therefore, sir, we are not satisfied—as a result of the two speeches we have listened to from the government side—that there is an emergent situation that cannot be taken care of. We have been told nothing at all, from the union's point of view, of what it intends to do to provide emergency crews to keep electricity flowing to essential industry. The hon. Minister of Labour talks about \$1 million in antibiotics and he talks about \$30 million in meat that is liable to be spoiled.

My understanding is that this union, a responsible union, has said that it will take such steps to provide crews to see that these things do not happen that the hon. Minister of Labour is talking about. One only gleans that from keeping a close watch on the development of this dispute. One becomes aware of that because, as I say, unfortunately, we did not become aware of that from the lips of the union leaders themselves. It is rather bland for the hon. Minister of Labour to get up in the House and start to cry havoc about the possible repercussions of the strike, but he really does not give credit to the union leadership for their readiness to act responsibly in this situation.

For all of those reasons, sir, I say to you that we have come to the end of the road in this matter of compulsory arbitration—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For how long?

Mr. Sopha: —and coming from the community that I come from, my heart is filled with joy that I can stand in this Legislature tonight in the face of an alternative proposal that would avert this strike.

This proposal that the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party put before the House is an honourable alternative where nobody loses face. The union does not lose face, and the Hydro commission does not lose face; it merely puts the repercussions off for a period of 60 days and reasonableness might return within that period. So it was unnecessary for us, in the face of this proposal, to sacrifice our friend from Downsview to hear what the proposal was, to be made aware of it. Now that we have heard it, I can say,

and I do say, with an absolutely clear conscience, that I will have no difficulty in getting to sleep tonight, since in the face of this alternative, when I stand to vote against this bill I will be standing for every member of the collective bargaining unit in Sudbury, each and every one of them.

How do we know, how do my people in Sudbury know, how do the members of this union know that this government, having infringed the principle of the right to strike once, it will not go marching on and impose it in other industries? How do I know that if INCO was threatened to be closed down, the government would not come in there and say that in the light of the conditions of the free world and the struggle with the East, the production of nickel is an absolutely essential service and we must continue it, and therefore the employees of Local 6500 cannot strike International Nickel and are submitted to compulsory arbitration?

Tonight we get back on the right road. We vote in defiance of this autocratic government, and in the face of the yappings of my hon. friend to the left for the rights of the working man.

Mr. MacDonald: Voting two ways in the same session.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Russell.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be extremely brief this evening, but they were brought to the top of my mind by the remarks as to guts and gutlessness that were tossed between the two Opposition parties, and scattered slightly over on to this side of the House.

As I recall earlier, the attack as to gutlessness that was being thrown about related to the suggestion that the government had no policy. As I understand it, the policy of a government, in the field that we are talking about this evening, would mean that the government would have some general legislation or some general code applying to a group of circumstances, as distinct from dealing with this kind of problem on a case-by-case, or on an ad hoc basis.

Mr. MacDonald: As they have in Sweden.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: That would require a code and it would require a legislative code. But that brought to my mind a remark made earlier in this session by the hon. member for Wentworth East, which I was able to find on page 1500 of the debates, when we were discussing the Act relating

to labour disputes in hospitals. If I may briefly quote from him, speaking for his own party formally on the second reading of that bill, he said, referring to organized labour and the hospital arbitration bill:

But they will not support it because this has not been done. They feel if we have a situation such as we had in Trenton and that if a dispute goes to the point of a strike deadline, it will have stirred up some public opinion. If the deadline is set and it is obvious there is going to be a strike in the opinion of people interested, such as the trade union movement and the government, that would be the time for us to act. I would be the first one to vote in favour of a specific piece of legislation to avoid a strike in a hospital when it came to the point that nothing else could be done.

The hon. member for Wentworth East has told us that he would vote for a specific piece of legislation, speaking for his party, and I would judge from that not a general piece of legislation.

In other words, that speech suggests to me, Mr. Speaker, that they are talking out of two sides of their mouth. From one side they attack us for not having general legislation, that is, policy, and from the other they are stating that they would deal with each of these problems, as is happening tonight, on an ad hoc basis.

As a result, sir, it will be very interesting to see if the hon. member for Wentworth East is consistent with his earlier remarks. I think we can expect the New Democratic Party at least to vote for this bill if its amendment is lost.

Mr. Bryden: We gave the government a reasonable alternative; that is what we will vote for.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very brief but I think there are a few observations I would like to make in regard to the reference of the hon. member for Russell. Certainly I made those remarks; we always vote on specific legislation. If he will check the speech I made he will note that I made no reference at that point as to how we would vote. Of course the hon. member knows very well my position and the position of our party in regard to compulsory arbitration; we do not have to rehash that tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: The principle is solid and I will stand on it as long as I believe that I am a trade unionist.

But, Mr. Speaker, the observations I want to make are brief. The hon. member for Sudbury referred to the proposals made by the union to the commission for a possible delay of this strike deadline as not being something new, and that they might have been lifted out of The Taft-Hartley Act. I agree with him. In my experience I have seen the same kind of document many times. I have been at the point of the eleventh hour about as many times as a trade unionist as I have been years in this House, which is ten years. I understand something about the problem that this committee has had in the past few weeks. I am not going to say anything about what happened prior to yesterday because, again of experience, one cannot explain to people what takes place in negotiations.

What I would say about this document is that I can understand how hard it must have been for that union's committee to draft and to agree on this proposal. I think it should have the highest commendation from this House and from the citizens of Toronto for the compromise it was willing to make. Certainly the tragedy of what is happening today is that the Hydro commission has not seen fit to accept this proposal. I would think that any time management made a proposal to a responsible union to entertain either compulsory or voluntary binding arbitration, it is done deliberately and it is provocative. Management knows full well the position of the trade union movement, and specifically it should know the position of the Canadian union of public employees, the stands it has taken publicly and the job it has done in the community.

Certainly the Canadian union of public employees is the second largest union in Canada at the present time; it may be the first for all I know, I have not looked at the membership figures. It has done a terrific job in organizing the unorganized, particularly those in the building services and hospitals which really need organizing. For any management to make a proposal to a union of that stature to entertain compulsory or voluntary binding arbitration, would be considered by most trade unionists as nothing more than a provocative attempt, a deliberate attempt, to set up a block in front of real collective bargaining.

I say that the union has taken a really responsible approach; it has shown the integrity of responsible leadership in making such a proposal, and I am really disappointed that by this hour we have not heard from the commission to say that it is ready to entertain such a proposal. Why it would take

a stand-off position and say, "Nothing will suit us but voluntary binding arbitration; we will not go along with a 60-day mediation period, that is it," I just cannot understand. It seems to me that it feels it has the union over the so-called barrel and intends to keep it there.

Another thing that disappointed me, is that the hon. Minister of Labour of this province did not have enough friendly influence with the commission or enough political prestige and respect from that commission to be able to get it to adopt this proposal. I think it is just about as reasonable a compromise as has ever been made in a situation of this nature. I certainly think that the union should be commended for their position in trying to resolve this strike at this point.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the motion as moved by Mr. MacDonald, please say "aye."

All those opposed, will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the motion, will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the motion, please rise.

YEAS

Bryden	Bales
Bukator	Beckett
Davison	Boyer
Farquhar	Brown
Freeman	Brunelle
Gisborn	Butler
Lewis	Carruthers
(Scarborough West)	Carton
MacDonald	Cecile
Newman	Connell
Nixon	Cowling
Oliver	Demers
Racine	Downer
Renwick	Dunlop
Sargent	Dymond
Singer	Edwards
Sopha	Evans
Spence	Ewen
Thompson	Gomme
Trotter	Grossman
Worton	Guindon
Young—21	Harris
	Henderson
	Hodgson
	(Victoria)
	Johnston
	(Carleton)
	Knox
	Lawrence
	(Russell)

NAYS

NAYS

Lawrence
(St. George)
Lewis
(Humber)
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Olde
Peck
Pittcock
Price
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Simonett
Spoonier
Stewart
Villeneuve
Wardrope
Wells
Whitney
Wishart
Yaremko—56

Mr. Sopha: Could we have it on record that the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) was not here to vote?

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays" 56.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Those in favour of the main motion as proposed by the Prime Minister will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, it is the same vote in reverse.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask will it be necessary to put this bill through committee? If there are no amendments to be offered, I would move third reading.

Mr. Thompson: As far as we are concerned, I would say it will not be necessary.

Mr. MacDonald: We have made our point.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves third reading of Bill No. 167.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province hath at its present sitting thereof passed a certain bill to which in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

An Act respecting a certain dispute between the Toronto electric commissioners and Local No. 1, Canadian union of public employees.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this bill.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning we will resume our discussions in the committee of the whole on Bill No. 136.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.35 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, June 11, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Friday, June 11, 1965

Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, continued	4044
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	4070

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery, students from Tecumseh public school, Port Credit.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the members of the select committee on youth be excused from attendance in the Legislature next week, to enable the committee to conduct hearings in Hamilton, Niagara Falls and Welland.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word in explanation of this motion. The problem is that the chairman of the committee made some rather complicated arrangements for these hearings some considerable time ago. Ordinarily, under normal circumstances, these select committees do not sit other than in conducting their affairs in this building while the House is in session.

Now, the question really was whether the committee could make alternative arrangements with the various groups of people who wished to attend these hearings, and in view of the length of the session, I think when the arrangements were originally made, there was no thought that this House would still be sitting at this time.

That is the background of it and I realize this will be an inconvenience to some hon. members who will want to be here to take part in the proceedings. On the other hand, there are a great many members of the public who made various arrangements to attend these meetings in the Niagara peninsula, and on balance I would ask for your support to this motion.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, it happens that my hon. leader (Mr. Mac-

Donald) is engaged at the moment in his office and will be a little late getting into the House. Well, he just got into the House and has not had a chance to familiarize himself with what is before us. In addition, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis), who is our representative on the committee, has been a little delayed this morning.

Under the circumstances explained by the hon. Prime Minister, I think there is no alternative but to accept the motion. We, too, are familiar with the problem of making arrangements for the second half of June, with the idea that one would be completely free and available. I guess nobody anticipated that we would still be engaged in this House.

There is just one matter I would like to explain, Mr. Speaker. This puts the hon. member for Scarborough West, with whom I have not had a chance to discuss the matter, in a somewhat difficult position. He is our spokesman on Health and Welfare, and both of these matters will be before the House next week. I assume that there will be a stenographic account taken of the committee's hearings, and that will probably enable him at least to familiarize himself with what happens.

But I think it should be understood that he is in a difficult position in that he has direct responsibilities in the House at the same time. I know he will regret having to miss the committee hearings because it is a committee in which he is most interested.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree).

Does the hon. Minister have any knowledge about strike breakers being imported in connection with the legal strike of employees of IBA stores, affiliated with the M. Loeb Limited Company in the cities of Ottawa and Eastview?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the department has no knowledge of strike breakers being imported in this situation. This strike has been under way for, I believe, some two weeks now, and the conciliation branch of The Department of Labour is keeping a careful eye on the situation in order to determine what assistance and at what time any assistance should be given to bringing the parties together for further discussion.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has not had a chance to prepare an answer to my question, but I think I will ask it. In connection with the story in this morning's *Globe and Mail*—and I realize he cannot have a full answer to it—but why did the Savoy family of 11 children have to be placed in a dilapidated house pending demolition, according to this four-column story with pictures? And how many low-rental houses has the Ontario housing corporation now made available? Is it not time that this government set up a ministry of housing?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question that is not a question, that is a speech. I would like to suggest that I received notice of his question about ten minutes before the House opened, and I want to assure him that I will have a full answer for him on Monday, because I read the same story in the *Globe and Mail* before coming to work this morning, and I asked my housing director to investigate this for me so I would have the information.

In the meantime, if there is anything we could do over the weekend to assist this family, I asked him to go ahead and do it. So if the hon. member will give me the time, I will have the answer for him on Monday.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) asked the following question: "Will the Minister please advise why province of Ontario graduate fellowship cheques are being held up until June 30, 1965?"

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the cheques are not being held up until June 30, 1965. There have been 1,927 awards processed for the 1965-66 academic year beginning in September, 1965. Last year some 1,225 awards were processed, and the previous year some 850 awards. There have, therefore, been 4,000 awards, the great majority of them for \$1,500 each since the inception of the pro-

gramme, a total value of some \$5,500,000. It will be seen that the increase in the number of awards this year is 57 per cent.

There are some 722 awards to students who were holders of fellowships in 1964-65 and who are continuing their studies this summer. The processing of these awards has been completed, and as soon as the cheques can be written they will be forwarded to the students.

Additional lists for students who are holders of awards for the next academic year, and who are beginning their graduate work this summer, are to be submitted by the universities by June 15. It is not possible for the universities to provide these lists earlier because they must await the results of the final year examinations. The cheques for these students will be available just as soon as they can be processed after receipt of the lists from the universities.

The hon. members of the Legislature will be interested to know that the graduate fellowship programme has increased greatly the number of students doing graduate work, to the point where at least some of our universities will next year enroll the number of graduate students that they had originally anticipated would register as long as three or four years later. The programme, therefore, will make a substantial contribution to the supply of teaching staff at the university level.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The forty-seventh order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE (continued)

On section 21:

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose yesterday, we were discussing section 21, and there were some fears expressed that certain possibilities for exclusion existed, and thereby loss of benefits. I checked again and again on this matter, and the superintendent of insurance insisted that this section be put in because of his fears that certain ones now covered under existing contracts could be excluded. He was of the opinion that this covers all possibilities.

However, after further discussion and consideration, I would propose to you, sir, the following amendment:

I move that subsection 4 of section 21

be amended by inserting after the words "subsection 1" in the second line, "or cancels for any reason other than those specified in section 17" so that the section will now read:

Any licensed carrier that cancels its medical services insurance contract under subsection 1, or cancels for any reason other than those specified in section 17 shall in the notice of cancellation given thereunder, etc.

Mr. Chairman: We have an amendment by Mr. Sopha. Is it agreeable that this be delayed until we deal with the Minister's?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Yes, I so accede, with pleasure.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the amendment of the Minister of Health—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I will not debate it at length, I am glad the hon. Minister saw fit to bring this in. I feel that the point was not covered. At any rate it certainly does no harm to make abundantly clear that it is covered. I think this will be an improvement in the bill.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment of the Minister of Health?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sopha moves that subsection 4 of section 21 be deleted, and that the following be substituted therefor:

If any licensed carrier cancels its medical services insurance contracts under subsection 1 the corporation shall place applications with other licensed carriers as it may deem fit and there shall be no change of benefits as to the policyholders in respect of such change of insurer.

All in favour of the amendment by Mr. Sopha, say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

The amendment is lost and the section is carried, as amended by the Minister.

Section 21 agreed to.

On section 22:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, under section 22, I would like to ask for some clarification from the hon. Minister, through you if I could.

I raise one question, and I do not think it fits in here completely but I crave your indulgence that I could bring it in under this section. It is a question which was raised in the *Globe and Mail*: What is to be done

about the low-income worker who would be entitled to government subsidy but is already a member of a group plan to which his employer contributes? Will he be required to forfeit assistance either from the government or his employer?

Then I raise another question, sir: There could be situations where there is some employer-employee coverage of just certain benefits, but on other benefits you get under the standard plan. The employee will probably want to stay with his employer-employee coverage. Under this section, with the standard plan, if there are already existing plans which cover the insured, then they will cover the benefits concerned rather than come under the standard plan.

Does the hon. Minister, therefore, suggest that there might be a reduction in the premium of the standard plan in such circumstances?

I do not think I have expressed myself too clearly on this. What I am saying is that you already have some coverage through an existing plan—not all coverage but just some, a couple of points covered—therefore you will not be getting all the benefits under the standard plan. Do you have to pay the same premium as if you were getting all the benefits under the standard plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I could not foresee that. We have definitely specified there can be no interference with the provisions of the standard plan. The premium cannot be lessened, and actually cannot be increased, as a standard plan. Additional benefits can be secured with the standard plan, but at no time, and under no circumstances, can they be written in, typed in, or printed in the body of the contract itself. They can be attached as a rider, but they cannot be put into the body of the plan because our bill will not permit any interference with the standard contract.

Did I understand the hon. leader of the Opposition rightly to say: Suppose the present group coverage gives him, say, half of the benefits that could accrue to him under the standard plan, could he then take half of the standard plan? No, that could not be done because this would get away from the principle of the standard plan. However, if his group plan is such that it is not bound up with several other fringe benefits—and a great many group medical services insurance contracts in industry and commerce are part of a package and it is usually to the overall benefit of the employee that he retain that package—but if it is simply medical services insurance and the group coverage does not

provide him with as much, then he has the right to withdraw from it, if this be possible under the group, or the group can disintegrate and all members can come under the standard plan as individuals if they so choose.

But again, the principle inherent in this bill is that these are individual contracts and do not apply to groups per se.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister see a situation where there could be an injustice to a man who is tied in, through his employment, with a medical insurance plan which is giving him some coverage? He has been paying into this and the group wants to stay with this. Yet on the other hand he feels that for his family coverage he should get into a standard plan to give him more comprehensive coverage. He is then paying the whole shot on the standard plan, while he is covered to some extent under the employer-employee plan. He is really paying double, not double but he is having to pay extra. Can the hon. Minister see a situation like that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can see the situation that I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is proposing, but I cannot see a way of getting out of it here without the insured dropping his inadequate coverage. I can only say that, from our studies and our knowledge of the insurance field, there are relatively few group plans which do not provide, or rather that provide, much less than the standard plan. The tendency has been, more and more, to broaden the scope of those; naturally so, because this is the evolutionary development of this whole field. Indeed, there is a very marked and steady decrease every year in the number of partial coverage plans—for example the Brown plan, and the plans that go under the various headings as provided by various carriers. The medical-surgical plan—the surgical-obstetrical plan—has been quite common and is still relatively common among the younger age groups, the young adult age groups. But these are steadily decreasing. In fact, the decrease has been very rapid until now. As I stated during second reading, the number of people in Ontario holding such contracts is less than 500,000.

This has come down quite rapidly over the past five or six years. It would be my opinion that there are relatively few contracts that do not provide benefits at least equal to what we propose in the standard contract.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I raise this other question then, and I really

crave your indulgence and that of the hon. Minister in raising it, because I do not think it completely fits in here. What does the government propose to do about persons—this is one of the questions asked by the *Globe and Mail* and I am quoting from the newspaper—they say there could be many who do not pay for coverage and then suffer illness or injury for which they have no money to buy medical attention.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I presume the same will obtain in the future as has obtained for a long time.

Again, I want to point out that we will make as widely known as is possible, with all the resources at our disposal, what is available to the people. We know from the outset there will be those who for a variety of reasons will not obtain coverage, no matter whether they can afford it or not. Even in the case of those for whom it will be provided free, we recognize that there will be some who will not, again for a variety of reasons, seek to avail themselves of this service.

I do not know what one does with human nature in a case of that kind. When people become ill, we would hope that they would be induced to ensure during that first illness that the same problem does not recur. I suppose the members of the medical profession—and I hope they will—will assume it their public responsibility to look after them. If they do not have the money, you cannot get blood out of a stone. I would hope and expect that they would be looked after at least as well in the future as they have been in the past.

Mr. Thompson: Some of them have not been looked after too well in the past.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not quite see how this discussion is in order under this section, but if I may just make one comment on it since it has been raised—I think the hon. Minister's answer once again points up the gross inadequacy of this bill.

He has said in effect that for the people to whom reference was made the situation will be as it always was. In other words, they will not be able to afford insurance. If they fall ill they will have bills they cannot pay; they may be in debt for years, they will have debts hanging over their heads. How that is going to contribute to their recovery I do not know.

The alternative is, of course, that all their assets will be used up and they will be reduced to welfare. That can happen too. But there is a large group in the community that

is not in any way covered by this bill that faces that risk day by day. It is regrettable that nothing is being done to meet their needs.

Mr. Thompson: If I could point out, I understand that in Alberta 15 per cent are in that category. I hope this will not be the situation in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did give the opinion, and I think this is a very solidly based opinion, that the reason they have missed these is that they, I understand, are in the low income group—the group which, under our bill, will be totally subsidized.

Mr. Bryden: No, the group just above that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Even then our support is extended beyond that offered in Alberta and in more generous terms. I would therefore believe that we, by this means alone, will catch the very large majority of those 15 per cent. But human nature will always be human nature and there will always be those, for whatever variety of reasons, I repeat will not—

Mr. Bryden: Not under a proper plan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wonder if the hon. member for Woodbine would have us do here in Ontario what is done in Saskatchewan? There it is compulsory, and if you do not pay your premium—if you do not pay, Mr. Chairman, no matter how little you have—you go to jail.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: We have let this go far enough.

Mr. Bryden: I suggest you keep the hon. Minister in order, if he is going to make that sort of inflammatory statement.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is a fact.

Mr. Bryden: I did not raise this matter, but the hon. Minister has made one of his typical irresponsible inflammatory statements. If he wants to know if I would like to see the kind of plan there is in Saskatchewan, the answer is an emphatic "Yes." And a further answer is that the Conservative Party in Saskatchewan is in favour of it, the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan is in favour of it, and the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan is in favour of it.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: And, after experience with it, the people of Saskatchewan are in favour of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, we were getting along so beautifully at the outset. I have a question that is foursquare within this section. This section speaks of contracts other than the standard medical plan. The hon. Minister told us yesterday there will be no interference with those contracts.

My question is: Supposing an employer pays the premium for his employees under a plan other than the standard plan; supposing one of the employees qualifies for total or partial subsidy under section 6: can the employer, instead of paying the premiums for this other plan, say to that employee, "You go to the government and make application for partial or total subsidy," and thus relieve the employer, unlike the big-hearted hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), from paying the premium? Does the hon. Minister follow me?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I think so. I suppose it would be conceivable but I can hardly think of a group being disintegrated in this fashion. I think there are certain rules and regulations which govern group insurance contracts; and one of them is, as I understand it, that a percentage, if not 100 per cent, of those in the group must have the coverage. But if, however, that employee did cover himself under a standard contract, our bill provides that if there is any charge against it, the amount that is available to him under his first contract would be applied, and the standard contract would pay only the difference. One fee only will be paid.

Mr. Sopha: Could I ask this supplementary question? In the regulations you make under section 6 regarding total and partial subsidies, where the Minister has a discretion, is the hon. Minister and the department under his direction going to have a pretty searching questionnaire directed to the person applying for partial subsidy? Are they going to look into his background? Are they going to determine, in fact, what his assets are?

A lot of people will be asking me these questions, because a lot of people have already commented that they regret very much the situation arising where their tax money is going to subsidize persons who really do not deserve to be subsidized—the persons with \$50,000 in bonds under the mattress; the people who make a good wage seasonally. For instance, Ron Haggart's

description of the people in the parimutuels at Woodbine racetrack. These people query this; after all, they are going to pick up the tab for it. They want to know that only the deserving will be able to come to the public Treasury and make use of public moneys to provide them with health care.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think this would negate one of the basic principles of the bill. We have stated that there will not be a means test, and I can only see, inherent in the hon. member's question, the institution of the imposition of a means test. We recognize that there will be some people—and this has concerned a great many of the hon. members from at least two parties in the House as much as it concerned us. But, you see, we have tried to build this on the same reasoning as obtained in, say, the universal old-age assistance plan, where there used to be a means test, and the family allowance plan.

All the economists have told me that the cost of administering it in this fashion, that is, determining eligibility on the basis of deserving rather than on income, would cost us more than we would lose. I have to listen to these arguments because, after all, these people are experts in the field and they know about these matters. But I am quite frank to admit, sir, that the hon. member is perfectly right, and his hon. colleague who sits on his right has brought this up several times to me privately. It is of concern to us.

We have had proposals that we might write in something about disposable assets and all these things; but then, I think, we would get into the rather iniquitous means test and we are certainly trying to avoid an income test. Unfortunately, some will slip through, and I really do not know at this stage, in spite of all our consideration of it, what else we can do to close out this group. I can only hope that the basic morality of our people—although maybe I am a little naive—will cause them to refrain from asking for something which they know perfectly well they do not really have the right to claim.

Mr. Chairman: Let us go back to section 22. This has all been dealt with on a previous vote.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Yes, they make a reference to standard contracts, and I have a question for the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, as to how we are going to get around a problem like this. Suppose an individual is on a group plan; he works for a firm that has a group plan. This indi-

vidual receives a salary which is so low he would either be normally receiving all his medical services free under the new plan or at least in part be subsidized; yet that individual belongs to a group plan, and where he works he must belong. There you have a situation where an individual is forced to pay into a group plan, yet he would normally receive help from the government. What do you do in a situation of that kind?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I submit that I have just answered that question for the hon. leader; but I will repeat, as far as I can, what I said. He has two choices. If it is possible he can withdraw from his group and apply to us for coverage, if he is eligible for assistance, or he can remain under group coverage.

Mr. Trotter: My point is that the employee does not always have the choice. Suppose, where he works, he has to belong to the group plan. He may not have a choice.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The principle of the bill, sir, again I repeat, does not interfere with the existing plans.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 22 stand as part of the bill?

Sections 22 to 24, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 25:

Mr. Sopha: Under this one: No licensed carrier, it says, shall under a standard contract interfere with the right of a covered person to choose his own physician or impose an obligation upon a physician to treat any covered person. All right, then. What happens if the carrier knows that the doctor is one of this minority of doctors we have talked much about, who abuse these plans, who get money out of these plans in an unjustified way—I think somebody used the phrase: they milked the plan—then what recourse, if any, does section 25 give to the carrier to move against that doctor, to prevent him from milking the plan? Because the section says in the clearest possible terms that they cannot interfere with the right of the covered person to choose his own physician, and they know that the physician is acting fraudulently and they cannot tell the covered person, the insured: "You cannot go to Dr. X." How do you stop this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the responsibility of the carrier, as a citizen of the province, of course, is to lay a formal

complaint with the college of physicians and surgeons, or, if that is too troublesome, to the council. The council exists to hear complaints from any party—the consumer, the provider of the services, or the third party who pays for the services, or from any other quarter. I would certainly think, and from past experience I feel quite sure, that if there is any hint or evidence of over-service, or over-use, by the profession, that the carrier has a very sound moral obligation to bring that to the attention of the council or, better still, to the college.

I can assure you that if it comes to the council, there is no doubt in my mind but that it will go to the college. We have made it very clear to the college that it is their responsibility to police the profession. But I still do not believe that we should remove this section. I do not think that anybody should interfere with the patient's right to choose.

Now, there is, as you will recall, a provision, in certain cases where a programme is now in existence, a closed panel programme for instance which has already by common consent agreed that a certain group of doctors will treat a specified group of patients, not to interfere with that, because this is an arrangement arrived at by people agreeing in good faith to these provisions. There will be no interference, as provided in the Act, but I would be very loath to think of any carrier having the right to dictate to which doctor you shall go.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. Minister is really addressing himself to the point that I want to raise now. What is the significance of the inclusion in this section of the term "under standard contract"? It reads:

No licensed carrier shall, under standard contract, interfere with the right of a covered person to choose his own physician.

Can one conclude from this that a carrier has the right to interfere if it is not under a standard contract?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It might very well be if that is already in the existing contract. Again I have to say, this bill, of course, addresses itself specifically to standard contracts. We have stated that we are making it, by law, mandatory that a standard contract be offered and, therefore, we are dealing with standard contracts. If the superintendent of insurance believes that this right is being violated, then I think it will be necessary for him to have his Act or Acts changed.

But this bill only strays into the field of other contracts where they might have a bearing upon the standard contract, and we have not interfered in matters that are really none of our immediate concern as a Department of Health. I do believe that there are certain contracts in existence where certain doctors are specified, particularly those of fraternal organizations, for instance. These are becoming steadily fewer, but I believe most fraternal organizations have their own doctor. Certain branches of railway employees used to have their own doctor. I remember for a time I was a railway doctor, and all railway people in my community had to come to me.

This again is an agreement reached by common consent, with the carrier and the employee, or the employee's representatives. But it is spelled out in the contract that the services of these specific doctors must be used. I do not believe there are many of these existing now, but it is possible.

Mr. MacDonald: I concede to the hon. Minister that there are some contracts in fraternal organization or in—I suspect—union contracts, or in industries, where there is a direction to a certain doctor. I am not talking about that. I am not talking for the moment about those under a standard contract. I am talking about all of the individuals who will be going on the myriad of contracts that will be offered to individuals, apart from standard contracts.

Now, we are back to the old difficulty and I am not going to belabour it. But the government has intervened to a degree and then they draw the line, but the line is not a straight line, it is very ragged in its edges. One of the ragged edges is at this point here.

You pay lip service—everybody has been paying lip service, I think almost excessively—to this right to choose your own doctor up until now. It seems to me that if you are going to protect people in the whole field of medical insurance, then it is a legitimate proposition that you should protect the individual who is not covered in a contract, standard or otherwise, from being victimized, if you will, by his carrier, and directing him to a specific doctor he does not want to go to.

The hon. Minister says presumably he can appeal to the council, or to the superintendent of insurance, and if the superintendent of insurance finds that this unwritten law to which everybody pays lip service is being violated, he may take action with the carrier. If the carrier is rather flagrant in his abuse of it, he might even withdraw the licence.

But this is a very long procedure. This is the kind of procedure that an individual is likely to be unaware of and, indeed, if he is aware of it, he is not likely to pursue it.

If this is the way that the individual has redress, I submit that even within the confines of your rather vague degree to which you move into the field and regulate, that he should be informed. It should be stated in the Act than any individual who is victimized by a carrier has recourse to either the superintendent of insurance, or to the council. But it does not.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to say that the subscriber should have to make representations to the superintendent of insurance. I can see where this could be ponderous, and certainly would be honoured more in the breach than in the observance. What I did propose, or what I meant to convey, was that I thought that The Insurance Act, or The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act, should be amended. But I have not the authority or the right, within the substance of this Act, to change them.

I agree with the hon. member that the best way to ensure that the patient shall have free choice of doctor is to make it certain by the Act under which the insurance carrier operates, but I have not that authority under this Act to do anything except with respect to the standard contract.

Mr. MacDonald: The government has, and you are a member of the government.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, the Cabinet has.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): The hon. member—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to get this clarification, through you to the hon. Minister of Health. Does the physician have the right to refuse to treat a patient, simply on these grounds alone, that the patient is covered by the standard contract?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This, Mr. Chairman, opens up a very difficult question. I know of no law that says a doctor must treat the patient, any more than I know of any law that says the shoemaker must fix your shoes. Again, we think we can depend on the integrity, morality and the sense of responsibility that the doctors will exercise. I have known doctors to refuse to take patients for very good cause, because in their judgment

they could not give them the treatment required, or that the patient should have. But I have never known one, from my own personal experience, who, placed in such circumstances, did not make certain that a patient was referred to a doctor who in the first doctor's opinion would render the treatment.

I believe that there is a free choice, both for the patient and the doctor—for the patient to choose his doctor and for the doctor to choose his patient. I would be very loath, indeed I would not even consider the suggestion that any government should say to either an individual or a doctor: "You shall go to a certain doctor," or, "You shall treat the patient."

Mr. Thompson: I know, but that is not my point, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister is nervous about certain situations, but he is not loath to tell insurance companies: "You have to carry a standard contract." However, surely the situation is that you can have this standard contract. But supposing the doctor and I raise this hypothetically—were to say: "Look, we disregard this standard contract because the Prime Minister suggested that the government do have control indirectly over fee schedules, etc." There may be a situation where the fee schedules go up to a point and the hon. Minister of Health says: "These standard contracts are going to be held at fixed amounts." So the doctors start saying: "Anyone with a standard contract will be ignored."

The law says that insurance companies must provide standard contracts. If a person comes—and I say solely on the basis of being refused by the doctor on the standard contract—would you say this would be permissible?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No. If that is the only reason, I certainly would not say it is permissible. And I am quite sure I speak for my profession when I say they would not tolerate such a situation. I think that would be a very valid reason for complaint on the part of the subscriber. It would be, in my opinion, a complaint to be treated with the greatest consideration and most urgent consideration. I cannot anticipate such a thing happening, but I can assure you it would not be tolerated.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister of Health has now said that it would not be permissible, which to me anyway means that it would be compulsory.

Mr. Chairman: The member for High Park.

Mr. Cowling: I seem to get the impression from the hon. member for York South that insurance companies direct policyholders to special doctors, which, in my knowledge of the industry, is not the case. In some fraternal organizations they might, but insurance companies are not interested in which doctor you go to. Is this what the hon. member thought? Did he say the insurance companies direct people to certain doctors?

Mr. MacDonald: It states in here that it is a possibility.

Mr. Cowling: It might be a possibility but it certainly is not in the practice of the business. The insurance carriers could not care less which doctor you see; they have no control over which doctor—

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Cowling: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member: If this is so wildly remote that it could never happen, why would this government put in a section which was careful enough to cover this point, section 25? They apparently thought it should be considered.

Mr. Cowling: I will tell the hon. member why they probably thought it. I do not know for sure but, as the hon. Minister said, we are dealing with the standard contract which is the one that all companies must qualify—

Mr. MacDonald: But if it never happened, they would not have to deal with it.

Mr. Cowling: So they simply specify that they must carry on according to the standard contract; but there are thousands of other contracts in the province which people have, and they visit the doctor of their choice. I cannot see that there is any problem with that particular section. You go to the doctor of your choice.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member's sentence was a little long; he cannot see, "period."

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on this question which has been raised, quite obviously the hon. member for High Park does not understand the point which is being made. This is a limitation which this statute purports to imply: that, in some way, a licensed carrier can interfere with the right of a covered person under contracts other than standard contracts. The hon. member

for High Park says that that cannot happen, therefore we say let us delete the words "under a standard contract"—

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I do not profess to know nearly as much about insurance as the hon. member. I mean, he has all the answers. I am just trying. But I did not say what he said that I did say about the standard contract. You have the doctor of your choice, under the standard contract or any other contract.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the point I want to make. The hon. member for High Park said you have the doctor of your choice, under a standard contract or under any other kind of a contract. We are in complete agreement. We just want to make sure that that is so by deleting the words "under a standard contract" so that the section, or that part of it—and I have another comment to make—will read: "No licensed carrier shall interfere with the right of a covered person to choose his own physician." And I think that should be acceptable to the hon. member for High Park and certainly would be acceptable to us.

On the second point, I cannot understand why or how the hon. Minister of Health can equate the freedom of the doctor to choose his patient with the freedom of the public to choose the doctor. They are not terms which can be equated. The doctors have a professional obligation which is quite distinct from their freedom to say which patients they will or will not serve. You cannot equate, on the one hand, the number of doctors in the province of Ontario who, under a statutory authority from this Legislature, exercise the obligations of their profession with the freedoms of the individuals within this province.

There is no need in this section to equate those two concepts because there is, in fact, a professional obligation on a doctor to treat people in the province of Ontario. The extent of that obligation is a matter which, by authority of this Legislature, is vested in the council of the society to which the hon. Minister of Health belongs; but to say that there is no obligation, or to even make the least implication in this section that there is not an obligation, on the part of the physician to provide the services, and that he is completely free to choose which persons he will treat and which he will not, is something which we here cannot accept. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that section 25 be amended by striking out the words "under a standard contract" and also the words "or impose an obligation upon a physician to

treat any covered person," so that the section will read:

No licensed carrier shall interfere with the right of a covered person to choose his own physician.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. Renwick that section 25 be amended by striking out the words "under a standard contract," and also the words "or impose an obligation upon a physician to treat any covered person."

Mr. Sopha: We most heartily support that, and I see that amendment is perfectly consistent with the amendment proffered by the hon. Minister of Health this morning in regard to 21(4), which we were delighted to endorse. We endorse it because we do not want any difference of treatment between standard contracts and other contracts of insurance; they should be treated as equally as possible so far as the benefits to the policyholder are concerned and, indeed, I hastily say, so far as the rights of the insurer under those contracts are given.

I also say that I agree with the hon. member for High Park most heartily that he does not know as much about insurance as the hon. member for Riverdale. The hon. member for Riverdale was a director of an insurance company.

Mr. Chairman: Let us come back to section 25.

Mr. Cowling: That does not make him an expert.

Mr. Sopha: He was fired because he was not a Tory, apparently. They do not believe in compulsion but they believe in conformity, so they fired him.

The hon. member for High Park gets up in high dudgeon and says that insurance companies will not send patients to specific doctors.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I do not know. I have no information, but insurance companies certainly have no inhibitions about sending insured people to certain lawyers; they do it all the time. So why would they not do it with doctors? Why would they carry on that practice?

Under section 24, the insurance company is given the right to direct the insured to a specific lawyer because of the right of subrogation; and not only in the exercise of the right of subrogation do they send them to specific lawyers, they send them to specific lawyers to pursue the insured's own claim.

I just cannot see in my mind that they would compartmentalize the two professions and say, "We will exercise our right and, indeed, will give gratuitous advice to send them to certain lawyers, and we will not send them to certain doctors." I just do not believe it. Of course, there will be a group of doctors which will be a favourite of the insurance companies; there will be a particular clinic that they would send them to—I do not see much wrong with it. The workmen's compensation board does it all the time. They send claimants to specific doctors within a city, and those doctors are not employees of the workmen's compensation board; they just happen to do that kind of work, when claimants are directed to them.

However, that right, or that exercise of discretion on their part, should certainly be proscribed by the statute in the clearest possible terms and that is why we support this amendment. It should be brought home in a campaign of advertising by this government in respect of this bill which, I suspect, is going to pass this House and receive third reading. And, in the campaign of advertising, one of the things to be brought home to the public of this province is that they have an inalienable right, under the bill, to choose their own doctor in respect of every policy of insurance that is issued in the province for health care of any nature or kind.

I would say to the hon. Minister of Health, to whom I bow in profound ignorance about medical matters—I know nothing about medical matters, but I suspect this: The freedom of choice of a doctor and the building up of an attitude of reliance and trust upon a specific member of the medical profession by the patient with an illness has some psychosomatic effects upon his recovery. His great faith in his doctor and his infinite reliance and trust in that medical person, assists him along the road to recovery. I remember the case of my own mother in that regard, the implicit faith that she had in a certain doctor; we want to encourage that. The person who has such trust in a doctor is a person who is inclined to follow his advice in medical matters to the letter.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, on the amendment I am afraid the hon. member should really stick to the legal problems which he knows something about, because there are some phases of the insurance business that he does not know much about.

I have been selling these medical policies ever since they were introduced in Ontario and I never heard of a company yet which directed a policyholder to a specific doctor.

That is one of the great advantages of the whole situation, that once you have paid the premium and are covered by the policy then you can go to any licensed physician in the province. I think that holds good for most of the 200 companies that are members of the Canadian health association and other non-profit organizations.

So I really do not think that there is a problem here at all. I have never heard of a case in which an individual was directed—that is other than for a life insurance examination or something of that kind; or people employed by the railroad, for instance, going to special doctors—but medical companies really are not interested as long as you go to the doctor of your choice.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of comments I would like to make.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, with reference to the comments made by the hon. member for High Park. Apparently, for some reason or other, there has been some idea in the minds of the drafters of this bill that they should protect themselves on this point. The hon. member for High Park feels there is absolutely no need, but apparently somebody on the government side felt that this should be clarified.

However, when you get down to the amendment that has been made by my colleague, the hon. member for Riverdale, the second portion of his amendment dealing with striking out the latter portion of the section reading:

or impose an obligation upon a physician to treat any covered person.

I think the case he has made is obviously a valid one. One does not want to appear to be violating what is laid down in another statute of this government, namely, the obligation of a doctor to meet the needs of the ill, and there is at least an appearance that you are moving in the direction of doing this. I think this is an unnecessary addition in the section.

I come back to the point I raised earlier, and with which I think my colleague has now dealt. When I queried the hon. Minister as to whether the significance of the inclusion of the term "under a standard contract" meant that if the person was not under a standard contract the carrier would have the right to discriminate, he said that this was not necessary in a case that did not fall under this Act. He agreed it was a matter that should be clarified, but it should be clarified under the other statutes with general reference to medical insurance carriers.

I think the hon. Minister was unnecessarily bowing out of the picture in saying that this should be dealt with elsewhere. I think it can be dealt with here; indeed, it could be most appropriately dealt with here in an Act to which the average person is going to turn if he wants to find out what this government is doing on medical coverage, an Act which is entitled, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

So the hon. Minister does have the power to meet this problem, which he acknowledges is something that could be clarified. I suggest to him that he can meet it by accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Riverdale, which just strikes out the term, "under a standard contract," so that it becomes very clear to everybody concerned that no licensed carrier shall interfere with the right of a covered person to choose his physician; no matter where he holds his contract, under a standard contract or as an individual under one of the many other contracts offered by carriers.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Riverdale who moved the amendment has put the case very clearly, inasmuch as he expressed that one of the fundamentals in the professional oath of the medical profession is that they treat the sick and wounded wherever and whoever they are. I also think that to leave this last sentence in this section will provide an argument for the medical profession in regard to some of the problems they are facing today, that is an overload of patients.

I had several cases in the last two months where people have called for an appointment and have been told by the doctor that he is taking no more patients. In one particular instance, the patient was an elderly chap who injured his side and had pain for a few days, and finally I recommended that he call the doctor. He did so and was told that the doctor was taking no more patients and that he should go to the hospital.

The chap went to the hospital and received treatment. First, there was an x-ray and he had to pay \$10 for this because he was beyond the 24-hour emergency treatment provision. If the doctor had accepted him or referred him to a doctor who would have treated him, he would have had no cost attached to his injury, because he was covered by a medical insurance programme.

There have been cases in the last couple of years where, because of the new medical programmes coming into force—industrial contracts—doctors are segregating their patients based on what kind of coverage they have.

It is developing a problem in some of the municipalities inasmuch as the built-up areas have their ration of doctors and new people coming into the community cannot establish what we might call a family doctor within a reasonable distance of their home. Particularly in the city of Hamilton, there are people, living down in what we call below the mountain section, who have to establish their relationship with a doctor several miles away on what we call the mountain section of the city. Certainly it is an inconvenience for travel and accessibility.

I think this is another area that has to be looked at very shortly, the shortage of doctors in our communities, but I do not think this sentence should be left in this section because it will in some sense, I think, give the medical profession what might be considered a legal right to either defer a patient or refuse him attention.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the amendment. All in favour of Mr. Renwick's amendment, say "aye."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think before you put the question I want to speak against the amendment. This bill, first of all, I repeat, has to do with standard contracts and there is little sense, at least in my thinking, for us to trespass in a field that is already covered by other specific Acts. While I subscribe to the principles underlying the argument I do not believe it applies. Here again is evidence of the gulf that exists between us, and I have just as much right and just as much validity to my argument as my hon. friends in the splinter group have.

Mr. MacDonald: You have as much right to your opinion as we have.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course you say it is not right, my hon. friend, but I say it is right. I say you are wrong and I say I am right. You say I am wrong and you are right. So who is to judge? The public has judged time and time again, and they will continue to judge and I know what judgment they will make.

But I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that this bill applies to standard contracts and I think we should stick to standard contracts and build in all the safeguards necessary in respect of them, because they are the contracts which the government says to the insurance carriers, "You must provide for our people."

Then, too, I think we have lost sight of certain facts, or at least we have strayed quite far afield. This section of the Act says nothing

about the doctor's obligation to treat his patients; and there is nothing like that in it. There is no attempt to equate these things. This section says that no licensed carrier shall interfere with the patient's right to choose his own doctor, nor shall any licensed carrier impose an obligation upon a physician to treat any covered person.

My hon. friend from Riverdale is really talking foolishly, sir, because he knows perfectly well that there is no legal obligation, no obligation established by any statute of this Legislature, which forces him to accept a client, or forces the client to go to him; and I think this would be the most dangerous principle to introduce in any piece of legislation.

My hon. friend from Wentworth East pointed this out when he said that the doctor refused to take a patient because he had more than enough to do now. Is the hon. member suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that by law we should say to that doctor, "You have got to take the patient"?

Mr. Bryden: The amendment would not do that; you know that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Bryden: On that point, it leaves the law unchanged.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member like to take the floor, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I would certainly do a lot better with it than you are doing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I am quite sure you would.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The Minister of Health has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is surprising to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member does not dislocate his shoulder patting himself on the back.

I want to point out to you, sir, that here we are trying to protect the rights of the subscribers by stating that the carrier shall, under no circumstances, interfere with a subscriber's right to choose his own doctor, nor impose upon the subscriber a physician of the carrier's choice. Suppose the patient does not want to go to that physician. Does the carrier say, or the law say, "You have got to go there," or "The law does not say that I cannot send you there"? We are making certain that the law says he cannot

impose that obligation, either on the physician or on the patient.

Therefore, sir, I say that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask that you read the amendment? I do not know if there has been another amendment that the hon. Minister is talking about.

Mr. Chairman: There is only one.

Section 25 be amended by striking out the words "under a standard contract," and the words "or impose an obligation upon a physician to treat any covered person."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, may I speak again? As the hon. Minister, when he last spoke, directed his comments to me, I would just like, for a moment, to reply to him.

On the first point, he states that this Act deals only with the standard medical insurance contracts; yet, in the very definition sections of the Act, it does otherwise. If you will notice the amendment which we have proposed, it refers to:

No licensed carrier shall interfere with the right of a covered person to choose his own physician.

And then, if you will look simply at the definition of "covered person," in section 1 of the bill, you will find that "covered person" means a person who is covered by medical services insurance. And if you will look then at the definition of "medical services insurance" on page 2 of the bill, in section 1, you will find that medical services insurance is drawn in the broadest ambit possible, by stating that it means a contract, agreement, scheme, fund or arrangement, whereby a resident is covered for medical, surgical or obstetrical care or services, or the cost or a portion thereof, when rendered to such resident and to his dependants by, or under, the direction of a physician.

I will not read the obvious exclusion that comes at the end of it. I would simply say to the House that the comment of the hon. Minister that this bill does not deal with medical insurance contracts in its broad context is just not correct, because the bill itself so provides.

So far as the second point is concerned, what I was stating—and if I could try to state this clearly, I think that every hon. member of this House will agree—is that we are not speaking about statutory obligations as to what his profession or what my profession, or any member of it, must do. What we are saying is that there is a professional obligation on anyone who is in the privileged

position in our society of being either a doctor, a lawyer, or other qualified professional person; and, in the privileged position, it imposes a professional obligation on him to do certain things. We have not got, so far, in our society, to where it is possible by statute to specifically define what that professional obligation is.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale is out of order. This has nothing to do with this section. This has to do with a licensed carrier and not the profession.

Mr. Renwick: I will complete very quickly, Mr. Chairman. All I wish to say is that the law of the province of Ontario is broader than the statute law of this province and covers many more fields. I am content to leave the extent of the professional obligation, of any professional person in the province, to be determined by our courts, but I just simply do not wish to have, and we here do not wish to have, the implication in here that in some way a professional person is completely free of a professional obligation.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the amendment. All in favour say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the nays have it.

Call in the members.

Those in favour of Mr. Renwick's amendment, please rise.

Those opposed to Mr. Renwick's amendment, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "yeas" are 21, the "nays" 48.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost, and section 25 forms part of the bill.

On section 26:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, this I suppose is what could be called the draftsman's saving clause. I can appreciate the feelings of a draftsman after he has drafted a complicated bill. He undoubtedly always has a gnawing feeling that he may have overlooked something. Somewhere in the statute law of the province there may be something that is in conflict with what is in that bill he has just drafted, and this may, at some future date become a matter for litigation. So a clause of this kind goes in, stating that, in the event of a conflict of any provisions of this Act with any provisions of any other Act, the provisions of this Act will prevail.

This is fine, Mr. Chairman, but what happens when we have two Acts in conflict,

both of which have this clause in them? My impression is, without having made a study of the matter, that most of the statutes of the province have this clause in them, with the result that the whole thing is totally meaningless.

Mr. MacDonald: A good point, you will have to agree, a very good point.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): How crazy can you get?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I believe that the normal rule is that, if there is a conflict between two statutes enacted by the same legislative body, the statute enacted most recently is the one that prevails, on the theory that it represents the present thinking, or the most recent thinking, of the Legislature concerned. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think that is the way we should leave it. I think we should give up putting in these asinine clauses which really do not mean anything.

If, inadvertently, a conflict arises, let the matter be interpreted by the court as to precisely what the legislative situation is. If it is different than the government and the Legislature intended, then there is always the remedy of coming back to the Legislature to straighten the matter out. I think that is the best way of handling it. I am not inclined to make a major issue over section 26 since it is largely meaningless, but I would suggest that in future we might consider dropping that type of section from the statutes.

Section 26 agreed to.

On section 27:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, sir, if the hon. Minister will be kind enough to tell us, in view of the fact that we are in the fiscal year of 1965-66, and that all of us through our taxes are compelled to pay to the consolidated revenue fund, that all of us therefore are contributing to this Act. I want to re-emphasize that no matter how he wants to dodge around it, that we are compelled to contribute to the Act. I would like to know how much we are going to be compelled to spend and whether the hon. Minister will tell us how much money he intends to spend this year before anyone is actually offered coverage under this Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, no one will be offered coverage under the Act during this fiscal year. As has already been stated, the programme will come into effect on June

1, 1966, but there will be moneys required in connection with the organization and preparation for the coming into operation of the programme.

I cannot at this time give you a definite budget—this, again, is dependent upon the passage of this bill. It would be rather presumptuous of me to anticipate the will of the Legislature and have everything ready and the budget all prepared in the hope and expectation that the bill would pass. I awaited, as I think is proper behaviour, the will of the Legislature. But now that I know it is going to be passed unanimously we will proceed very vigorously to the preparation of the budget for this year.

Mr. Thompson: Well, Mr. Chairman, on this question, I presume because of his usual quiet and rather shy manner, and never wanting to be presumptuous, the hon. Minister cannot tell us the costs of premiums and answer a number of other questions, like the aged and what they will have to pay. Now he is suggesting that he could not tell us how much funds he will want allocated. I wish, in this particular area, that perhaps he could have been a little bit more presumptuous because it would seem to me that he is presenting an Act to this Legislature and to the people of Ontario, and some of them are very interested in knowing just how much it is going to take out of their pockets, how much they are going to be compelled to pay. We would have hoped that he would have had more facts, in view of the six years' intensive study that he says he has given to this Act.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that the answer given by the hon. Minister to the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition carried the same note of irresponsibility that has characterized many of his answers to this House, a note almost of flippancy.

This section is a supply section, this is a request for grant of supply. When the hon. Minister puts the section before us, he is requesting a grant of supply. If we approve the section, and ultimately go on to approve the bill, then that means that supply has been granted.

Mr. Chairman: May I interrupt here—the resolution was carried the other day—

Mr. Bryden: We choose to deal with it here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman. But when we had the resolution, it was carried.

Mr. Bryden: I still say it is quite in order. This section has not yet been carried, Mr. Chairman, it is quite in order to ask questions about it.

Mr. Chairman: I did not say you are not in order, I just gave you a little information.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I am well aware of the resolution, but we thought a better time to deal with the matter would be here. It might have been better to have dealt with it at the other place, but I think the option is open to us.

When a government asks for supply, it is customary and desirable that it should state how much money it anticipates it will spend for the purpose, and detail how it arrived at that figure. That is what happens when we have the estimates before us. This is an item obviously that could not be included in the estimates, but here I think we should get the kind of answer that we would expect to get on estimates.

Now, I judge from what the hon. Minister said that he has an idea—surely he must by now have an idea—of how much money is going to be spent and what it is going to be spent for. However, he is not going to bother to tell us, he is going to return to the old days before the responsibility of King to Parliament was established and the executive simply levied money without explaining to the people's representatives what it was for and how much was involved. I suspect the hon. Minister must know but he has refused to give the answer on what I can only say is a purely flippant reason, namely, that we have not yet passed the bill and he does not want to presume to anticipate what the House will do.

Well, I suggest to him that when he comes before us with a request for supply, he should not presume to refuse to tell us how much supply he wants and precisely how he expects to spend it. I think we are entitled to an estimate of the total amount of money involved here, and a breakdown of that figure.

Mr. Chairman: Section 27—

Mr. Bryden: No! I think we should have an answer from the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister does not care to answer.

Mr. Bryden: If the hon. Minister will not answer, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to this House that it should not grant the supply that he is requesting. We should not grant

money without knowing how much is involved and what it is for. I suggest to the House that it should vote against the adoption of the section.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 27 stand as part of the bill?

All those in favour, say "aye."

All those opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of having section 27 stand as part of the bill, please rise.

All those opposed to section 27 standing as part of the bill, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 46, the "nays" are 22.

Section 27 agreed to.

On section 28:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to one subsection of section 28—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sopha: We have had a rare degree of unanimity between our two parties in Opposition to this bill—

Mr. Bryden: Even the *Globe and Mail* is on our side.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and in very good company. Only the Tory party—

Mr. Singer: Even the *Toronto Telegram*—

Mr. Sopha: I move that section 28 be amended by striking out clause (b), and by adding the following clause: Prescribing the form and content of financial and other statements of all licensed carriers to be furnished to the council by the corporation, when the corporation recommends to the council any changes in benefits or maximum subscription rates, and that section 28 be further amended by deleting subsection (k).

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sopha moves:

That section 28 be amended by striking out clause (b) and by adding the following clause: Prescribing the form and content of financial and other statements of all licensed carriers to be furnished to the council by the corporation, when the corporation recommends to the council any changes in benefits or maximum subscription rates, and that section (k) of section 28 be deleted.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that perhaps the matter could be simplified if this composite motion were framed to read that the section be amended by striking out clauses (b) and (k), and by adding the proposed words. It comes to the same thing with less expenditure of words.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, can there be two joint movers and—

Mr. Bryden: No, there are not; the hon. member for Sudbury moved—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: But they are both speaking—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, since this group proposed the ideas contained in a significant part of that amendment, I would like to explain our reasoning with regard to them. I may say, before I go on to deal with clause (b) and the proposed new clause (m), that we agree entirely with the proposition of the hon. member for Sudbury, that clause (b) should be knocked out.

Indeed, we have the same mixed feelings with regard to this entire regulation section as we have expressed on numerous occasions. When you get right down to it, Mr. Chairman, everything that matters with regard to this bill is concealed in section 28 which gives the real power to the Lieutenant-Governor to legislate without any accountability to this House at all.

This is essentially what has happened here, and it happens in all too many statutes. I will say that the Opposition in this House, during committee consideration of this bill, has done what I would call an outstanding job.

I see that even unsympathetic newspapers agree that it has been an outstanding job in bringing to light the nest of jokers which were concealed in the namby-pamby, mealy-mouthed words of the bill, and which are to come to light only when the regulations are passed. We have smoked out a lot, but we have not smoked everything out, I feel certain, because it is difficult—especially when there is a Minister like this one, who evades questions rather than answering them and who goes into long tirades unrelated to the questions asked in order to divert attention from those questions; this makes the job particularly difficult. I can understand his position; he does not want

to answer the questions because he does not think the answers would stand up under analysis.

However, included under this regulation section are the really important things that are to be provided.

For example, clause (c) says that the Lieutenant-Governor has power by regulation to designate the classes of persons mentioned in section 6. Now section 6 relates to the people who are to be subsidized. We have certain assurances from the hon. Minister as to what people he has in mind; I would give him credit on this point, he has given us more definite information on it than he usually gives us. But the designation of the classes of persons mentioned in section 6 is one of the most critical and important features of the whole legislation.

Then we have the power to prescribe the exceptions referred to in subsection 3 of section 14. As I pointed out when that subsection was under consideration, what the Lieutenant-Governor in Council does under that power could change the character of the bill quite substantially. The hon. Minister refused to say what the government has in mind under this subsection; in fact he wilfully misunderstood the meaning of the subsection and we never could get an answer from him.

Then we come down to clause (h) whereby maximum subscription rates are to be dealt with by regulation. We have not been able to get any real information from the government regarding the maximum subscription rates except that it appears quite obvious that these maximum rates will be excessively high, so high that they will not be maximums at all, they will be totally meaningless. But again, we are not in a position to make any real comments.

Then we come to clause (k), which the hon. member for Sudbury proposes should be struck out and which, again, permits the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to prescribe limitations on benefits. I think that section relates to schedule "A".

If one takes the bill all together, Mr. Chairman, the regulations are really going to be the significant element. The regulations will prescribe who will get subsidies, what the maximum charges will be for those who do not get subsidies and what coverage they will get under standard contracts. What else is there? In the whole plan those are the three critical points. We have been given only limited information about most of them; there is nothing about them in the bill. All we can say is that what we have been told

leads us to believe that the regulations will be most undesirable.

However, we will never have an opportunity to deal with them in this House. It is a sad commentary on parliamentary government that governments persistently ask the elected representatives of the people to abdicate their function of making laws and to hand it over to somebody else who then never has to report back to the elected representatives on what they have done; this is the sort of thing the government proposes to us.

We have a particular objection to clause (b). There are some others which I have mentioned that I do not like, but there is no alternative to them at this moment. Since there is nothing in the bill about the maximum rates and the subsidized groups there has to be some way of providing for them, and so we are left with no alternative but to agree to such clauses as (c) and (e).

But let us take a look at clause (b), Mr. Chairman. Under clause (b) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will have the power to enlarge the functions of the council that is to be set up under this bill. Without repeating what has been said before, I would just remind the House that this council as provided for under section 3 of the bill is called the medical services insurance council. It is a council that will have very great influence on the administration of the bill, too much in our opinion, and what is particularly undesirable, as we have tried to indicate previously during the consideration of this bill, it is a council that is heavily loaded in favour of the medical profession and the insurance industry. The whole bill is loaded that way, but we think it is most undesirable that a council with significant influence in the administration of the bill should be so loaded.

We cannot now reopen the question of the powers the council already have; but we object to this type of weighted council, biased in favour of specific interest groups, having any additional functions given to it. We simply are not willing, as far as this group is concerned, to let the Lieutenant-Governor in Council expand the already excessive functions of that council. If the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in experience, thinks there are ways in which the functions of the council should be revised or expanded, then let him come back to this House and get the law changed. But as far as we are concerned we are not prepared to agree to any expansion of the functions of the council without knowing what is involved.

Let me put it once again, as we have put

it so many times Mr. Chairman, we are not prepared to buy a pig in a poke. If the Lieutenant-Governor in Council wants these functions expanded, then let him come before this House and explain how and why they are to be expanded.

As for the proposed new clause (m) that we suggested be inserted in the bill, it will be noted, Mr. Chairman, that nowhere in this bill is there any provision for insurance carriers to provide financial statements and other documentary information that ought to be provided, if they want to increase their rates. We believe that, in a bill of this kind, which puts them in quite a preferred position, the public or at any rate representatives of the public should have access to their financial statements. They may come along and make a great song and dance about how they are starving to death, and that they want an increase in fees, and so on. If they are going to do that, then I say that they should be prepared to back up their contention by putting the facts on the table, by permitting their financial statements to be analyzed so that a determination can be made as to whether or not they actually need the increase.

As I understand it, if this sort of power is not specifically provided, there is no way the information can be obtained. You cannot force them, barring a specific authority, to produce their financial statements and other relevant documents. Are we going to be in the position, in the future administration of this bill, that we may be expected to permit an increase in rates merely on the say-so of the insurance companies, without a full analysis of what is involved? Whatever the hon. Minister may see fit to do with the rest of the amendments proposed by us, I think he should be happy to accept the proposed clause (m), either as it stands or perhaps in some redrafted form. There is obviously a bad oversight in the bill. This amendment will help to correct the oversight. It will give an opportunity for such documents—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House, a moment ago, when the amendment about which the hon. member is speaking was moved, so I do not know the wording of it, but I take it from his remarks that it is a question of requiring the filing of financial statements by insurance companies as legislation in this Act. I just would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House, that, under The Insurance Act, all insurance companies doing business must file financial statements with the superintendent

of insurance, that is The Department of Insurance; and all other types of carriers, such as PSI, must file their financial statements under The Hospital Insurance Act. So there is no gap, there is no opening, through which an insurance company can escape, or can evade the filing of its financial returns; that information is available, either under The Insurance Act or The Hospital Insurance Act. If there is an amendment requiring a further filing under this Act, I think it might be regarded as somewhat superfluous or unnecessary.

Mr. Bryden: I would point out to the hon. Attorney General that the proposed amendment requires such filing only in relation to a recommendation for an increase in fees by the corporation, so called, which is the consortium of insurance companies. It does not provide for a general filing of returns. I am obviously not going to get into any dispute over the law with the hon. Attorney General, but I would put this point to him.

It is true that, under The Insurance Act, insurance companies must file certain information, but I do not think that information is available to all and sundry. That is for the information of—I have just forgotten the title—the chief insurance officer at any rate, the director of insurance, the superintendent of insurance so that he can make sure that they are complying with The Insurance Act. I would be surprised if that information, some of which I would think is of a highly confidential nature, could be transferred to some other government agency, or any other party at all, without a specific authority.

Certainly, income tax returns are not available to anybody except The Department of National Revenue. No other department of government at Ottawa can get access to them, except by special authority. That being so, the provision to which the hon. Attorney General refers, really does not meet our point.

Our point is that if the corporation—that is the insurance companies—is to apply for an increase in premiums under the law, then the government should be in a position to require the corporation to get from its members such financial information as is required, including confidential information, so that it will be possible to judge whether or not the application for an increase in rates is actually merited. Without such a provision, I would suggest that the government is going to be operating in the dark to a considerable degree in determining what the maximum premiums will be under this Act. It may be that the government does not mind operating in the dark, because, as we all know, the maximums are

not really going to mean anything. But some day an attempt may be made to make them mean something, in which case the government will need much more information than it can get under the Act as it now stands.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few remarks in regard to this section, because this particular section 28, and the amendment as suggested, really sums up the entire debate—whether it be on principle, or section by section. The real operating power of this Act is in section 28; and, quite frankly, it shows in this section that this scheme for medical insurance, or for the health of the people, is a sick plan, because the real power and the real importance of the plan is not spelled out. We get, in subsection 8, such things as the wording: The Lieutenant-Governor in Council will have power to prescribe the maximum subscription rates. Here, after all these hours of debate, we still do not know what those subscription rates are. I say that those rates should be spelled out in this section here.

Even in the course of debate, we stumble virtually on the fact, from an utterance of the hon. Minister, that there are to be certain extra premiums, it would seem, for those who are sick and those who are aged. If the problem of the rates were spelled out, we would know where the people of this province actually stood. But here, after all these hours of debate, the government keeps hidden, will not tell us, what the rates are. As we said before, I think the reason is that they are much higher than we even suspected. We even suggested the maximum will be \$180, we now rather suspect it is going to be higher than that. I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister and the government is ashamed to tell us what the rates really are going to be.

Again, under this section, they have the power to prescribe the limitation on benefits under the standard contracts. This, under the amendment, we want struck out, because in essence this section gives the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the power to chop away at the plan. We think now that the people of the province are going to get so much in the way of coverage—not enough coverage; but we have some idea what it is proposed that they get. Yet, under this very section, it could be quite possible that they are first of all going to chop away under what the people are going to receive. We know, from reading other sections of the Act, that there the Ontario medical association can keep boosting their rates so that we can find that, in this particular section, where there is

literally power to cut the benefits, and in other sections where the OMA has the power to boost the rates, that this particular Act can insofar as providing even the minimum coverage for the people of the province of Ontario, is what the hon. leader of this party called at the very beginning when this Act was introduced, a monstrous fraud. And that is exactly what it is. The whole tenor of this debate—and this section sums up the debate—is a monstrous fraud, because we learn as time goes on that the people of this province are going to receive less and less from this particular Act.

So I would ask the hon. members of this House and I admit I cannot expect much from the Tory government, they have given so little on this—but I would ask their support in striking out subsection (k) of section 28, and supporting also the other amendment as suggested. What we really need to do is give the council more power, as suggested in the amendment in section (b).

I do not like the set-up of the council as it is, but because the principle has been recited we have to accept it insofar as the debate on section 28 is concerned. But at least if the council was given more power, as suggested, there would be some hope of controlling the premiums, there would be some hope of giving more protection to the aged and to the so-called poor risks, than this Act is giving.

In essence, we do not give the proper protection to the people who need it most. We ignore the important principle that we should spread the risk, that there should be a standard premium, a standard plan, so that no matter how old you are or how sick you are, you pay a certain minimum rate. We ignore this completely in this bill, and whatever protection we could give in giving the people minimum rates, we could do it under this section, which we do not.

So again I say that this is a sick plan and it is going to cost the people who can afford it least the largest amount of money. In trying to protect the so-called poor risk and the older and the aged, I would ask this House to support the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: In regard to this power to make regulations, it strikes me, after an exhaustive study of the subject matters in the subheads up to (1), that just about every important principle covered in this Act may be changed by the Minister of Health and his advisers upon recommendation to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. In other words, we, this Legislature, the supreme law-making body in the province, having passed

a statute, albeit not with our support, the statute having been passed, is handed over to the faceless and nameless bureaucracy—and I do not use that term of bureaucracy as a term of opprobrium, but as a term of art. And they may, in their own discretion and without our presence, make regulations which in effect may change the intent of the Legislature itself.

Now, the hon. Attorney General is in the House and he has joined in the debate this morning. He will recall that shortly after the last world war, Lord Ewart of Bury, Lord Chancellor of England, wrote a book called *The New Dictatorship* in which that estimable law lord charged that democracy had been replaced, had in fact been destroyed by the power to make regulations, and that the legislative power—the hon. member for Forest Hill will have read that book also—of the Legislature had been replaced—

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): *The New Despotism.*

Mr. Sopha: *The New Despotism*, thank you very much. Perhaps I may be forgiven by saying that it is some 13 or 14 years since I read that book, but it is *The New Despotism* by Lord Ewart of Bury.

He said that the power to make regulations exercised by the bureaucracy had, in effect, replaced the supreme power of the Legislature to legislate. We complain quite strongly about the wide compass of subjects that has been provided in these regulations over which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide the flesh to this statute. Strangely enough, I might say that a statute which is proclaimed by some in this House as a great and major social advance, has not as many sections in it as one would think that it would deserve in implementing what is called a step forward in the realm of social legislation. I should like to address myself to some comments on the individual paragraphs of this section.

In regard to (a) we are told there are some 200 carriers in the province that provide contracts of the nature contemplated by this Act. I have not the faintest suspicion of what the grounds may be whereby the Minister of Health would recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that any one of the 200 might be exempted from the obligation to provide coverage under this Act. I presume that it refers to companies already in the field. One would not think that it would be directed at insurance carriers who are not already operating in this field.

In regard to that large number of 200

companies, I recall in my submission to the select committee dealing with compensation for persons injured on our highways, I said to that committee—and I was not shot for having said it—that there are too many insurance companies operating in Ontario. I would say that 200 companies in the health care field has implicit in it, almost without further need for proof, the concept that that multiplicity must be inefficient. When you duplicate administrative staffs and all the capital overhead that is required to run an insurance company, it strikes me that merely to state that there are 200 serving the needs of 6,750,000 is far too many.

I said at the time to that committee—and I wish to repeat it here—in regard to the number of companies that were offering public liability and property damage insurance in the auto insurance field, that what the industry needs is an E. P. Taylor. He, or a man of that type, would be just the man to weed out some of the inefficient companies that have a very small amount of premium income, and necessarily a small amount of risk, and consolidate them into larger and more efficient companies if the health care—as seems likely—of our people is going to be administered by private interest groups.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have very great respect for my hon. friend, but I think we are going back to discussing, not only the clauses of the bill, but the principles of the bill. All of these clauses have already been passed, and all we are seeking is the right to make regulations under those clauses. The clauses themselves have been passed.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I have said everything I wanted to say about that anyway, so I will move on.

In respect of the amendment proffered, the deletion of paragraph (b) and the amendment moved by my hon. friend adding to paragraph (m), which we deal with next, we agree with him wholeheartedly that it is in the public interest, and I do not really see why it is necessary to argue this. That idea should commend itself to all corners of the House, that before an increase in the maximum subscription rates ought to be permitted to any company, or to any group of companies, surely they should show the government that their financial condition is such that they deserve an increase?

You will note, in the earlier section of the bill, that a degree of restraint is imposed upon them. I have said, and I will repeat it, that this statute seems to anticipate that they

are going to be at the door of the council very frequently, asking for an increase in the maximum subscription rates.

The *Globe and Mail*, a long-time supporter of this government, besides advocating that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) should take his hon. Minister of Health in hand, also makes an allegation that the premiums for the high-risk cases are going to be from \$230 to \$250 a year. And, try as we might, neither this party, my hon. friends in the New Democratic Party, the *Globe and Mail*, nor the *Toronto Telegram*, which has a critical editorial today in the afternoon edition, can find out from the hon. Minister what the maximum subscription rates are going to be. He has not denied the accuracy of the allegation of the *Globe and Mail*, that people who cannot afford it are going to be required to cough up \$250 a year—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is completely wrong for the hon. member to befuddle and fool the people of Ontario by saying that they are going to have to cough up \$250. No such figure has been stated, and I have given complete and total reasons why we have not said anything about a maximum premium; we have not got the right to set a maximum premium. That is provided under this law.

Mr. Bryden: You mean the insurance companies are going to determine it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not say any such thing.

Mr. Bryden: That is what you mean.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You are a very smart fellow, being able to read my mind.

Mr. Sopha: The *Globe and Mail*, in an editorial in today's issue, has this to say referring to Premier Robarts.

He can be expected to second-guess his Minister and restore the confidence in the government's motives that was reflected after the Medicare legislation was announced.

They are referring directly to this statement:

Yet their costs are to be covered by a premium of \$180. For high-risk cases in the unsubsidized group, the premiums may climb to \$230 or \$250 a year.

So speaks the *Globe and Mail*, and to this government that is almost like saying, "Thus saith the Lord."

Will the hon. Minister, through our friends in the press gallery, assure the people

of Ontario that the *Globe and Mail* figure, of from \$230 to \$250 a year, is totally inaccurate, that it will not approach that figure? May we have that assurance?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I assure you, sir, and the hon. members of the House, that the *Globe and Mail* figures are just as irresponsible as those that have been shouted abroad by the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I have not mentioned any at all.

There goes the *Globe and Mail*. Since 1937 it has supported this government and now it is coming back.

That does not detract from the emphasis in this statute; and there are two sections, which refer to an increase in maximum subscription rates, which are tied in with this amendment proffered by myself and, in all fairness, drafted by my hon. friend from Woodbine. We think, and we hope, we will find the same degree of agreement in the press tomorrow as we got in regard to our assertions of yesterday. We say that it is a matter of the carrying out of the responsibility of this government to require these companies, before they come forward and ask the maximum, to show that they are entitled to it, based upon their financial experience in the field of health care.

This statute is based on private carriers. Therefore, an eager and quick eye of watchfulness over private carriers should be a prime consideration of this government. Now I leave that; we hope that we will hear from the hon. Minister on the gist of this amendment which has been put forward. But the longer we argue this thing the more reluctant he seems to be to give us the answers we seek; and I might say that the hon. Minister also demonstrates a high degree of arrogance as we reach the end of the debate.

In regard to paragraph (i). This paragraph refers to the prescription of the manner in which the notice, referred to in subsection 2 of section 19, will be given. Section 19 refers to an adjustment of its subscription rates under subsection 1, which deals with an adjustment not more than once in any 12-month period in respect of standard contracts in accordance with normal business practice, and that the carrier is required to notify his holders of such adjustments. I wonder: What is the necessity—and I ask the hon. Minister to tell us—what is so complex about that, that it is a matter that need be left to the regulation? Surely notification by the insurer of the insured is a fairly simple matter. What is the necessity of making it all the

more complicated by giving to the Lieutenant-Governor the power to make regulations surrounding the form of that notice?

Then again, as in other parts of the Act, why is not the figure of three months' notice adopted? We find the figure of three months' notice appearing in respect of other notices. Indeed, when a company is going out of business under section 21, it is stipulated that 60 days' notice be given of the cancellation of its business. But I am really at a loss to understand why the content of the notice, and its form and the length of time that the notice must encompass, is left as a matter to be prescribed by the regulations.

In regard to (j), the hon. Minister told us, with some emphasis—and he got into high dudgeon about this—he puffed himself up and said that the government is not going to tell the medical profession how to practise medicine. I suppose that is all right. In fact, we all know that is a bit of window-dressing, because as soon as the bureaucracy starts to operate in this deal, they will be telling the medical profession a good deal that the medical profession had not thought they would be telling them. But, having said that, where does the government, to be consistent, become an expert on what is a "certified specialist" and what is the meaning of the word "referral"? Surely those are medical terms, and only the medical people are qualified to determine what the term "certified specialist" is going to mean.

Of course, the reply of the hon. Minister, who is now in a phase of inconsistency with his earlier statement, is going to be—if I may anticipate it, he will say, "We will ask the doctors to advise us on the meaning of those terms."

Paragraph (k) we are unalterably opposed to. We do not even agree, in this party, that the limitations which are set out in schedule A ought to be included—annual health examinations, well-baby care, and psychotherapy. We would not refer to those at all in the standard medical services insurance contract, but would treat those as purely services on a physician-patient basis. I do not need to elaborate why that is so, because it becomes apparent to all hon. members that annual health examinations are a matter that is consistent with the care of one's health. I need only protest that I have said, time and time again, that the one thing this country needs is healthy babies.

I am one who believes that we have not fulfilled the destiny of this country, in the words of Laurier, that the 20th century belongs to Canada, because we only have

some 20 million people inhabiting the three million square miles of this country, in this, the seventh, decade of this century. Psychotherapy, we have said, is one that is an ordinary—when mental illness strikes at us so deeply as it does, psychotherapy is one that ought to be included in any intelligent contract for medical care.

But most of all we do not wish to give the Lieutenant-Governor in Council any further power to deal with limitations and that is the purpose of this amendment. We do not want the exercise of that power to go to the extent of putting more exceptions in, or circumscribing the already limited area of care that the patient can now get under these contracts from his physician. Remember that I say that, sir, in the context that we in this party have stood from the very beginning for a comprehensive programme of medical care.

So, sir, having said that, we come to the end of the fight and it has been a good fight. This bill has had a very studied attitude demonstrated to it by this House. I do not pretend to take all the credit for the Opposition, other hon. members from other parts of the House have made their comment. However, it is the Opposition that has got the notice in the press for its attitude towards this bill. Let me just say in closing, and I expect this may be near the last word that I will say on the thing, that our attitude is in no way changed.

This is going to pass. The hon. Minister talks in terms of the woolly and ethereal that he would not presume that the Legislature is going to pass it. He knew when he came in here that this bill was going to pass. At the start he demonstrated an absolutely inflexible attitude, that he would not change a comma, he would not change a semi-colon, in the bill. But his position grew more and more untenable, and finally he had to give in to some amendment; and he is in further trouble, bearing in mind the attitude of the popular press toward him. But it is the best we can do if the government, through its majority, intends to adopt for our people this form of health care plan. I merely say on behalf of this party that we shall continue the struggle for a government operated, therefore cheaper, more efficient health care plan; a universal and comprehensive system of health care for the people of Ontario. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Health

something with respect to the statement which the hon. Attorney General made a few minutes ago. The hon. member for Woodbine raised the question as to whether or not there would be an examination of financial statements of the carriers prior to granting of increases and if there would be some regular scrutiny of these statements. The hon. Attorney General indicated that such financial statements must be filed, and so they are in The Department of the Attorney General or the appropriate section of that department.

The question I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Health: Are those statements available to the Minister of Health or to his department for this kind of scrutiny?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid I would have to ask the hon. Attorney General that. I do not know. I do not know what is permissible in his department. I do not know if these statements are public property or not. I really cannot say.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, this would almost make a mockery of what the hon. Attorney General has said. If these are not available, then it does not do the job which the hon. Attorney General inferred it was going to do. If the hon. Minister of Health has not these statements available for scrutiny, he cannot relate them to the prices that are going to be charged for the standard contracts.

I think this is a vital question that ought to be established here today. More and more I am getting the impression that this debate is being run on the old principles, Mr. Chairman, of the game we used to play when we were smaller, blind man's bluff. What the hon. Minister is asking the Opposition to do is to debate blindfold; to examine this bill and to pass it and to make it law with blindfolds over our eyes.

We do not know even this fundamental thing. We do not know what the rates are going to be. We do not know what this plan is going to cost the people of Ontario. We do not know what many of the conditions are going to be; they are going to be laid down in regulations. We do not even know at the present time what a standard contract really is going to cost the people; evidently even there the regulations provide for certain limitations and all the rest of it.

Mr. Chairman, this is not democracy. We should be able to examine the cost of this to the province, the cost of this plan to the people.

In addition to asking us to examine it and vote blindfold, evidently the plan is going to

run blind; because unless this scrutiny is available there is no standard by which the government itself can judge whether or not the rates are adequate, whether they are proper, whether the insurance companies are in fact gouging the public; or whether they are making only a legitimate profit out of the rates that are being charged.

So I do not think this House should be asked, in the first place to vote blindfolded; and in the second place to put our stamp of approval on a plan which is going to run blind after it is established.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, because I know the hero worship that the hon. Minister of Health had for Mr. Bennett, although it is not the same Mr. Bennett I am sure he will be interested in knowing the approach that was taken by the Premier of British Columbia. May I say, sir, that his plan is going to come in on September 1, and yet he introduced in a very democratic way for the consideration of the people of British Columbia and for the Legislature, a very clear definite statement about the premiums.

Mr. MacDonald: If you think that "wacky" Bennett is democratic, then watch out, for he can be just about as undemocratic as possible, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: I would agree very much with that. There have been situations when we have felt that we have been blessed in this House with perhaps a more democratic approach on the part of the government, but here is the situation where B.C. has let the sun shine on and the light into what they are going to propose. They have suggested that the premiums under the scheme which they are proposing will range from \$30 a year for a single person with no taxable income, to a maximum of \$150 for families with taxable incomes of more than \$1,000.

I know that the hon. Minister will be interested in hearing the coverage which they are proposing in B.C. Coverage under the plan includes medical, surgical, osteopathic, X-ray, anaesthetic—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Is this not out of order?

Mr. Thompson: Not at all, I am talking under (k), laboratory, therapeutic, maternity, psychiatric services, special nursing psychotherapeutic, orthopaedic—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Ask Dr. Sopha, he can pronounce those words.

Mr. Thompson: I agree, because they are of Latin derivation and I have not taken Latin for a while. Naturopaths and chiropractic services—let me emphasize that—are included up to limits of between \$25 and \$100 a year.

Now, sir, the hon. Minister has stood up when the *Globe and Mail* editorial was mentioned indicating it could amount to a certain amount and he said this was irresponsible. Could I ask the hon. Minister: Am I being irresponsible when I say that the premiums at the maximum might be \$300, is that an irresponsible statement?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Fine!

Let me say therefore I am assuming when the hon. Minister says it is irresponsible that it would not be as high as that. Am I correct in that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this, as I say, has absolutely nothing to do with the clause under discussion.

Mr. Thompson: It most certainly has.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have stated to you, sir, and through you to the House, that I have not the authority under this Act, until it is passed, to set a maximum premium. The maximum premium will be decided on the recommendation of the medical services insurance council and until this Act becomes law, we cannot even set up that council. But I can assure you that \$300 is a ridiculous maximum premium.

Mr. Thompson: Fine! At least we have an assurance that the people will not be gouged to the extent of \$300.

Now, let us have another try in the bingo game. What about \$200?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am—

Mr. Thompson: I assure the hon. Minister that this is the very point that people are most interested in.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is not a question-and-answer period. It is based completely on conjecture.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is based on conjecture, but it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, would you please rule that I have already stated to you, sir, the facts as they apply to this

bill. I have stated the premium structure on which will be based the government-operated proposal. I might point out to the hon. member that, in Ontario under our plan, those in need of assistance will do better than Mr. Bennett's plan, because one in receipt of a taxable income of up to \$1,060 will only be called upon to pay \$150.

Mr. Bryden: We are not talking about this.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say, sir, if the hon. Minister will not tell us what the premiums are, or suggest it is less than \$200 or will be \$200 or \$250, perhaps I am going to be included among the people who need assistance to pay your premium if we have no idea what the maximum is going to be. I would suggest to you—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): This whole thing is completely out of order.

Mr. Thompson: The whole crux of the thing is a pig in a poke. We have no idea what we are passing on. The thing that concerns the people of Ontario is their pocketbook. To make this available to them—with all respect that is the term, this would be available to the people of Ontario, that is the purpose of the Act. Yet we do not know if it will be available because the hon. Minister refuses to tell us what the premium will be.

Mr. Chairman: I am not ruling you out of order because under section 8 you are perfectly in order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on a number of occasions the term "financial irresponsibility" has been applied to the hon. Minister and the government in this Act. Now that we get some clarification, and I emphasize only "some" clarification as to the hon. Minister's limited capacity under this bill—even worse, his limited interest in finding out what the financial position might be with regard to the insurance companies—I would say that the financial irresponsibility of this government becomes even more underlined. We have a bill in which the hon. Minister has said emphatically that he is going to have no exercise or control over the schedule of fees.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had waited for me to answer his previous questions, I have the information.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, just let me go ahead and then I will be glad to listen. Certainly pulling teeth would be very easy

in comparison to getting some information from this hon. Minister. On the one hand, he has no control at all over fees that are going to be charged. Indeed, as of two years after the bill has come into effect, the OMA is going to have carte blanche to raise their fees as they please, when they please, to any level they please.

Mr. Reilly: No, they are not.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, they will. And the hon. Minister then says that since he has certain maximums and the pot in effect will become empty, that through the two members of the medical profession on the OMA he will put adequate pressure on them. Like fun he will put pressure on them. He should have control in a real sense.

But even worse, the hon. Minister has not control over the charges that are going to be made, there is going to be no opportunity to bargain.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to remind the speaker that I have permitted a great deal of latitude.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, we will come right back. I was just trying to bring the two points together which I think document the financial irresponsibility of the government. We now have a new subsection (m) put in here, in this amendment, which is going to give somebody, and presumably this hon. Minister, because he does not know whether he can get it from the director of insurance—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I do.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, he does know now?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is just what I was going to tell you if given a chance.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if he can get it from the director of insurance, I hope he does more with it in terms of controlling it than the director of insurance has, because, quite frankly, the important thing is that you had access to the information. The director of insurance has had access to the information for years, but he does nothing about it, he just rubber stamps any increase in fees. And I presume if this government is going to continue to act that way, once again it is just going to rubber stamp, whether it is getting the information from the superintendent of insurance, or whether it is coming directly to the hon. Minister himself.

But we certainly should have it, with

power to act. Otherwise you have no control at the carrier level, you have no control at the schedule of fee level fixed by the OMA—so you have no control at all.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): May I say one thing that I do not think should be let slip by in regard to the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition? He read a press clipping which purported to show that the Premier of British Columbia announced the fees to the British Columbia Legislature, which I believe, in effect, was made this week, whereas the British Columbia medical health insurance bill was passed through their Legislature a good six weeks ago. At that time there was no mention in that Legislature what the fee schedule would be. And the same questions and answers were given as were given by our hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I now have the information that the superintendent of insurance assures us that the records referred to as being required by him of the insurance carriers will be available to us, so that we will know their financial status, we will know their rates, we will know their profit levels, we will know all about them in a financial way.

Now, very briefly, all through this discussion and in the amendment, is inherent the belief of the Opposition, which actually has become, over the past several days, a pathological obsession, that everything they can see in this legislation is evil and sinister. Mr. Chairman, the record of this government, the record of all governments of this province, all down through our history, shows differently than that. There are some times when certain governments have not acted solely in the interest of the public or as some of you may have thought they should. But, by and large, government in this province has been good. These regulations are not to give us the power to downgrade or to cut down the benefits. Have my hon. friends realized that we need those regulations just as much to expand the benefits, to give the people more if we possibly can? This is the tendency of government.

Mr. Bryden: Regulations under clause (a) could not possibly be made in order to expand benefits.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, will you kindly tell that empty barrel to keep quiet for a few moments?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the hon. Minister withdraw that statement.

An hon. member: How do you know he is referring to you?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Well, what is your ruling, sir?

Mr. Chairman: How do we know he was referring to you?

Mr. Bryden: Sir, it is quite obvious. Personally I do not care about it, knowing the source from which it has come, but in the interest of the dignity of the House the hon. Minister should withdraw it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am assured that the hon. member is not an empty barrel, so I withdraw that.

Mr. Bryden: No, sir, that is a conditional withdrawal. He has no respect for the House rules. He should make the withdrawal unconditionally, and I ask that you so rule.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister withdrew the remarks.

Mr. Bryden: He prefaced his withdrawal by repeating the accusation. I suggest he is required under the rules to withdraw unconditionally with no other comments.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the statement that the hon. member is an empty barrel.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat again that it is very obvious that those in opposition to this bill can only see as evil and sinister the request of the government. This is not unusual legislation. I can go through many, many of our statutes and find authority and power vested in the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to provide regulations, and I am in agreement with, and have some sympathy for, my hon. friend from Sudbury, that Lord Ewart's book has a good deal of validity. Many of us do not care for government by regulation, but it does seem to be a trend of our times, and I think it is involved in, and bound up in, the complexity of government with our increasingly expanding society and our changing society.

But again, I repeat, that these regulations are just as essential to us who will administer the Act in the interests of the people. For instance, the amendment to delete subsection (b) of this section. Under section 5 (d), we have already been given the power to put before the council any other matters relating to this Act. This regulation can be a safeguard.

Any other matters are very wide sweeping things and we can spell these matters out in regulation. This is what we would hope to do. Then, prescribing limitations in (k), we have set down and put before the House that there are certain limitations, and now we want to prescribe them to see at least that the limitations we have in mind will be observed and again, if possible, that they may be deleted, as time and experience might dictate—as I have said time and time again in this bill.

I suggest to you, sir, that the proposed new subparagraph (m) is no longer necessary because it is already embodied both in The Insurance Act and The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act. The filing of this information, spoken of by my hon. friends opposite, is already made mandatory by law; and the information is available and will be made available to us through The Department of Insurance.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I notice that it is now nine minutes past one, and I understand that we were sitting on Fridays under a motion by the hon. Prime Minister that we sit from 10.30 a.m. to 1 p.m.

Mr. Chairman: The motion is that we sit at 10.30; it does not say anything about one o'clock.

Mr. Gisborn: On that basis, I stand corrected; but I am sure that the reason for this morning session on Friday was originated to provide for hon. members to get away on Friday. That being the rule, others have made arrangements for home business in the afternoon and I suggest that the chair should recognize that.

Mr. Chairman: I was thinking: We are almost through this section. When we come back on Monday we may have forgotten what has been said, and the whole thing would have to be gone over again. I think we should finish off this section.

Mr. Sopha: It has been a long week.

Mr. Chairman: All we have to do is put it to a vote right away.

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Sopha's amendment—

Mr. Sopha: No, no, no! It is not going to be carried yet.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the amendment, and the additional clause that was suggested, clause (m)—respecting the provision of prescribing the form and content of the financial statements and other documents which would be made available by the corporation for each licensed carrier to the medical council when recommendations were made by the corporation as to the benefits under the contracts and as to the maximum subscription rates—the hon. Minister missed, again, the whole of the point. It is not some subtle legal point that requires a decision by the hon. Attorney General or by the superintendent of insurance at all, sir. The question is not answered, and it is not provided anywhere, as to whether or not the council—and the council is the mechanism by which the public will have some say, small as it may be—says how this scheme will operate and how it will function. It is not simply for the hon. Minister to have available to him the statements of the insurance carriers—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Perhaps the hon. member did not recognize my meaning. I stated, I believe, that the financial statements and accounts will be available to the council. I have been assured of this.

Mr. Renwick: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest again, as we have suggested on other occasions: Let us say so in the statute so that there will be no question whatsoever that the body, on which there is going to be public representation, will have the power and the authority and the ability to make some reasonably intelligent assessment of whether or not there should be changes in the benefits or changes in the subscription rates. The only way that this can be done is if there is a power in the bill which will, during the course of the experience of the medical council in determining these questions, permit them to establish some method of uniform reporting so that adequate comparisons can be made of the figures which are supplied to the council.

Anyone who has any knowledge of financial statements knows, very well, that if you have one phase of a business—and for the licence carriers this is going to be one phase of their business—unless there are special rules and special requirements, there is no way in which you can separate out the financial status of that particular phase of their business in order

that it may be compared with similar business being carried on by the other types of carriers.

By providing financial statements, and making this provision for the provision of financial information and other statements that the council may require, the council, over a period of time, would be able to build up publicly, and make available to the public, the kind of comparative information which could determine whether or not the profit features inherent in the scheme, so far as certain of the licensed carriers are concerned, are causing an undue maximum price to be charged for the medical care to be provided under this Act.

It seems eminently sensible that the corporation, when it provides recommendations, should, at the same time, provide the kind of supporting information with which a representative body—and the only representative body in the whole of this mechanism—can make an informed, intelligent, public decision.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The power is already in the Act in section 4, subsection 14.

The corporation shall furnish the Medical Carriers Incorporated—

the representatives of all the insurance carriers:

—shall furnish copies of the minutes of the meetings of its members, of its board of directors, to the council and, in addition, such reports and information as the council may require from time to time.

Mr. Bryden: Which council is referred to there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The medical services insurance council, the council to which my hon. friend from Riverdale referred.

Mr. Bryden: Where is that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On page 6, section 4, subsection 14.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. Sopha's amendment—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask your clarification? If this section is voted on, we have a number of questions under schedule A, and we would like to feel that—

Mr. Chairman: I can tell the leader of the Opposition that the schedule must be called separately before the bill can be reported.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I have one final comment in response to the hon. Minister's little speech about the trend of the times.

This government has been in power for 22 years and it has never taken any steps yet to civilize the administrative process; by that I mean to do something about the implementation of an administrative procedure code. In regard to regulations—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Where have you been? Where have you been?

When we pass a statute of this government, the statute normally goes to the committee of the House where members of the public have an opportunity to come and make representations about the statute. Not so with the regulations. The regulations are passed in secrecy and there is no opportunity for interested people to come forward and have their views made known, to those responsible, of what they feel should be in the regulations. They are a fait accompli, and you cannot get a regulation altered because it is passed, and the seal of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor is put on it, and that is it.

I went, as a private member of this Legislature—and I know of no other who went as a private member—before the McRuer commission, and I advocated to him that we should require publication of the regulations first, before they are enacted, in the *Ontario Gazette*—yes and have a committee to deal with them—to allow people to come forward and have their views made known of how they feel the regulations should be drawn.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Most improper.

Mr. Chairman: Order! You have made your point.

Mr. Sopha: What is most improper? To do what?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: It is most improper for a member to go before a Royal commission. You should make your speeches in this House.

Mr. Sopha: For goodness sake, it does not deserve an answer.

An hon. member: Are you going to give one?

Mr. Sopha: I will not give one. I always thought my alumnus from St. George had some sense.

The hon. Minister plans, he says—and he says we should recognize all the problems inherent in government by regulation, but it

appears to be the trend of the times—though it is bad, to continue the inequities of the evils that exist. Well, that is a fair commentary on the facts.

Mr. Chairman: Order! You are out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Are we out of order, you and I? I have made my point.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the *Globe and Mail* stated editorially and I quote:

The response of one government supporter to one of the Opposition protests indicated the critics were cutting close to the bone.

I would suggest that the statement made by the hon. Minister a few minutes ago indicated the same thing about him.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. Sopha's amendment, please say "aye."

Those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of Mr. Sopha's amendment, please rise.

All opposed to Mr. Sopha's amendment, please rise.

Clerk of the House. Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays," 42.

Mr. Chairman: The amendment is lost and the section is included in the bill.

Section 28 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 29 be—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I thought there was an understanding—

Mr. Chairman: All right! We just wondered if you wanted to go on and finish those or not, because I will tell you we could not go on.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: There is nothing to sections 29 or 30, as I understand it.

Mr. MacDonald: Let us wait and see.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, on Monday there will be a night session, as previously announced, and we will proceed with this bill. There will be estimates also. The hon. members should be prepared for estimates of The Department of Health and The Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.25 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 14, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, June 14, 1965

Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	4073
Statement re new programme dealing with water resources, Mr. Simonett	4073
Medical services insurance, bill respecting, in committee, concluded	4077
Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	4106
Recess, 6 o'clock	4109

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the Speaker's gallery, young farmers' club delegates from Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England and a junior farmer delegate from New South Wales, Australia.

We also welcome students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Robinson school junior Hy-Y, Toledo, Ohio; in the west gallery, St. Peter's separate school, Peterborough, Ontario.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I am pleased to announce the appointment of Miss Aileen Nicholson as administrator of adult female institutions in The Department of Reform Institutions.

This appointment, which became effective on June 11, 1965, is a result of the department's previously reported plans to effect certain further administrative reorganization.

Miss Nicholson is a young woman of exceptional capabilities and qualifications. She is an associate of the association of psychiatric social workers (AAPSW), a designation originating in the United Kingdom and universally respected by members of her profession. Her academic achievements include a diploma in social science from Trinity college, Dublin, and a certificate in mental health from the London school of economics.

Since 1957, when Miss Nicholson came to this country from England, she has been engaged at both the Toronto psychiatric hospital and then at the hospital for sick children as a psychiatric social worker and has provided psychotherapeutic services to parents and children.

She has had several years of experience with the forensic clinic of Toronto psychiatric hospital, where her services were directed to persons referred to her by the courts and to whom she provided both group and individual psychotherapy. Miss Nicholson is also a field work instructor to second-year students at the University of Toronto's school of social work.

This appointment carries with it the responsibility for planning and administering the department's programme in the adult female field, and in co-operation with the department's other administrators the overall co-ordination of policy, procedures and programmes within the department. This will be especially valuable in correlating treatment methods and facilities relating to the particular needs of the juvenile and the adult female offender.

We are most pleased to have secured the services of so highly qualified a person as Miss Nicholson and I am confident that her professional skill and administrative abilities will reflect in substantial benefits not only to female offenders in this province, but to the field of penology in general.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report for 1963 of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to announce a new programme dealing with the management of Ontario water resources which I feel will be of widespread interest throughout the province.

The new programme deals specifically with the maintenance of water control dams. At the present time the provincial government pays 75 per cent of the capital cost of construction of small water supply reservoirs, while in the case of larger reservoirs the federal government shares this portion of the cost equally with the province.

Up to the present time the local authority has been required to assume the full cost of

maintenance of these dams. The government recognizes the very important work in water resource development being carried on by the conservation authorities and other local bodies. It is also recognized that proper maintenance and staffing are required to ensure reliable operation of water control dams at all times.

Therefore, effective immediately, the government will make a grant of 75 per cent of the annual cost of operating and of major repair items, together with the contribution of \$1,000 per dam towards operators' salaries. There are 53 dams in the province which will be eligible for grants, including the three dams constructed on the Grand River and its tributaries by the Grand River commission.

It is estimated that this programme will cost the province approximately \$85,000 in the remaining portion of 1965, and that the annual expenditure will increase to \$200,000 over the next ten years as new reservoirs and flood control works are constructed.

As a further aid to local authorities, department engineers will carry out annual inspections of water control constructions.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have two questions I wish to address to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) of which notice has been given.

The first one is this: Would the hon. Attorney General concur with the statement made by Chief Constable Robert McCarron of Guelph, who appealed on Thursday last for enlightened information on emergency measures co-ordination while speaking to members of the provincial emergency measures branch, at a meeting of the Ontario association of chiefs of police?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, if the chief says, as he has been reported as saying, that he does not know what to do about emergency measures—

Mr. Singer: He had some stronger words than that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I am hardly in a position to disagree with him, and tell him what he does know, but I can say this, Mr. Speaker, to the House: the city of Guelph and the county of Wellington emergency measures committee issued an approved planning guide to the city of Guelph police department over two years ago, describing the areas of planning required in this city, and the county and the city of Guelph has developed traffic plans for emergency, complete with dispersal

route maps for control. It appears, from my study of the situation, that a good deal of work has been done in that particular locality. However, I am prepared to have an official of my department visit Chief McCarron and ascertain in which areas we can help him.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the bill which is on the order paper, The Emergency Measures Act, was designed for a further activity of The Department of the Attorney General in the whole emergency measures situation. There are some areas which, I must frankly admit, have been hazy and quite unclear; and the purpose of the bill, as the hon. members who have read it will know, is to disseminate information, to co-ordinate services with municipalities and with government departments, and to make The Emergency Measures Act really effective. I think it is fair to say there have been some areas where municipal chiefs have had some difficulty knowing from whom they took direction. But the bill, I believe, will go a long step toward clearing that situation.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. Attorney General's faith is well placed, because when the chief can say neither he nor a single man on his force knows what to do, something has to be done.

Mr. Speaker, my second question is this: Would the hon. Minister inform the House if lack of police personnel is seriously impairing the quality of law enforcement in northern Ontario communities and, if so, what is being done about it?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think this question stems, Mr. Speaker, from a statement made perhaps by the adviser to the police commission, former Chief Robertson. The very reason he made the statement is because he was directed by the police commission to make a study of the northern Ontario area with a view to seeing what conditions existed there, and what might be done to improve them.

I think it is fair to admit, and I think it is generally known, that in some of the smaller municipalities in northern Ontario, being so far away, and being not perhaps so happily situated with respect to assessment and the amount of taxes that can be collected, the police forces, along with other services, have suffered to some extent. They find it difficult, and some municipalities are not inclined, perhaps, to spend as much money as we would like to see on police services. It is very difficult for police officers to get away for the training schools; and the hon. member for Downsview, in the course of my

estimates, suggested that, before we take any new ones on, we should train them completely at the police college.

These things are not just quite possible yet. We asked former Chief Robertson to make this survey, and I think he is quite right in saying that there is area for improvement. We are seeking to assist; through the Ontario provincial police force, we hope to assist these municipalities in bettering their police services by various means; but the whole purpose of the survey was to see what the conditions were and what might be done. It is not yet complete, but it is being studied.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, there was another thing emanating out of that conference of police chiefs relating to the remarks of Magistrate Klein. I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would care to comment on that? The closeness of police chiefs and magistrates?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not see the article, I am afraid. If I did, I am sure I did not see the one to which you refer. I saw some remarks of the chief magistrate. If you would care to submit a question—

Mr. Singer: I will have one tomorrow.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

Does the hon. Minister intend to amend further section 28, of Bill 146, in addition to those amendments reported by the standing committee on labour, legal and municipal bills?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer is "No."

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would now like to direct two related questions to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree).

First, will any charges be laid as a result of a coroner's jury's finding regarding the death of a workman of the C. A. Pitts Construction Company?

Second, what action is to be taken in regard to the coroner's jury's recommendation for stricter enforcement of The Construction Safety Act?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the question relates to an accident involving a Mr. Frank Wolfinger and his subsequent death.

The responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for laying charges in connection with this matter, rests with the city of Toronto. At the time of the

accident, after investigation of the circumstances, the construction safety inspectors of the city of Toronto did not think that grounds for the laying of charges existed. After reviewing the evidence at the inquest, held on May 19 and June 10 of this year, they have reaffirmed this view.

In addition, I would point out that the accident occurred nearly two years ago, on June 19, 1963; under The Summary Convictions Act it would not be possible now to lay charges under The Construction Safety Act, even if they had been deemed necessary.

With respect to stricter enforcement of The Construction Safety Act, the record of the past two years shows a steady improvement in the standard of inspection and enforcement, not only in Toronto but throughout the province. Naturally, the officers of the construction safety branch of the department will continue their efforts to improve still further this standard of inspection and enforcement.

The recently passed amendments to The Construction Safety Act, and the doubling of our inspectional capacity, will, we hope, contribute to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that I am aware of the circumstances involving the matter which is the subject of this question and I would simply say this: It is a terrible situation, and a tragic situation, which exists and has existed, for the past two years; and I would say that I think it is the most tragic accident ever to come to by attention.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I recall correctly, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development had undertaken to answer two questions today.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, out of courtesy for the gentleman who asked me—who, I believe is asking for another hon. member who is absent—I was going to wait until his return, but if the hon. member would like me to answer the questions, I would be very happy to do so.

Mr. Thompson: He would appreciate it; he is absent on constituency matters.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The questions were asked by the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) for the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor), and as they are both absent, I shall answer them for the hon. leader of the Opposition. The questions are these:

Why did the Savoy family with eleven children have to be placed in a dilapidated

house pending demolition? How many low rental houses has the Ontario housing corporation now made available?

Before replying to the hon. member's questions, I would like to comment on the role of the Ontario housing corporation insofar as the provision of emergency housing accommodation is concerned.

As hon. members know, the Ontario government, through the Ontario housing corporation, has accepted responsibility for providing rental accommodation for low income families on a province-wide basis. To provide an emergency housing service, the corporation would have to maintain vacant units for the express purpose of providing instant accommodation for families who lose their homes unexpectedly through unforeseen circumstances. This service is presently provided by municipalities through officials who can be contacted at any hour of the day or night, and who maintain a list of sources of emergency accommodation, either dwellings or residential hotels.

When an emergency occurs in Metropolitan Toronto, for example, these officials contact the central housing registry of Metropolitan Toronto which knows whether Ontario housing corporation or the city of Toronto housing authority have suitable accommodation available. Failing this, they contact private rental agencies and landlords who have listed available accommodation.

It would not be practicable for the Ontario housing corporation to provide alternative emergency housing facilities which would simply be a duplication of the services already provided by the municipality.

In the case of the Savoy family, I am advised that the city of Toronto emergency housing officer received a telephone call from Mr. Savoy during the evening of June 10, to the effect that he had received notice to vacate and would be requiring alternative accommodation. The following day Mr. Savoy informed the housing officer that he had moved his furniture onto an adjacent parking lot and required accommodation immediately. He stated that the family had been moved out because the house had been sold.

In view of the urgent need to provide the family with accommodation, the emergency housing officer arranged for the city of Toronto housing authority to allocate them a large house in the St. James Town area which had not been rented because it is scheduled for demolition at the end of this year. I am advised that the house in question is structurally sound and has not been condemned by

the city of Toronto building department, but was boarded up by the owner to discourage vandalism and unauthorized use.

The press account of the Savoy family's housing problem was the first indication the Ontario housing corporation had of this matter. The family, which came to Toronto from New Brunswick in September, 1964, had not made application for rental accommodation with either the Metropolitan Toronto central housing registry or directly to the Ontario housing corporation.

Ontario housing corporation officials have since been in touch with the owner and the agent of the property vacated by the Savoy family, and were advised that the family was not, in fact, evicted by court order, but had been given notice to vacate, which they did.

The second question dealt with the number of rental houses Ontario housing corporation has made available.

Since the corporation came into being in August of last year it has completed or purchased a total of 356 dwelling units.

In Metropolitan Toronto, the corporation is currently in the process of purchasing 1,200 existing dwellings which were offered in response to its advertisement of February 27, 1965. The first of these dwellings will become available later this month, with the remaining purchases scheduled for completion over the ensuing two months.

In addition to existing units, the corporation received builders' proposals for approximately 1,700 new dwellings to be constructed by proponents on their own land. Of these, approximately 900 were acceptable in terms of price, standards and size. Construction of these is scheduled to commence this year.

Apart from builders' proposals for existing housing and new construction, the Ontario housing corporation has an extensive direct construction programme for the Metropolitan Toronto area. Projects at Thistletown, O'Connor Drive, Alexandra Park and Stableford Farm will all be under construction this year, which will provide a further 1,400 dwellings in 1966.

The corporation's programme, which was planned in conjunction with officials of Metropolitan Toronto and was embodied in the metropolitan corporation's request of February 9, 1965, is going according to schedule. By the end of this year it is expected that a total of 3,000 units will have been purchased, or will be under construction.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have clarification from the hon. Minister of my question. At this point, the Ontario

housing corporation does not have one low rental house available. Will it have one available in the future, did the hon. Minister say?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would not say that. I said that the family had not made application to us, or to the registry agents in Toronto. If they had made application to us, or to the agencies we have here, we could have found them accommodation.

Mr. Thompson: The second part of the question was:

How many low rental houses has the Ontario housing corporation now made available?

If I am correct, with reference to the hon. Minister's statement, there are none.

Hon. Mr. Randall: That is right. We have 1,200 that we are purchasing now, and we have 1,700 under construction.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, and in the absence of my friend, the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine), I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) the following question: Would the hon. Minister inform the House if his department's regulations requiring a registered nurse, or a nursing assistant, to be on duty at all times in nursing homes, is being enforced in the province?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I would say "yes," to put it briefly, except I should like to explain that at this time the municipalities which were under the old bylaws are now in the process of preparing the new bylaws. They must follow the regulations if they want to be eligible for the new subsidies. However, as long as they are conforming gradually to the new bylaws, we maintain them under the old regulations.

Mr. Oliver: I would ask the hon. Minister who enforces this, if there are no bylaws? Does the provincial government do this?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: If there are no bylaws, and the regulations are not followed, naturally there is no subsidy.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the hon. Minister. How does he say that there are nurses and nursing aides on duty at all times in the nursing homes across the province, when most of the hon. members of this House received a letter from the medical

officer of health of Kenty county, indicating that within his county that was, in fact, not true around the clock. And a letter from the associated nursing homes indicating that this was not true in the majority of nursing homes across the province.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid that the member will have to put his question in the form of writing tomorrow, and then the hon. Minister can answer it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I shall do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The forty-seventh order. The committee of the whole House. On Bill No. 136; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE

(continued)

Section 29 agreed to.

On section 30:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I move that section 30 of Bill 136 be amended by deleting the words "Services Insurance" and substituting therefor the words "Carriers Benefit," so that section 30 shall read:

This Act may be cited as the Medical Carriers Benefit Act, 1965.

Mr. Chairman, my reason for moving the amendment is that the title of the bill should, in our opinion, bear some relation to the other provisions in the bill.

Mr. Chairman: I wish to advise the member that this amendment will not be permitted, as being frivolous. It certainly does not carry out the intent of the bill. I do not think there is any justification for the name. The bill had its original name and therefore I declare the amendment to be frivolous and out of order.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, would you please give us your authority for this ruling? We suggest the amendment is not frivolous, but apart altogether from that matter of opinion, what is the basis for ruling it out? The only rule governing amendments is, as I understand it, that they may add words to or delete words from or substitute. This amendment substituted certain words and I submit to you, sir, it is quite in order. I would like to know what your authority is for your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to you, sir, that my ruling is not debatable. If you looked

in Lewis under definitions of frivolous amendments, this would qualify under that definition.

Mr. Bryden: I would like a rule of citation.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, under no circumstances will I accept the ruling that my amendment was frivolous, it was not frivolous in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Chairman: You can demand a vote on it, it is your privilege.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I speak to the point of order? Surely, Mr. Chairman, the House may call a bill by any name that it wishes, it may be that my hon. friend's amendment will so commend itself to the House, in all honesty, that it will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. Chairman: I have already ruled that the member knows his course of appeal; that is my ruling.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would still ask that you give your citation.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Where is the citation?

Mr. Bryden: Surely if you are going to make a ruling on the basis of the rules, you should be prepared to cite the rules.

Mr. Chairman: It is stated clearly in Lewis that I am not required to do so at this time. If there is a wish to appeal the ruling—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, are you not required to cite a rule at this time when you are basing your ruling—

Mr. Chairman: It is not debatable, the ruling is not debatable.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not debating it, I am just asking why are you not required to cite the rule upon which you based your ruling?

Mr. Chairman: I am not setting the rule, it is contained in Lewis. If you wish to look it up, fine. If it is required at a later date, it can be provided.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we cannot find the ruling within Lewis. The House deserves to know the ruling to which you refer before we are denied the right to—

Mr. Chairman: I will ask the Clerk to find it.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right, we will wait for the Clerk.

Mr. Bryden: We do not believe it is there.

Mr. S. Lewis: We are prepared to wait for the Clerk to give us the ruling.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, is your ruling being appealed?

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure, but I believe the member indicated that he was appealing my ruling. If so, we will have the vote on the appeal.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it would help the hon. member to decide whether or not to appeal if you could give the citation on which you are apparently relying.

Mr. Chairman: Question! All in favour of my ruling in this regard—

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I believe that since I moved this amendment I am entitled to know under what rule of this House you have made your ruling that it is frivolous, so that I can—

Mr. Chairman: It will be shown to you in due course. I have made my ruling and I would point out that my ruling is not debatable.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that your ruling is frivolous if you have no rule upon which to base it. If it is in the book, may we have it indicated where in the book?

Mr. Chairman: As soon as there is time to look it up it can be located. In the meantime—

Mr. S. Lewis: Are you chairing this House or is the Clerk chairing this House?

Mr. Chairman: I have made the ruling.

Clerk of the House: And I personally resent that remark.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I hear the words of the Clerk coming over the public address and then, quite frankly, echoed by the Chairman.

I should like, as a member of this House, to know the rule on which the ruling was made. That is not a challenge of your ruling.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that I have read the regulations of the House, I would suggest furthermore that was some two years ago, I would suggest that at the

minute I am not prepared to give the exact clause of the ruling but I am satisfied that the ruling is there. I am satisfied that if this House wants to debate my ruling, they can bring the motion to question my ruling. That is the privilege that you have. If you wish to question my ruling proceed to do so and the vote will be taken. That is my ruling.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not questioning your ruling. I am asking the basis on which that ruling has been made before this section is put to the House. I would ask then that this amendment and this section stand over until the ruling is given to us.

Mr. Chairman: If you wish to put your motion to the House in questioning my ruling, you are at liberty to do so.

All those in favour of the Chairman's decision will please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

Those in favour of the Chairman's ruling will please rise.

Those opposed to the Chairman's ruling will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 34, the "nays" 17.

Section 30 agreed to.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I assume that in due course I will be furnished with the rule under which that decision of the Chair was made.

Mr. Chairman: You will indeed.

Mr. Renwick: Thank you.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I assume that has been carried?

Speaking on a point of privilege which affects all hon. members of this House, I think the remark of the hon. member for Scarborough West should not go by unnoticed. Indeed, I would ask him to withdraw the remark which he addressed to the person of the Clerk of this legislative assembly.

It is unfortunate that in dealing with the rules of this House in the last two or three years those who propose to be the greatest exponents of the maintenance of those rules, that is the hon. members of the Opposition,

from time to time are in flagrant abuse of the rules.

The Clerk of the Legislature is unable to speak for himself. I have the responsibility of speaking on his behalf in respect of the estimates and perhaps can make this point. Lewis, the bible of the Legislature, states on page 98:

The Clerk of the House is appointed by Royal warrant of the Crown and is the principal servant—

and I underline this, Mr. Chairman:

—of the legislative assembly. He is directly responsible to the Speaker and acts as the Speaker's deputy in carrying out the routine work of the Legislature. He is usually appointed—

in this case, the word "usually" is superfluous because of his knowledge of the rules of the House and his acquaintance with parliamentary procedures generally. Then I conclude, and these are the important words:

The Clerk acts as an adviser to the Speaker in connection with the interpretation of the rules, decisions on points of order and similar matters and his advice is always at the service of the members on questions of procedure.

I suggest to the hon. member for Scarborough West that he rise and retract that remark which I think showed a sign of disrespect to the clerk of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the hon. Provincial Secretary has always shown himself to have a capacity of not knowing when to let well enough alone. If he wants to have this issue out, we are glad to have this issue out, Mr. Chairman.

Last week, every man in the Opposition here, when the Opposition chose to challenge a vote, heard an outburst of obvious displeasure from the Clerk with regard to our action.

I submit to you that the Clerk is a servant of this Legislature and he is not a person who should be expressing his feelings so that they are audible throughout the whole Opposition. That is what happened last week. We have seen many instances of it.

The hon. Provincial Secretary saw fit to raise this. If he wants to have the issue disputed in all its full ramifications let him proceed, but there is a difference between the Clerk being an expert on the rules of the House and interjecting himself into the direction of the House and we in the Opposition have had a growing feeling that the latter is the case.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, without wishing to prolong it, because in honest fact my respect for the Clerk of this Legislature in his capacity is not exceeded by that of the hon. Provincial Secretary, but I asked, and it was by way of question and not an assertion—and *Hansard* will bear me out—whether the Chair is chairing this House or whether the Clerk is chairing this House. What I heard, Mr. Chairman, was a precise coincidence of words, a synonymy of phrase, each time, again and again, for six or seven separate phrases. While I accept the fact that it is the Clerk's right to advise, I question the propriety of precise direction and that is all that I question; if the Chair wishes to answer me, so be it, but I do not withdraw the question.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest that quite frequently, in all honesty, it is quite easy to assume the same words. I believe that the other day I called a member for the same expression several times, so that it only goes to show that anyone can be guilty of the same offence. Now, if you will accept the remarks—

Mr. Bryden: Why do you not just try—

Mr. Chairman: Section 30 having been carried, we will now ask: Shall schedule "A" stand as part of the bill?

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on schedule "A", I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) this first question. I notice where it says, in the first paragraph:

Standard contract will pay for necessary personal professional services of the physician.

Now my question is this, sir: Does this leave the gap between physicians' services and hospital services covered under hospital insurance? Will a person be fully protected if he has standard contract, plus Ontario hospitalization, or will he find himself stuck with bills for obscure services which are not included in standard contract and not included under the hospital insurance? I am thinking of additional bills for some particular additional services and, not being a medical man myself, I cannot give examples. I am sure the hon. Minister of Health can; do I get my point across to him?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I cannot foresee any possibility of the patient being charged for services which are inclusive under this bill, whether he gets them at home, the office, or

in the hospital. This is the basis of the standard contract—the personal services of a physician for medical, surgical and obstetrical needs, in the home, the office and the hospital—and I think that it would be all covered. The hospital insurance plan, of course, does not pay for any physician's services, except in certain cases such as pathology and radiology, where these professional people are salaried people. As a rule, in certain hospitals where they are not salaried, where they are on a fee-for-service basis, they are also covered under the hospital insurance plan; but the hospital insurance plan essentially does not cover the personal services of a physician. They would be carried under the standard contract.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate getting that remark, and I am sure this will give a renewed feeling of well-being to people, when they know that people will not start adding services because you had cream with your cereal or something, and saying that this happens to belong in the hospital services. I cannot think of a medical example, but that is the kind of thing I was thinking of.

One thing I am curious about, and I would appreciate an explanation from the hon. Minister, is that I had noticed that both the insurance companies and the doctors—certainly my doctor and, I am sure, every doctor—emphasize that there should be an annual check-up. It seems to me that in a health plan—rather than in a sick plan, where you take people when they actually get sick—if this is an approach taken on the basis of trying to keep people healthy, then you would want an annual check-up. Thus I ask, sir, through you to the hon. Minister, why this extraordinary limitation in connection with annual health examinations?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this actually is not any extraordinary limitation. Indeed, it is an unusual finding in an ordinary medical services coverage—an annual health examination. It is limited in that we want the contract to be in force for one continuous year before the subscriber is eligible for such an examination. If this were not so, there could conceivably be a rush on the plan, which could have devastating effects on it, quite apart from the fact that one would question whether there are—judging by the remarks of some hon. members opposite—enough doctors to do the job, if there are a flood of these requests at the beginning of the plan. May I point out that many contracts do not provide this at all. Many contracts have this provision, that a period of time

elapses during which the contract must be in force, before this and such like preventative services are provided.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I should like to follow up on that and say that, as the hon. Minister will know with respect to the schedule, we in the Opposition are not at all happy with some of the limitations and exceptions it imposes. In fact, sir, we are not persuaded by the suggestion that because you will flood a plan with annual health examinations, for instance, that that is a feature much to be abhorred. I suggest that of course we will not, in fact, flood; that these exceptions are, in their own way, picayune and frivolous; and that they are not to be highly regarded by the Opposition.

And that applies to all the limitations imposed under schedule "A." It certainly applies to well-baby care; and I think it a great affront to this House, and to society in general, that in relationship to psychotherapy, any limitations should be placed. If, in fact, psychotherapy is required and desirable, then within this bill it should be granted without limitation. You do not cut people off in mid-psychotherapy, if I may be allowed to put it that way.

The items which might perhaps incline themselves to limitation, are those items number five and number six—"expenses for travelling time, or mileage" and "advice by telephone." I think it wrong that they should be designated as an exception, but perhaps there would be some method, by regulation, of working out a limitation; that we would consider justified.

But let it be said, Mr. Chairman, that, under the exceptions within this schedule, we deem number four and number nine, inherently wrong. In fact, the cosmetic surgery—or however else one wishes to categorize it—is frequently most important to the health and psychological security of human beings and should not be designated as an exception under this bill. And it is our feeling that refraction and eye examination, generally, is a foolish area of exception. That list of impressions having been recorded, Mr. Chairman, I should therefore like to move that schedule "A" of Bill No. 136 be amended:

(a) by striking out items one, two and three, under the heading "limitations" as prescribed by the regulations and substituting the following:

- (1) expenses for travelling or mileage;
- (2) advice by telephone.

(b) by striking out items 4, 5, 6 and 9 under the heading "exceptions" and by renumbering other items under the heading accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, that does not save this schedule by any stretch of the imagination, but I think that it has improved it immeasurably.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I must say, in support of the amendment that is offered, that I cannot, though I strive mightily, understand the use of the phrase in 2 (b), "dental care for dental purposes." Dental care for dental purposes, it would seem to me, is a supreme example of a redundancy. Dental care, I would take it, almost always is for dental purposes. But may I ask the hon. Minister whether the intention there is to permit dental care to be given which relates to the effect of bad teeth upon the system? I expressed that very badly I know, but I am not a doctor. We hear of people who suffer physical malaise because of the condition of their teeth. May I ask him, in all sincerity, does that definition or expression permit dental care where a doctor certifies that the dental care is for the purpose of removing some other condition in the organism of the body?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this could be; and cases of this kind would be treated on their merit. But one can think, for instance, of a neoplasm in association with the teeth, where it would be necessary to do a good deal of dental work in order to remove the neoplasm. One can think of the removal of part of the jaw, for instance, for a malignancy which would call for dental work; and no doubt matters of that kind would certainly be included under the plan.

Mr. Sopha: Of course the courts cannot look at the debates of the Legislature to see what the intent of the Legislature is in regard to the interpretation of a statute, but it is very useful that at least the insurance carriers may look at the remarks of the hon. Minister of Health and get some guidance as to what is intended by way of explanation of the use of the term. Now, may I ask whether in respect to treatment of the eyes, is it the intention that from the words used—the eyes are referred to twice, you will notice in 2 (b) one of the exceptions is eye-glasses, and in heading 9 of the exceptions, and that is encompassed in the amendment—that only diseased or traumatized eyes are to be treated under this policy.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is right, Mr. Chairman. Examination of the eyes by refraction, in spite of all that has been said and written about it, is a well understood term. Indeed, Dorland's dictionary, which is an authority on medical definitions, defines refraction quite

clearly, and I quote: "The act or process of refracting is specifically the determination of the refractive errors of the eyes and their correction by glasses."

It is well known by every doctor, every optometrist and everyone who is dealing with the eyes, and to argue, as has been argued, that this is not an item in the Ontario medical association schedule of fees has absolutely no bearing on this Act whatsoever.

None of these exceptions or limitations were drawn up with any special reference, or indeed any of the bill, with special reference to items included under the OMA tariff of fees or any other tariffs.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is interesting! The hon. Minister divines that what I have in my hand is a brief prepared by the optometrists, and they make this comment that nowhere in the OMA schedule of fees does the word "refraction" appear, nor is there any such procedure as examination of the eyes by refraction. The Optometry Act does not include the word "refraction," nor does optometry recognize any such isolated procedure as "examination of the eyes by refraction." They go on to say:

The procedure of the OMA schedule, which is the medical ophthalmological equivalent of what is generally understood by "examination of the eyes by refraction," is "major, ocular examination," including all procedures necessary to diagnose or eliminate pathology and to fully assess other ocular functions.

Now, let me complete what they say:

The ophthalmic optometrical terminology for a procedure similar in detail and in purpose would be "examination of the eye for the relief or correction of any visual or muscular defect or error, including necessary procedures to determine whether or not pathology is present in the eye."

Now, only the hon. Minister of Health in this House will understand what all that means. I must confess that it does not come through to me with any degree of clarity. What I should like to ask, and it may sound like a stupid, silly question, but forgive me if it is, is the only thing accepted under this schedule, treatment or examination of the eyes that leads to eye-glasses?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That sums it up fairly well—examination of the eyes to see if the vision can be improved or corrected by prescribing glasses. Despite the fact—pardon me for rising again—and despite what is in

the brief, the optometrists know full well that neither in their Act, nor in the medical Act, nor the schedule of fees or the medical schedule of fees, is refraction mentioned. But Dorland is a recognized authority, and I believe the same or almost a similar definition can be found in Stedman's medical dictionary, two of the most widely accepted medical dictionaries that I know of.

Mr. Thompson: I am assuming that when this amendment is voted on, this section (a) will be then carried if it happens that the amendment is lost. I do not want to raise that until we come to it, but on my assumption, I have a number of questions, if I could ask the indulgence of the hon. Minister. I will just run down a number I have under (a).

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest you proceed with your questions, and when the amendment is put that will settle the matter.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to reiterate this question of well-baby care. To me this also seems an extraordinary thing. The hon. Minister in his reply about annual health examinations, said that we might get a flood of people coming in. It would seem to me this would be the one thing you would want to encourage, that the whole of our population would get an annual checkup and that you would not be apprehensive and fearful of this and give this as a reason for limitation.

Similarly, with well-baby care, I think the hon. Minister would agree with me—certainly the insurance companies do—that this is a very high-risk group. It was pointed out in the House last week.

Surely the idea of well-baby care—to keep the baby well and watch out for any disease or situation which could develop into a major sickness crisis—is good. I find the implication behind this limitation on annual health services and well-baby care almost infers that this is not important to the health of the people. Otherwise, I would think the hon. Minister would have done everything to see that those limitations were excluded.

Then when we come to No. 3, to psychotherapy—the hon. Minister I know is concerned about this situation, that there are over 110,000 supposedly emotionally disturbed children—here is a chance for group therapy and a number of other things to be done. Yet in what I look upon as a completely callous approach, the needs of emotionally disturbed children, of mentally ill people, are excluded from this.

I would like to have a definition on what

the hon. Minister means by psychotherapy. That seems to me a very broad term, and it may exclude a large number of areas.

Under 1—exceptions, one of the things I would appreciate from the hon. Minister is clarification. He says “limitations as prescribed by the regulations,” and after that he says “exceptions.” I am not a lawyer, as the hon. Minister well knows, but is that exceptions to the limitations, or are these further exceptions?

However, under point one (a), I think that this raises the point of double coverage. We went into that before, but this clause means that people will be paying double. They will pay their standard contract premium, but will not collect under that contract; they will be taken care of under workmen's compensation.

Would the hon. Minister tell us if any actuarial work is being done on this, and if the standard contract premium will be reduced for persons with such double coverage? Or does the bill just use the workmen's compensation fund, in effect, to provide extra profits for the insurance industry?

Going down to 1(c), services for which no charge would be made in the absence of insurance, I would like to ask the hon. Minister what services are these? Is it clear from the Ontario medical association what services doctors provide that they do not bill for in the absence of insurance?

Under 2(a), the second clause raises again the question of essential services provided as a source of treatment which are not covered under Ontario hospitalization, nor covered under the Act. It also, in effect, leaves the definition of services to be covered, not in the text of the standard contract, but in the mind of the physician. In other words, it appears to me that under section 2(a) that doctors say what is covered, and what is not, not the contracts.

Section 2(b) has been discussed by the hon. member for Sudbury and also by my hon. friend from the New Democratic Party.

Under section 4, services with respect to conditions that are not detrimental to the health of the covered person, who is to decide what conditions are not detrimental to the health of the covered person? How can this clause be administered? If a child has a cleft palate, for example, and this is operated on, is this cosmetic surgery?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is not a good example.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, sir. I could see that for the mental health of some

children, I do not want to take an extreme case, but say a hip dislocation or—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, these are pathological conditions.

Mr. Thompson: I would suggest that there are people who suffer great psychological discomfort that is detrimental to their whole personality structure because of something that another person would be able to accept as just an affliction. We would like to get clarification on this, and include some other ones, such as a club foot or defective hearing or word blindness—I think of that particularly because of some personal knowledge I have of this. Are these detrimental to the health of a person?

I think that the way this clause is written, with due respect, there is an enormous loophole for the insurance companies to refuse claims of this kind and to get away with that refusal.

I would have liked to have made an amendment to that section with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes: “Unless in the opinion of the attending physician such treatment is essential for the mental health of the patient”; but it was struck out and so my amendment is really redundant.

Considering number 5—I realize that some of these points have already been made but I want to underline them—under 5, expenses for travelling time or mileage: Whose expenses for travelling time? With the disastrously unfair distribution of health personnel and facilities in Ontario, surely some arrangement should be made to make it possible for people from some rural areas to get treatment without facing a \$100 travelling bill? It is worth noting that the enormous percentage of patients in the sick children's hospital, for example, come from outside Toronto.

I know that this has also been discussed; but on advice by phone, if doctors have a bill for advice by phone surely this could be covered. You have previously suggested that you are not going to include annual health examinations because of the flood to doctors' offices. If you were to permit advice by phone would this not mean that you would not get this enormous cluttering up that you are so concerned about in people coming to doctors' offices with the resulting higher cost and more strain on the doctor and less efficient use of health resources?

On 7—again I just want to underline annual examinations—I strongly suspect; in fact, I will put this to the hon. Minister: I would ask him if in his own practice he would

want to see his patients once a year and would urge them to do this in order that he can keep tabs on their health and save them unnecessary costs by being able to spot symptoms as quickly as he can if some disease is beginning to build. I think of cancer, and in fact I think of your whole preventive approach toward health. You are spending thousands of dollars encouraging people to take TB tests. May I even use this term: I suggest you make TB tests compulsory for children in schools because you want to stop something before it develops into a crisis.

For all those reasons, as a doctor I think you will agree that this is a sick plan and not a health plan.

As for schedule "B," Mr. Chairman, I think we will vote on that at a later time so I will reserve my remarks until then.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, my hon. leader made some interesting and some very incisive points. One is in respect of medical advice by telephone, because one hears more and more complaints from people one speaks to about how difficult it is to get doctors on the telephone. I had a personal experience myself, of attempting to telephone. I know all the doctors in Sudbury, all 70 or 80 of them, and I attempted to telephone five in a row on a Saturday afternoon, and each time I got the answering service and the same girl on the answering service answered each one of the numbers.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Do they know you?

Mr. Sopha: They know me and I get along fine with them. I spoke to a convention of them on Saturday. The hon. Minister spoke last year to the same convention. They tell me that he did not get a standing ovation as I did yesterday. To a man they were for government operation of the medical care scheme.

However, I spoke to the answering service five times in a row and I got so frustrated in speaking to the same girl that I got hold of my boys and I took them over to the emergency department of the general hospital and just waited for the first doctor to come through who was qualified to give an opinion on that part of the anatomy. The first one, who was a psychiatrist said that it was the wrong end of the body for him; the second was an orthopaedist and the third a surgeon. Finally a pediatrician came through. It is very cheap that way, I recommend it.

Perhaps it would be possible for people to get doctors on the telephone if they were paid for it. Really, in justice, I do not see, if a doctor is called at three o'clock in the morning and he tells a woman to put a bread poultice on the boil and bring the boy in in the afternoon to his office, I do not see why he should not be paid. Certainly, as my friend, the hon. member for St. George knows, we lawyers are paid for advice given on the telephone. We usually send out a bill and keep a diary of telephone calls to and from the clients. We charge them for them, as properly we should. So what is the difference in paying doctors for advice which they give which contributes to the health of the person?

I want to say a word in connection with this ambiguous word "health" in 4 that has been referred to by my hon. leader. I am just wondering out loud whether that word "health" will be interpreted by the insurance carriers to include mental health, because I know that in the year 1965 mental health is not respectable in this province, not yet respectable.

It is not respectable with the workmen's compensation board which deprives a man of benefits because of what they call "an emotional overlay," whatever that term means. That is part of the medical jargon, that a man who has suffered an injury and is disturbed in his employment often has sequelae that are addressed to his mental equilibrium, and the workmen's compensation board tell us when we act as ombudsmen on behalf of these claimants that the emotional overlay is compensable. They will not alter the rate with which they are paying the workmen.

Now, we do not want in this statute, to allow terms to be used where unscrupulous insurance companies—and there are such, whether we like it or not, in this province. Pierre Berton had an interesting article in *Maclean's* magazine about a couple that are operating in a similar field to this. There are such. We do not want to employ verbiage that will allow them to get out of their financial responsibilities in respect of this Act. The language should be simple and plain and precise. I do not know really what that term means, as a lawyer, looking at it: "Services with respect to conditions that are not detrimental to the health of the person." I simply do not know what that means, but you will note it goes on in the heading—"Or with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only." Someone might interpret that to mean that it is that type of thing where only the vanity of the person is at stake.

Certainly treatment for cosmetic purposes goes far beyond that. The person who suffers severe lacerations to the face which cannot be repaired by plastic surgery may suffer what we call in the law—if we do not call it in medicine—may suffer “personality change” which to that individual is just as traumatic as is the partial loss of the use of a member. People go through very dramatic emotional upheavals as a result of trauma, so I would invite the hon. Minister, in line with what we have said over here, to consider some amendment to make heading 4 much more clear from the point of view of interpretation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to one or two features of this amendment which I hope will commend themselves to the House. I am not going to speak to the substance of the first part of the amendment, which suggests that the existing items 1, 2 and 3, under “limitations as prescribed by the regulations,” should be eliminated. I think the case has been made by a number of hon. members already, pretty solidly, that the need for annual health examinations, for well-baby care, and for psychotherapy, without the kind of limitations that are apparently being contemplated, should be an integral part of any standard policy that this government is going to be spelling out in the Act.

Therefore, we think that these should be removed from limitations to be prescribed by regulations. However, what in effect this amendment does is to take two of the exceptions from lower down in schedule “A” and bring them up within the category of limitations to be prescribed by regulations. These two exceptions are with regard to expenses for travelling time, for mileage, and advice by telephone.

Let me be very frank about this. I am puzzled as to why the hon. Minister, a medical doctor, coming from an area that is part of a rural community, would not recognize the value and the integral part of advice by telephone. There is, indeed, not only in rural areas, but also in city areas, for reasons that the hon. member for Sudbury has just spelled out—a difficulty in getting a doctor because there are too few of them. They are busy, and you cannot even get them on the telephone. But if they knew they were going to be paid, they perhaps would be a bit more available on the telephone.

Out in rural areas, I think this has been a part of a doctor-patient relationship, traditionally. I can recall growing up in the country, and the proposition of somebody being sick and calling the doctor and, in many

instances, getting advice from the doctor which the parent proceeded to put into effect in the home, was as much a part of medical services provided by doctors as going to his office. Indeed, I would suspect there would be more occasions, in actual number of seeking advice by telephone than actually going to the doctor's office.

However, we concede that this is an area in which abuses could creep in, and that is the reason why we put it up in limitations as prescribed by the regulations. We recognize that there will have to be careful scrutiny here; and, indeed, there may have to be scrutiny between sessions of the Legislature, when it might best be handled more quickly and by regulation. The same, I think, is true of the whole question of expenses for travelling time or mileage. Here again you have an area in which you could have abuse, but which I think is an integral part of the whole provision of health services on the part of the doctor, again out in rural areas. Therefore we think it should be up there, but subject to limitation by regulations because of the possibility of abuse.

With regard to the other two items, in the existing exceptions in schedule “A,” namely, item numbers 4 and 9, it is our view, for reasons that I will not take a great deal of time to spell out once again, that they simply should not be exceptions. Certainly I am not going to be persuaded, until I get something more from the hon. Minister than we have had up until now, as to what in heaven's name is the exact meaning of this phrase to which hon. members have already referred: “Services with respect to conditions that are not detrimental to the health of the covered person.” I can see it being an area of unbelievable abuse on the part of insurance companies, or with respect to the treatment for cosmetic purposes only.

Then finally, with regard to number 9, examination of eyes for refraction. It seems to me that surely we have reached the stage where the provision of glasses, and the right kind of glasses, for people in our society—when you can have many other consequences flowing from a lack of such provision—is something that should be part and parcel of a healthy insurance coverage, and certainly part and parcel of a standard medical services insurance. For those reasons, I would hope that the House would look with favour on the amendment.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, it is hard to understand, in this day and age, why we would have annual health examinations restricted by regulations.

It seems to me that this would mean that it is possible for regulations to say that you can have a physical examination every two years—maybe it would be every three years, or maybe it would be restricted to every five years. Certainly there is an oft-repeated term—that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure—and it has been proven wherever there has been established, particularly in the United States, group health clinics, established originally by the trade union movement in that country.

It extended to one particular area here, the Sault Ste. Marie health clinic association, where they have found that to provide annual or regular periodic health examinations has paid off tremendously. Certainly it has reduced the cost of health care in every area where they have health clinics and where they have regular health examinations and to restrict it to anything over a year would be detrimental to the new approach to medicine—to prevent people from getting sick—and therefore to reduce the cost in the early stage.

As far as restricting the examination of the eyes for refraction is concerned, I also do not know exactly what that terminology is, but I think it means to go and have your eyes examined for glasses so that you can read properly. One of the changes in the carriers' programme and coverage, in the last year or two, has been to include optometrists' coverage. Our last contract with Stelco now allows treatment by the optometrists for eye examination, and I can see no reason why any medical insurance programme should not provide this necessary and healthful innovation in any kind of a contract.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. leader of the Opposition was speaking about some of the sections under "exceptions," I noticed the hon. Minister's response to section 4, "Services with respect to conditions that are not detrimental to the health of the covered person, or with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only." I think that that is a singularly inappropriate exception, and I want to remind this House of an event that took place earlier in this session.

On April 1, 1965, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) rose in his place before the orders of the day, I believe it was—no, it was under the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions—and inserted the following paragraph into his remarks, and I shall read it in its entirety:

I stated earlier that rehabilitation is not a surgical process. You cannot cut the wrongdoing out of man. But there is one

area in which surgery can play its part, and that is in plastic surgery. It is quite likely that with some of our youngsters, physical deformities play some part in forming their attitudes and behaviour patterns. In consequence, we were gratified when, in 1964, Dr. Harold L. Silver, a distinguished plastic surgeon in Toronto, at my invitation very generously offered to perform plastic surgery without fee on any child or inmate in any of our institutions, providing there was evidence that such work would help rehabilitate that person. I should like at this time to express our very warm appreciation to Dr. Silver, and pay public tribute to him for this very generous, humane and helpful use of his skill as a plastic surgeon. It is our intention to formulate a research study around the work that Dr. Silver has been doing, which will enable us to establish its value in the rehabilitation process on those cases where plastic surgery has been utilized.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point. The question of the need for so-called "cosmetic" surgery is frequently in the psychological recesses of the mind of the person who feels the need. It cannot be objectively designated in the bill and since the hon. Minister has already agreed to psychotherapy and the importance of mental health, however limited, then he should be consistent in following through and not remove one area entirely from the field of mental health.

It says specifically in section 4, "Services with respect to conditions that are not detrimental to the health of the covered person." There may be many services which are not detrimental to health in the strict medical definition of the word but are of immense benefit in the broader, psychological meaning of the word.

The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions already recognized that during this session of the Legislature. It seems therefore invidious and unworthy that a bill should be put before the House containing a schedule with this kind of exception. I appeal to the hon. Minister that it is not a section which is likely to be abused. The drive, the zest for such surgery is not one in this society that is overused, and since it could have very real effects on the rehabilitation of people in their psychological readjustment, particularly in the areas of youth and adolescence, I strongly urge him to think of the deletion of that exception.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I shall try to cover the matters that have been discussed and I think I should start at the top.

First of all, may I point out to you, sir, that we are not saying by inserting this schedule that we are opposed to any of these things. We have said from the start that this is not the total plan yet, this is the beginning and this is a further step in a progression of steps toward ultimate total quality health care.

The annual health examination, I think, is evidence that we are concerned about preventive medicine. I think that if my hon. friend from Wentworth East—who is not in his seat at the present time—would look back at previous contracts he will recall that for at least the first five or ten years there was no annual health examination included in their contract which was said then to be a comprehensive contract. The addition of an annual health examination has only become popular in relatively recent times. In all instances of which I have any knowledge whatsoever, it comes after a contract has been in force one year. We are emphasizing preventive medicine by stating that the contract will provide for one annual health examination of each covered person after the contract has been continuously in operation for one year.

Well-baby care, number 2: When we wrote the bill at first, at my own insistence, we had included, and quite in opposition to the Hagey commission report, that there should be ten visits to the doctor for well-baby care within the first three years. In discussing this with paediatric authorities at the university level and in practice, we were told that this is not modern practice. I said some days ago, sir, in this House, that I was out of touch with modern practice for some time. It was on their recommendation that we inserted ten visits in the first five years. The paediatrics people told us that this is good preventive medicine for babies and this is a good degree of well-baby care.

Now, this does not mean to say that the medical services to the baby or to a child will only be covered to the extent of ten visits in one year or ten consultations in five years. If the child becomes sick—and we hope that it will not—it will be covered. These ten visits are preventive medicine.

In the matter of psychotherapy: It is a broad term, because who is going to say what is psychotherapy except psychiatrists? They are the people who are skilled and knowledgeable in these things. They will determine what is psychotherapy. While we have put a limitation on it to begin with, we are persuaded that this is a reasonably generous provision and we would be imprudent if we did not pay very careful attention to

the experiences of many programmes which have been put in very serious trouble over the past few years because of unlimited psychotherapy services. We want time and a little experience to find how this is going.

It is not because we do not believe in these things, nor is it because we can say, by the stroke of a pen or by a word and a natural limitation and a schedule, that this is all that is necessary. We know that there are those who will need more, we know that there are those who will not need it at all. We have been forced to the decision, on the basis of advice and on the basis of study, that 25 hours per year for the individual and up to 50 hours per year for the family, is a reasonably generous coverage, at least for a start.

In the case of exceptions: These exceptions are part of the standard contract which all carriers provide. Look at your non-profit carriers; look at your medical form; look at your PSI! None of them pay for services provided under the workmen's compensation board or in accidents or other similar legislation, services that a covered person receives under any Act of this Legislature. I direct your attention, for instance, to The Venereal Disease Act. That is one that comes to mind; and The Sanitaria for Tuberculosis Act; at present our hospitals for the mentally ill, under The Mental Hospitals Act. These are things that come to mind immediately.

The laboratory and other diagnostic procedures: Here the only thing that is excepted is laboratory services that are not ordered by or provided by or supervised by a physician. We would be careless indeed if we had not inserted this, particularly in view of the growing body of concern, not only in our own country but all over the continent, about laboratories, some of which call themselves medical laboratories and hold themselves out as being skilled and capable of providing clinical, medical laboratory services.

Those of you who may have read the recent very revealing article in one of our international magazines must have been forced to wonder if there were any laboratories of this kind operating in our own country. We are concerned about them and are studying this whole matter very carefully, because it may well be that we shall have to step in and exercise a little control.

There is nothing in this section which refuses laboratory services ordered by the attending physician, so long as they are provided in a recognized laboratory under the supervision of a physician who is skilled in providing this service.

Dental care for dental purposes: I think I covered that by pointing out that if the health of the individual is at stake, then of course this will be considered. As in many cases, each case would have to be considered on its own merits.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister for clarification on this? I assume that it is the doctor who decides whether dental care is essential.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In 2 (a), the services are to be determined by the doctor and they must be ordered by the doctor, that is with laboratory services.

Then we come down to 4: "Services with respect to conditions which are not detrimental to the health of the covered person or with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only." It will not be the carrier who determines whether these services are covered, it will be the doctor. The doctor in charge or the doctor or doctors whom he may call in consultation. The carrier will have nothing to do with determining whether the service is covered under the contract, this will rest with the physician in charge.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, where that is provided: That the decision in the matter will be made by the doctor?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is a medical services insurance contract, the doctor is the deciding factor all through the piece.

Mr. Bryden: But it is also a legal document and I believe that determinations in cases of legal dispute are made in the courts. If clause 4 said "services with respect to conditions that are determined by the doctor as not being detrimental to the health of the covered person, and so on," then I think we could take it as acceptable.

But it does not say that at all, Mr. Chairman. It merely refers to services that are not detrimental to the health of the covered person or are with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only. The insurance carrier is certainly in a position to refuse a claim on the ground that it relates to this section. The patient may challenge him, but in such a case I think all he can do is go to court. The patient is then involved in considerable litigation, to get the thing determined.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there is always an appeal to the council. I may be on bad legal ground, I may be straying on

territory as foreign to me as medical ground is to my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, but I understand this quite clearly. And even if I were not standing here, but a practising physician, I would understand this quite clearly, that it would be my decision with respect to my patient whether the service should be covered or not, or whether this service was detrimental to the health of my patient or not.

I do not think that the insurance carrier is either equipped, or experienced, or anything else, to determine what is good for, or detrimental to, my patient's health. This is fully understood, Mr. Chairman.

The examples the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned, these are to me very obvious matters on which there would be no question in anybody's mind. He mentioned cleft palate; a dislocated hip—congenital dislocation I presume he meant—club foot; deficient hearing if it could be corrected by medical means, by all means; aphasia. The word blindness I believe he said. All of these things, of course. If anything can be done for them by way of medical treatment or surgical treatment, of course these things would be covered.

I think one of my hon. friends used the word "vanity," and I believe that that sums it up very well, although it is not a matter one wants to belabour or talk to at any great length. Suppose somebody wanted a face-lift. This is purely and simply a costly surgical procedure. If somebody wanted a huge roll of fat removed from their abdominal wall, because it does not look well or they cannot wear the proper type of foundation garment or something of that kind. Well, we contend that that is really most likely pandering to one's vanity.

On the other hand, one can foresee the possibility that if a person has a very pendulous abdomen that the doctor might decide it would be a very good thing to remove some of it by surgical means in the interest of the patient himself. And here again would be a case that is in a gray area.

You cannot draw a fine line of demarcation, saying this is on that side and that is on the other. There are many of these cases that will have to be determined upon their own merits, and there may be occasions when appeal to the council will have to be had. But this, I think, is the saving feature, that there is always appeal to the council in all of these things.

Mr. Bryden: Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Sopha: Where is that section?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Section 3, I believe it is; that one of the council's functions shall be to deal with complaints relative to this Act, and all matters referred to it by the Minister or by the corporation. Every person has access to the council.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman—again I am thinking of an insurance company—I could see where a doctor has been working with a sensitive child who had acne, and the doctor decided it would give a reassurance to the child and more confidence if he were able to give some treatment. I can see an insurance company saying, "Look, this is purely cosmetic."

What I would like to hear is that very definitely it is the doctor's decision if he feels for psychosomatic reasons, or some other reasons, treatment needs to be done which in definition might be cosmetic, just as the hon. member mentioned here that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has been suggesting that the facial operations might be very important in changing personalities. My legal friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, called it personality disorders that develop.

I would just like to get from the hon. Minister again, is it to be the doctor who decides? This may appear very trivial and a matter of vanity to an insurance company, but the doctor who knows the patient personally would recognize that this cosmetic thing was of significance and great importance to the mental health of the person. Would his decision be final?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is very difficult for me to say the decision would be final. There would probably be discussion about it. Here again, there is the doctor's decision. But you speak of the case of acne. If the doctor decided that some surgical procedure—and there are certain surgical procedures—would be advantageous to the general health and well-being of the patient, and the carrier made a noise about it, I think it is the doctor's responsibility to carry that to its logical conclusion, and in this case his appeal would be to the council. Every doctor will not do that because he may not want to become involved in these matters, but there is the appeal to the council.

These things are not new, Mr. Chairman. These are things that are coming up constantly, and are being argued constantly, and decisions are being made about them, insofar as this schedule is concerned, whether it be the physical health or the mental health of the individual that is at stake. I know that

some may argue that in the case of the aging dowager, she may say a face-lift would do a great deal to bolster up her faltering psyche. There is a point where reason becomes greatly strained. But a great deal can be done before we reach that point.

Mr. Sopha: Well then, would the hon. Minister consider in relation to this appeal business that he referred to, that there is no appeal directly to the council by the insured?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. Sopha: Only through the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, not necessarily.

Mr. Sopha: Well, section 3 says the council shall deal with complaints relative to this Act, and with all matters referred to it by the Minister or by the corporation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but it does not say, Mr. Chairman, from whom the complaint shall come. We are going to have to start in arguing the bill all over again, but it does not say in the section of the Act from whom, or through whom, the complaint shall come. It just says, "shall deal with complaints relative to this Act" and it does not go on to say that those complaints must come from the Minister. This is the basis of this Act, this is one of the reasons why the council was set, up so that every subscriber shall have access to the council.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister will look at the actual words—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could finish my remarks. I am getting completely led astray with all this. Now, the matter of 5, on travelling time. I practised medicine for quite a long time, and I have never yet known any insurance carrier who paid a doctor for his travelling time. Indeed, if we were to go back to the schedule of fees and argue that things have been dealt with on the basis of their appearance there or not, then at no time can I recall where travelling time was considered as an insured service.

Doctors in the country do charge travelling time, but this is not part of an insurance function and I think this would leave very grave openings for abuse. I would strongly urge that you reconsider that.

Advice by telephone is another thing. Legal men may advise their clients by telephone and this can be very useful in the case of legal advice, but encouraging medical practice by telephone is not conducive to high quality medical care. This, too, should

not be encouraged under any circumstance. I grant the hon. member for York South is quite correct, a good deal of advice by telephone is given in rural areas and in other areas, but I would question very much if it is charged for.

However, I do not know. I know what my own proceeding was, but never should any physician be encouraged in any way to advise or treat a patient by telephone, because that will only lead to a spread of the practice which is not in the interests of good health care for our people. Indeed, this is condemned by the profession itself, this business of trying to practise medicine over the phone.

Now, coming back to seven, what I said in the case of limitations applies again, every good doctor and everyone who is trying to practise quality medical care, will advocate periodic health examinations, and this I repeat, we are trying to do under this bill.

Examination of the eyes by refraction, I have pointed out, and again I must emphasize, is not because we believe this is not necessary. It is not because we believe this is not a good thing. It is not, by any stretch of the imagination, to be taken to mean that we do not think that the optometrists of Ontario are not doing a good job. They are doing a good job, but they, too, are steadily trying to improve the standards of their service. But we suggest that until we have a little experience with this and know where we are going and know what it is going to cost us, this is one service that we will exclude for the time being.

Again I would repeat, this has been the experience and the practice of other jurisdictions that have tried to bring in any type of medical services insurance. I know you will tell me that Great Britain has this in their plan, but let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, Great Britain did not have it in the original plan of 1911, and that was their first step. It took them 36 or 37 years to come to the point where they had a total health care plan, and I would make bold to predict at this stage of the game, that it will not take Ontario that length of time, until we too have a complete health programme to provide quality health care for all of our people.

The same applies to the annual health examination. I would remind my hon. friends that in the much-quoted programme in Saskatchewan, I do not believe that is included even yet. In the Alberta plan, they do provide an annual health examination after the contract has been in force for one year, and I think the same can be said about the

psychiatric service. I do not believe that either of those have made as generous provision for psychotherapy services as we have done under our plan. I repeat sir, for emphasis, that all we are asking at the present time is: Let us start on this basis. We believe that this is a sound and reasonable basis on which to start and, as we gain experience, and as we see where we are going, and how the costs are standing up, then we will be in a position to extend the services as we move farther forward.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of matters which arise with regard to the observations the hon. Minister has just made in reply to comments from this side of the House.

We have laboured all through the committee consideration of this bill under two important difficulties. One is that on some occasions the hon. Minister professes to be unable to give us any idea of what will be in regulations that are germane to the Act; then, on the other hand, he will occasionally reveal, almost it would seem by inadvertence, what I take it are to be in regulations, because the matters discussed are not in the Act. He has told us that the limitations with regard to the three items listed under limitations, are to be as follows:

One—annual health examination. Of course that is not in the bill, but I take it, from what he says, that is to be in the regulations.

Ten consultations respecting well-baby care, and 25 hours for an individual or 50 hours for a family with respect to psychotherapy; I take it that these are all matters that he plans to put in regulations. Certainly they are not in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest, on a point of order, that I already outlined this in my remarks on second reading? I think I specifically stated these two things. The reason I have told you these things, sir, is in an attempt to show that I am presenting this bill in the greatest of good faith. I am taking the House into my confidence—I do not want to put it that way—I am telling the House everything I know at the present time, what we believe, and what we plan to do from knowledge, now; and the things I stated with respect to the limitations, I repeat, I stated in my remarks during second reading.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister assures us that the limitations prescribed in the regulations will be no more restrictive, at any rate, than what he has

outlined, I am sure we will accept that as to his intention; I am sure he will carry it out.

We will still stick by the amendment at present before the committee, Mr. Chairman, to eliminate these three items altogether from the subject matter of limitations. The hon. Minister has frequently spoken of the need to maintain good health as of even greater importance than curing illness. We think that since these are the matters most directly related to good health, there should be no limitations on them.

As to the exceptions, obviously some have to be made. We here certainly do not suggest that a person who is covered by The Workmen's Compensation Act should also be covered by a standard contract under this Act—he will do better under The Workmen's Compensation Act—so, therefore, that is where he should be covered. We do not object to that type of exception.

I must say, however, that we do not accept as satisfactory the hon. Minister's explanation of exception number 4—that is the one which excludes services for conditions not detrimental to the health of the covered person, or with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only. The hon. Minister says, when a contract is issued under schedule "A", that the medical practitioner will make the decision as to whether or not a specific service is for a condition that is not detrimental to the health of the covered person, or is for cosmetic purposes only. I suggest to him that it does not say any such thing here.

A second difficulty we have had all through the bill is that the hon. Minister keeps insisting that his interpretation is what is going to prevail. When this bill becomes law, as it may unfortunately do, what the hon. Minister has said here and what he thinks will be of no significance whatever. What we will have to go on, and what those interpreting it will have to go on, will be exclusively what the words in the bill say, nothing more. The hon. Minister says that if there is any dispute about it there will be an appeal to the medical services insurance council; and he cites, as the authority for that, subsection 6 of section 3, which provides that the council shall "deal with complaints relative to this Act."

I submit to the hon. Minister that that is a very doubtful proposition. That authority is highly imprecise. I do not think—I would be most doubtful if it would give the council authority to deal with and adjudicate upon disputes over the interpretation of exception number 4. I would suggest to him that if he believes that the council is to be, and should

be, the final authority in adjudicating such disputes, then he should clearly provide that in the bill. It is not a matter, as he suggested, of reopening the whole Act again; it is a matter of dealing with the words in front of us.

As we see it, exception number 4 could become a very wide exception indeed. An insurance company which did not want to settle a claim—and, after all, a great many of these standard contracts will be written by private insurance companies, some of whom in the past have shown a great disinclination to pay up on claims presented to them—if a company decided it did not want to settle a claim, it could very readily seize on this exception and say that the services provided did not relate to a condition detrimental to the health of the covered person, or that it was for cosmetic purposes only.

What about an ugly, disfiguring scar on a person's face? Is treatment for that for cosmetic purposes only? Many people who would say that although it may not affect the physiological health of the person concerned, it would have a great deal of bearing on his general sense of well-being, and therefore on his emotional and mental health. But again it does not provide here, as the hon. Minister suggests is the case, that the medical practitioner will make the decision. It does not provide here that, in case of dispute, the council will determine the matter. It merely says that this is a basis on which payment could be refused under a standard contract.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that if an insurance company refused to make a payment relying on this exception, the only remedy of the covered person would be to take that insurance company to court to force it to pay, to get a court order to make it pay. This would mean the whole thing could be tied up in court, and that the patient could be involved in legal expenses greater than the benefits he may hope to recover. As the hon. member for Sudbury pointed out earlier in this committee discussion, insurance companies often litigate over fairly small sums of money. They are prepared to go to court if they think they can establish a principle which will relieve them of payments in the future.

I should think, if the hon. Minister intends this to mean what he says—namely, (a) that the doctor will make the first determination, and (b) that if there is dispute, the council will make the final determination—then he should say so clearly and specifically in the bill.

Turning to the matter of refractions, Mr.

Chairman, the hon. Minister has said on this, and on some of the other matters on which limitations are to be imposed or which are to be excepted, that we are at the first stage here, that we have to move slowly and see what happens. I do not object to that principle in general terms, but I would suggest to the hon. Minister that even though we are, shall we say, in the first phases of the implementation of this legislation, we do not have to start at the point where even private insurance companies were five and ten years ago. Private insurance companies under group contracts are now providing or covering refractions.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Some of them are.

Mr. Bryden: Some of them are, yes; and there are some that are not covering anything very much, they are just selling policies. But those who are subject to good stiff negotiations, such as the ones that provide group contracts for large employment units like Westinghouse or the Steel Company of Canada, about which my hon. colleagues here could tell you a great deal more than I can, are doing that sort of thing. They have to do it because they would not be able to sell their contracts if they did not.

The point is they have found it is practical to do it. Now, why can we not benefit by their experience? As the hon. Minister said, the first health legislation passed in Britain in 1911 did not cover refractions, but do we have to go back to where Britain was in 1911? Can we not benefit by their subsequent experience? Can we not now conclude that it is feasible—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Saskatchewan does not do it!

Mr. Bryden: If we are going to debate Saskatchewan, let us debate Saskatchewan in terms of its total contract, which is to provide far wider coverage than you are thinking of.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, not at all!

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is going to cover—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should really be fair.

Mr. Bryden: As far as any public plan is concerned or public responsibility is concerned, the hon. Minister is going to cover a maximum of 1,800,000 people. The rest, if they are covered at all, will be covered by private insurance contracts.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is the contract I am talking about, Mr. Chairman. I am comparing our standard contract with the standard contract in Saskatchewan, regardless of the number it covers. The benefits provided under our contract are equally as broad, and in some instances more broad, than those offered by Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bryden: I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that when one talks about coverage one cannot talk merely on the benefits in the contract, one also has to talk about the number of people covered or the percentage of population covered. In Saskatchewan it is the whole population and here, as far as any public responsibility is concerned, it is a very small percentage of the population. In Saskatchewan it is the whole population other than people who are covered elsewhere such as the RCMP.

I am suggesting that there has, in this province and in other jurisdictions, been sufficient experience of coverage of refractions that we can safely go ahead and undertake to cover it in the case of that percentage of the population for which we are providing coverage and that we can require private companies to cover it in their standard contracts.

I may say that the refractions covered in some of the group contracts now cover not only refractions by physicians and by ophthalmologists, but also refractions by optometrists. I do not really see why, if private contracts are now doing that, we can cannot make our standard contract as good as the best private contract now in existence. I would say the same with respect to annual examinations, well-baby care and psychotherapy. The private companies have had and continue to have limitations in these areas, but in the more advanced of these contracts these limitations are being quickly reduced. I think our standard contract should be the best now available. As it stands at the present time under schedule "A" it will be somewhat less than the best available.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to what the hon. Minister said. I was interested when he mentioned the exemption on advice by telephone. He suggested that the reason he has this in—or one of the reasons—is that it is bad medicine to be practising by telephone and that he was going to discourage this. If that is the principle that the hon. Minister is espousing, that what you put here as an exception will discourage people from following that particular practice, I just want to underline the fallacy in his argument. To

emphasize what my hon. colleague to my left has suggested on these exemptions—I admit that I am stretching this to some extent—in his first remark on advice by telephone, he said that we put this in because we do not want to practise that way; I suggest then the same implication is attached to the fact that they do not want to cover people for annual health examinations, well-baby care—

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): That is stretching it!

Mr. Thompson: No, it is not stretching it. It is very clear to me that you have these limitations because you do not think they are vital to the people—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order?

That is a complete misapprehension, I did not suggest or infer this and nothing I have said can be the basis to draw that conclusion.

Mr. Thompson: I would say the only inference that can be drawn from it is simply that the hon. Minister has drafted an Act and he says these are the limitations. I assume that to him the most paramount thing is the health of the people and this is meant to be a health bill, not a sickness bill. The hon. Minister's job, I would hope, and his whole emphasis, is to provide the best of health for the people. I would think as a doctor, apart from being the Minister of Health, that he would recognize that one of the ways in which health should be provided for the people is to have annual health check-ups. What about symptoms in connection with heart attacks and so on?

Let me come to another point on this in connection with dental care. From the Hall report—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I know my hon. friends laugh about this, they are indifferent about health services. They have this bill and they have said nothing in connection with it. They just sat there, a silent party, condoning it except to shout and gibe at us. That has never bothered me; the illiteracy of their remarks is only a reflection on themselves.

According to the Hall report by the age of 13, according to the dental health survey—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order sir, we have already debated very fully the principles of this bill and dental care is definitely not included in the principles of the bill. I am fully aware of what the Hall commission report says about

it. I am fully sensitive of the need for dental health care, but unfortunately it is not included in this bill. It is a medical services insurance bill and on that basis we have debated it very thoroughly now.

Mr. Thompson: I do not think we have debated the fact that dental care is surely related to medical care. I am just raising the point, not for the hon. Minister's information but for the information of the public and of this Legislature. I am aware he has read the whole report. I only wish he had implemented it. I think I am quite entitled to bring out some of the statistics mentioned.

By the age of 13, according to the dental health survey, 98 per cent of Canadian children have one or more teeth decayed and 40 per cent of them have lost one or more permanent teeth.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

I would like to suggest that the degree of treatment required or suggested in the report that you are quoting does not pertain directly to this bill. I think that the bill, in reading it, applies to dental purposes for the purpose of health only. It does not specify in any way the number of cavities that constitute serious illness, therefore I must uphold the Minister on his objection that this was, on a point of order, not a part of the bill and should not be discussed. The question of what is needed for dental treatment and that it is desirable to avoid cavities and things of that kind do not come under the bill.

Mr. Thompson: I will leave out the cavities then. I will say that only 13 per cent of children between seven and 13 years of age have no untreated dental defects. That comes under the purposes of dental care. I realize that you are intelligent and have seen that.

Mr. Chairman: Not necessarily!

Mr. Thompson: Each child has an average backlog of three teeth needing restoration; and yet when I looked at this dental care for dental purposes, at first I thought here was a broad approach being taken, even for children up to the age of 18. But, as I understand it now, this is something which is defined by the doctors and not by the dentists, and it has nothing to do with teeth.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is a complete misapprehension. A doctor has nothing to do with defining the need for dental care. If the person is suffering from something where dental care is necessary for the preservation of their general health, then of course the doctor will come into it, but

this bill does not provide dental care. This is one of the principles of the bill, sir; and dental care is not included, per se, as part of the bill.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir I am just—

Mr. Chairman: On the basis of that argument, I must tell the leader of the Opposition that he is definitely out of order. I am referring to dental requirements, in connection with this bill.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate it and I will not mention cavities in this context again.

Mr. Chairman: I would point out that it would appear that under this bill, if a medical doctor considers that dental requirements are the cause of another illness, then, as I have followed the Minister's arguments, it might possibly be considered.

Mr. Bryden: That is not what the bill says.

Mr. Chairman: I think that is what the bill does state; in clause "B" under section 2, in schedule "A", dental care for dental purposes is not included. I think it specifies it very well, for dental purposes.

Mr. Bryden: It does not say anything about a medical doctor.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister if the Chairman's interpretation is his interpretation? I think it is important we should know this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have already answered this question for the hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: There seems to me to be conflict, sir, between the Chairman's interpretation and the hon. Minister's, and I wonder if the hon. Minister could clarify this for us?

May I say again that when we come to such a thing as defining dental care for dental purposes—and I hear a squawk. Stop stalling, it irritates me; it is like a mosquito bite, it does not bother me that much.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: We have had two different interpretations.

Mr. Sopha: I have one final question to ask. This exception of the use of operating plaster or fracture rooms; I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us what that means?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes. If you have a broken limb, you need the application of a

plaster cast; this is already covered under The Hospital Insurance Services Act.

Mr. Sopha: I see.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, may I ask your ruling on a matter in the event that the amendment does not carry? I am somewhat concerned about some of the things my hon. friends are concerned with in section 4, and I would like to propose an amendment, but I must be guided by your ruling, sir. I recognize that when an amendment has been put to you before, and it was lost, the whole section carried. If that be your ruling, I would like to know now, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Quite frankly, sir, I want to know what I can do legally.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, as the mover of the amendment, I would be pleased to see it held until the hon. Minister makes whatever modifications he wishes.

Mr. Sopha: He does not even—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would move, Mr. Chairman, that paragraph 4 under "exceptions" be amended by adding, after "conditions," the words: "that in the opinion of a physician," so that the section will now read:

Services with respect to conditions that in the opinion of a physician are not detrimental to the health of the covered person or with respect of treatment for cosmetic purposes only.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I just raise one technical point on this. I think I got the hon. Minister's words down well enough, and as the clause has been now worded, the opinion of the physician would be the governing matter only in regard to matters that are considered not detrimental to the health. It would not govern the question of treatment for cosmetic purposes only, because there are two "with respect to" clauses. If he would just find, or if his advisers could find, some way of making it clear that that is his intention, that the opinion of the physician would be the determining matter in both of these cases, then I think we, in this group, would be entirely happy with the clause.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the intention, sir; and if the language is not clear, I am quite prepared to make it so that it is clear. I checked it with the legal people and they assured me it is clear.

Mr. Bryden: I wonder if they would just take another look at it, because it says:

Services with respect to conditions that in the opinion of the physician are not detrimental to the health of the covered person.

And then it starts all over again:

—or with respect to treatment, etc.

I submit it should say again "that, in the opinion of the physician, are for cosmetic purposes only." That is a rather clumsy way of putting it, but at least it would be clear.

Mr. Chairman: After the first word "services" in the amendment as proposed by—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, I did not hear.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): After the first word "services," put in the amendment, as proposed by the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member mind repeating it, please?

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, if the wording of the amendment was placed after the word "services," would that meet the hon. member's objection or condition, and would it make sense?

Mr. Bryden: There would then be a syntactical problem, but that would be a good place to put it; then it would clearly govern both of the subordinate clauses.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think I understand what my hon. friend from Halton means: Services that, in the opinion of a physician, with respect to conditions, are not detrimental to the health of a covered person or with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only. It sounds a little clumsy, but if the sense is right I have no objections.

Mr. Sopha: Services which.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, services which, in the opinion—

Mr. Renwick: If I might just comment, services which, in the opinion of the physician, are with respect to conditions which are not detrimental.

Clerk of the House: It would then read:

Clause 4. Services which, in the opinion of a physician, are with respect to conditions that are not detrimental to the health of the covered person or with respect to treatment for cosmetic purposes only.

Mr. Bryden: Before the question is put, Mr. Chairman, may I ask if it is possible, assuming we adopt this, that the legislative counsel could look it over and polish it up, in relation to the intention, because I think it is rather clumsy.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would appreciate that very much.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. Dymond's amendment, will please say "aye."

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: I will now put the amendment by the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the amendment then is amended itself accordingly by no longer wishing to strike out item 4, so that B part of the amendment is like striking out items 5, 6 and 9 under the heading "exceptions," and by renumbering the other items under the heading accordingly.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment of the member for Scarborough West will please say "aye."

All those opposed, will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the amendment, will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the amendment, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 21; the "nays" 37.

Mr. Chairman: Schedule "A", as amended, stands as part of the bill.

On schedule B:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, in the matter of schedule "B," this is one of the most obnoxious parts of this bill and it has to do with co-insurance. We must admit that, because of the passing at second reading, we are stuck with the principle of co-insurance, much as we may regret it, but at least it should not be bad as this schedule makes it seem.

Under this schedule, the insurance companies are only liable for 80 per cent of the cost of medical insurance, after the deductible of \$25 per person and \$50 per family has been made. In my view, and in the view of this side of the House, the insurance company, even after the deductible has been allowed, should pay 100 per cent of the medical bill.

This type of insurance has been put into practice in Alberta; we can learn from their experience as it has been most unsuccessful. Alberta has found that six times as many people prefer the type of insurance that covers the cost of medical service 100 per cent—six times, Mr. Chairman—and yet we in this province, despite the experience learned in other jurisdictions are insisting on pushing this co-insurance on the people of the province of Ontario.

Why would the government do it? To me, it comes back to the very same answer as has been in so many sections of this bill. The people who want schedule B, the way it is worded at the present time, are the insurance companies, and nobody else.

Many doctors with whom I have talked—

Mr. McKeough: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that the hon. member is debating the principle which is set out in section 5, and not the principle which is in the schedule at all.

Mr. Trotter: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not moving to strike this out, I merely move to say that after the deductible has been allowed—I admit that I am stuck with the principle of a deduction, \$25 per person and \$50 per family, and I admit that I do not like that principle—that 100 per cent of the balance of the medical costs should be covered, and not just 80 per cent. What happens in this case is that if a doctor's bill is \$100 for one person, \$25 is deducted, and then under the policy only 80 per cent of the \$75 is payable.

I say that 100 per cent of that \$75 should be payable. Twenty-five dollars is enough to have taken off a policy.

Take the average man who is perhaps making \$75 a week. To him \$50 is a lot of money, and if he has a family, \$50 is even more so. This, again, is a type of policy that puts a hardship on the individual, and more particularly on the individual family. It is also a type of policy from which the insurance companies have made the greatest profits.

They are the ones who want this type of policy for two reasons, one of which is that a lot of the heavy costs of administration of these policies is in servicing small claims. Well, let us face it, to the low income earner, no claim is a small claim, and he is the one who would suffer most under such a set-up.

So that I plead with hon. members of this House to bear in mind that if people want co-insurance—if they want the deductible—

certainly, after the deduction has been taken off, \$100 should be more than sufficient.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that schedule B of this Act be amended so that 80 per cent is deleted, and in its place, 100 per cent is placed, and that schedule B should read as follows:

That the benefits provided by this standard co-insurance, medical services insurance contract to a covered person, shall be the payment of 100 per cent of the benefits provided in schedule A, or the excess over \$25 deductible per covered person, or \$50 deductible per family, in any calendar year for the necessary additional professional services of a physician, wherever rendered, or the performance of such services, as the case may be, unless limited or accepted under this Act or under schedule A.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Trotter moves that schedule B be amended as follows:

That the benefits provided by this standard co-insurance, medical services insurance contract to a covered person, shall be the payment of 100 per cent of the benefits provided in schedule A, or the excess over \$25 deductible per covered person, or \$50 deductible per family, in any calendar year for the necessary additional professional services of a physician, wherever rendered, or the performance of such services, as the case may be, unless limited or excepted under this Act or under schedule A.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in speaking in favour of this amendment, I would speak more strongly than the hon. member for Parkdale. The idea of co-insurance has a superficial explanation, namely, that persons will be able to obtain insurance at a lower price by payment of a lower premium, or by payment of a lower subscription rate if they are prepared to assume some initial cost of the insurance and at some point to share a participation in any additional claims which are made under the insurance.

The reason why this has superficial appeal is that the differential in price is going to be such that it will of necessity attract a large number of people in that class of persons over the 1,800,000 figure and up to the next million who are not going to be in a position when they balance off all the other claims on their rather meagre income, to do other than to accept a co-insurance standard contract. And by accepting a standard co-insurance contract, they are going to hope that they will not have to pay any por-

tion of the deductible, except in very unusual or extreme situations that it will make it worthwhile for them to have that kind of coverage.

The great bulk of the coverage might very well mean that they will, in fact, have to pay individually for the first part of the insurance because that will perhaps cover most of the claims which they will be called upon to make. The differential in premium between a standard contract and a standard co-insurance contract will, I am certain, be so rated that it will have a considerable attraction, for the reasons which I gave.

But, Mr. Chairman, in addition to that and without reverting—because that section has been passed—but in subsection 2 of section 6 you will find that in addition the Minister is able to designate classes of persons who might very well, under that section, appear to be required to take standard co-insurance medical services contracts rather than standard contracts.

Certainly if the hon. Minister intends that some portion of the group of people who are going to be partially subsidized are by designation of the Minister going to be required to have only a co-insurance contract, then I think he should so state to the House. It would then emphasize and illustrate the very point which I am making, that some people are going to be required to pay the first portion of the contract whether or not they like it. Indeed they may wish to have a standard contract coverage and be partially subsidized, and it may be that the Minister is going to force them to take a co-insurance contract for certain classes of the people within the community.

The other argument which is put forward for co-insurance is that in some way there is going to be a misuse by the people of the province of Ontario of the available medical services. If one reads the Hagey report, this is certainly the line that report took and in great detail it indicated that co-insurance was a very necessary means for keeping the people of Ontario honest so far as their demands on the health services within the community are concerned.

Fortunately, the government did not go so far as to accept the reasoning of the Hagey commission, but even so they have introduced this co-insurance feature on the ground that it is going to be available for people. But as I have stated, under subsection 2 of section 6 it appears that the Minister is going to designate certain classes of people who are going to be required to take co-insurance medical services coverage.

Now, certainly the experience in Saskatchewan, to the extent that their experience has been correlated, has indicated that there has been no rise in the use made of the facilities within the community unless it has been by reason of the decision of the doctors themselves in recommending care and treatment which they would not otherwise have recommended unless there had been public health insurance coverage for everyone in Saskatchewan.

I would think that while we would support this amendment, we think that the principle of co-insurance in public health plans is not an acceptable one and is one which the hon. Minister should seriously consider deleting. As I said at the commencement of my remarks, the other reasons against co-insurance have much more merit than the specious reason for implementing it which appeals to so many people, namely, a lower premium rate.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, when the committee was debating section 5 it set out that co-insurance features shall be made available. I wondered at that time if there was some kind of gimmick being displayed in this Act.

It seems to me, if I remember correctly my experience with negotiating coverage, that in the last two or three years carriers were dropping their co-insurance features. The only place where co-insurance features still existed were in the major medical parts of their plans, that is, anything above the standard plan. When we get into major catastrophic coverage they then had the co-insurance features, inasmuch as they had deductibles and they would pay 80 per cent of the excess. In the last couple of contracts we have had we have been able to change them by decreasing the deductible on the family basis and having the major medical coverage on a 100 per cent basis.

The carriers were dropping co-insurance in their standard contracts and I think they were dropping them because of public opinion against co-insurance features which were an easy contract to sell and could be sold without giving the true impression of what the contract covered to many people. In this section 5, and then carried on in the schedule, it says that the carriers "shall," that means they must, include in their contracts co-insurance features. I think we should delete the whole schedule B and not allow perpetuation of co-insurance in any way at all.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, it has been emphasized over and over again that the

major problem in regard to medical care is not the cost of it but to make available to people adequate standards of health care, co-extensive with the vast store of our medical knowledge and the skills which medical science has developed.

I just fear that in respect of this co-insurance feature that carriers will emphasize the cheaper price. I could very well visualize them mounting a campaign of advertising which would point out to the would-be subscriber the savings that he might allegedly win by subscribing to the co-insurance type of policy rather than the standard medical policy. We know very well that insurance carriers like co-insurance, they prefer co-insurance to a type of policy that gives the first dollar coverage. I see something sinister in the inclusion of this feature in this bill. I would commend to the hon. Minister a consideration of accepting this amendment, going as it does but part of the way.

But what I really stood up to say to the hon. Minister was that we have come to the end of the battle in a clause-by-clause study and I want him to know that as we approach the end of the battle we treat it only as a battle, the war goes on. We intend to carry on the war until we achieve the day that we emasculate this statute of the principle of caring for the health needs of our people through private insurance carriers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few very brief comments on this.

The hon. member for Parkdale stated in his usual graphic way that we are shoving something on the public. This is not so, Mr. Chairman. We are simply making the standard medical services contract available on a co-insurance deductible basis. I am quite prepared to accept, as I did during the debates on the principle of the bill, that this is losing popularity, but there are still sizeable numbers of people who like it. I had it myself before I came under the legislative group contract. A great many people use deductible insurance and it is here for them if they want it.

I want to assure the hon. member for Sudbury that there is nothing sinister in it. There is no intention nor attempt—the hon. member for Riverdale suggested that we were going to designate classes that must take the co-insurance—there is nothing in this bill that would lead one to imagine this.

I cannot see where the hon. member for Parkdale can see the hardship in this. There is nothing compulsory or mandatory about it.

If a subscriber does not want to buy it, he does not have to. The standard contract, first \$1 coverage, is available for him and the belief that this has a deterrent effect, I do not believe is very valid. I have never been impressed with the idea that co-insurance or deductible features were any deterrent on service, or demands for service, or over-servicing, and I have not developed any greater liking for it today than ever I had. In fact, the records that are available to us across the country show that in those provinces where there are deterrent features built into the hospital insurance plan, the utilization is just as high as anywhere else in Canada. I think this is fairly positive proof that the so-called deterrents are a fallacy and do not work.

I can assure you that I am very pleased, sir, to hear from my hon. friend from Sudbury, that the war is still going on, because we are fighting the same war. We are, as I said at the outset of our discussions, aiming for the same goal, but we have taken different roads toward it.

It is very nice for my hon. friend from York South to say that this is specious and it is very nice for him to stand up with his cohorts and tell us that nothing short of the maximum is satisfactory, knowing full well, sir, if I am any judge at all, that he will never be called upon to assume the responsibility of providing this sort of thing for the people of Ontario.

We are charged with that responsibility and I say to you that this schedule B is an added service made available to the people. If they do not want to use it, there is no compulsion on them to use it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: You are charged with the responsibility, but could I, through you, Mr. Chairman, give you a piece of friendly advice? You have made a dreadful mistake in this business of the higher premiums for the aged and the infirm.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the end of the so-called battle, the fact of the matter is that some very serious flaws have been revealed in this bill. So much so that people who started out strongly in support of this government's plan have now climbed off the band wagon, and I venture the prediction that this bill will never go into effect until the government has faced up to some of its weaknesses in the next session. It is not just that we in the Opposition have fought and fought to get these amendments in

—this government has been imposing its will on something like 30 of its own hon. members who started out being in favour of full medical coverage. You are not just ploughing us under, you are ploughing under 30 of your own members and most of the people of the province who want full coverage.

Mr. Sopha: You do not like the truth? The truth shall set you free.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I have a few final remarks concerning schedule B. One of the many weaknesses is that when you have a co-insurance type of policy, it opens up, among the insurance companies, so-called "competition." All this means is extra spending for advertising and it is the person promoting the policy and the insurance companies themselves that are going to get the benefit from co-insurance. It is amazing to hear the hon. Minister of Health admit that he did not think that deterrents did any good, because this is the specious argument that the insurance companies use—that it does do something good.

Obviously, the hon. Minister does not believe the insurance companies himself, and yet he is giving them a great big assist in trying to foist on the public a policy that is definitely not in the public interest. And even though some person might be persuaded, by high pressure tactics that some of the companies use in selling this type of policy, in the long run the average person who buys a co-insurance policy is taken in. He is a sucker, and in the long run, in the vast majority of these policies, they are definitely bad for the public. I see more—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member suggesting that the people of Ontario are stupid?

Mr. Trotter: I say that there is a sucker born every minute and you are helping the insurance companies hook their suckers when you allow these co-insurance policies to go out. They are just filled with small print that removes any possible value to the buyer from the policy. They are definitely weighted in favour of the insurance companies and it is most unfortunate that we have not only recognized this type of policy in principle, but even under this schedule B, that we allow such an item as the 80 per cent to remain in the schedule. It is certainly a disservice to the public of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment—

Mr. Renwick: I have one question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman. Will he give us the assurance that no portion of the group of people who are going to be partially subsidized will be required to take a standard co-insurance contract in lieu of a standard contract?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, before I answer that, may I repeat the question as I heard it:

Will the Minister give the House assurance that no one who will be subsidized in whole or in part by the government will be required to take a co-insurance contract?

I can give the hon. member that assurance, sir, absolutely.

Mr. Sopha: Could I ask one further question of the hon. Minister?

Since this is not to come into effect until June 1, 1966, we are told, would the hon. Minister assure us that in the interstice, all of the debates concerning this will be studied from the point of view of possible improvement?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the debates are already under study.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment, will please say "aye."

All those opposed, will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

Clerk of the House: While we are waiting, Mr. Chairman, I now have the redraft of clause 4 of schedule A, prepared by the solicitor as follows:

Services with respect to conditions that, in the opinion of a physician are not detrimental to the health of a covered person, including services for cosmetic purposes only.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment, please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment, please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays" 38.

Mr. Chairman: I declare that schedule B stands as part of the bill.

Shall the bill, as amended, be reported?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the question now before the committee is whether or not the bill shall be reported. I would like to

submit to the committee that it should not be reported. I am not now discussing the principle of the bill, and I do not intend to do that, for that matter, unfortunately has already been determined and is no longer open to discussion.

I merely wish to take the principle as given and to submit to this House that even within the terms of what we regard as a very inadequate principle, the detailed execution in the provisions of this bill are so inadequate as to leave us in the position where the only humane thing we can do is to let the bill die on the order paper right now, and give it a decent burial.

During the course of this committee discussion, which has extended over several days, many most disturbing facts have come to light as to the inadequacies within the bill, within its own framework. So much so that even the *Globe and Mail* was moved to protest that, as it said in an editorial of June 11, that we—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order or a point of information, I just wonder how far, Mr. Chairman, you are going to permit this debate to go on this motion.

Mr. MacDonald: This is in order. There is a motion before the House.

Mr. Bryden: I assume, Mr. Chairman, that you will permit it for as long as it is in order. Certainly what I have been saying up until now—

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Chairman, I was asking for your ruling on it, not the hon. member's.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would suggest that, as long as the argument pertains to the actual reporting of the bill, it is in order, but I am questioning how an argument can be carried very long without going into other subjects. I am sure that any remarks you make must deal specifically with a question of reporting this bill.

Mr. Bryden: I fully appreciate what you have said, sir. I agree with you that we are now discussing the question as to whether or not the bill shall be reported. I am suggesting that it should not, and I am trying to give reasons why it should not be reported. I was merely indicating that it is not only we in this House, but people throughout the province, who have been appalled to discover exactly what is involved in this bill, even within its own limited principles, to the point where even the *Globe and Mail*, which though generally independent in

its outlook tends to support the government, was moved to say, "It now turns out that we and the people of Ontario, have been naive." It said that "we," that is the *Globe and Mail*, and the people of Ontario, were naive in accepting the bill at its face value. The detailed examination of the bill brought to light many facts which had not been appreciated by most people in Ontario. Now that the people of Ontario appreciate those facts fully I am satisfied that they are overwhelmingly against this bill, and for that reason I think it should not be reported.

Mr. Chairman, in order to summarize as briefly as possible my position in this matter, I have drawn up what I am calling a bill of indictment against the detailed provisions of Bill No. 136. This bill of indictment includes 11 points, succinctly stated, outlining the inadequacies of the detailed provisions of the bill. I think it would be useful to the House at this stage.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, surely this has gone beyond the area defined by you a few moments ago? This has now entered the realm of partisan politics.

Mr. MacDonald: What are you up for?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It has nothing to do with completing technical procedures. All the debate is finished. The reporting of the bill is a procedural matter and it does not lend itself, as you indicated, to any debate beyond—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think a frivolous objection of that kind is worthy of consideration. I do not know what we are engaged in in this House from day to day, and at all stages, if it is not partisan politics. Naturally, we are each trying to put forward our point of view to the public. If the gentlemen on the other side will restrain themselves for a couple of minutes, I think I can summarize quite succinctly my reasons why this bill has been revealed to be so inadequate in its detailed provisions that it ought not to be reported.

As I indicated, I have summarized the points that are inadequate in what I have called a bill of indictment, including 11 points. This, I may say, is illustrative rather than exhaustive. I am sure that other hon. members could add other points to it, but I will be satisfied with these points. Taken together, I think they are fatal to the bill.

1. No provision at all is made for the large number of people who will not qualify for government subsidy and yet will not be able

to afford the high cost coverage available from private carriers.

Mr. McKeough: This is the principle of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: 2. The provision that a private carrier must make a standard contract available to anyone applying for it is unenforceable. Thus there is no guarantee that people not in the subsidized groups—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I believe that all these matters have been discussed throughout the various clauses of the bill. As long as their reference was to the reporting of the bill, something outside of this House, something apart from the discussion, you could be talking about the advisability of not reporting the bill. As soon as you deal with the details, the deficiencies of, or what is contained or not contained in the bill, you are definitely out of order.

All in favour of the reporting of the bill—

Mr. Bryden: No, just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I will accept your ruling. I think it is extremely narrow, I think it should be in order to summarize our basic objections, but I agree that this is a very difficult matter on which to rule and if it is your ruling that what I have been saying is not in order, I will accept your ruling.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): But you will rearrange the words?

Mr. Bryden: No, I am not going to rearrange the words; I am merely going to say that I have drawn up these 11 points in which I think that—

Mr. Chairman: Order! The 11 points are out of order.

Mr. Bryden: There is nothing out of order about them. They constitute my reasons for opposing the reporting of the bill. I think it would have been useful if I could have refreshed the memory of the House by enumerating these gross inadequacies of the bill. If that is out of order, I will not attempt to do so. I will merely issue them outside of the House, since I cannot do it inside the House.

However, I would emphasize once again, Mr. Chairman, that the objections to the bill in its detailed provisions, apart altogether from its principle, are so serious that the bill should not be reported.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the bill be reported?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine. I realize the limitations which are on me, that I am not able to outline in detail many of the points which have shown the inadequacy of this bill. I may say, sir, for my part and for the part of my party, that there has been a steady stream of letters coming in, not only to my office but, I know, to many of the hon. members' offices—letters from people who had hoped that they were getting health coverage, and letters expressing shock at the type of bill on which you are now asking us to vote. Many of these letters have said that they understood that we had Medicare, and that the government was proposing something of a broad coverage, and people suggesting that they feel that this bill is so leaky, so full of holes, that it does not wear. I will be very glad to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I most certainly did not get to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Would it be 200?

Mr. Thompson: I have not added them but I will say it would take me some time to add them, and I will get a great many more. I may need some kind of computer system to add them, but let me tell you that this bill, and the discussion, is naturally of concern to all the people across this province. They have followed it with a great deal of interest.

Before I sit down I am going to say one word, through you, sir, to the hon. Minister of Health: Knowing his fiery Scottish temper, and realizing the indefensible position he was in in connection with pushing this kind of tattered bill through the House, I want to compliment him on the fact that I do not think he lost his temper once. He showed patience. But I sympathize with him being put in this position, because always in the back of my mind has been the thought that he was a reformist, and I think this was a most uncomfortable position—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am a reformist.

Mr. Thompson: —for a man such as this to have had to stand up here and defend what is indefensible.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of reporting the bill, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the bill being reported will please rise.

All those opposed will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "yeas" are 38, the "nays" 21.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance, with certain amendments, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance and certain amendments, and asks for leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker: The committee of the whole House begs to report Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance, with certain amendments, and asks for leave to sit again. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): No, Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the committee of the whole House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

That the Bill No. 136 be referred back to the committee with instructions that it has the power to consider and make recommendations to further amend the bill to provide:

(1) That government support according to an appropriate sliding scale be made available to provide standard contracts to those whose taxable income does not exceed \$3,000 per year, and;

(2) that all residents of the province be entitled to receive standard contracts from the Minister of Health upon voluntary payment by them of appropriate contributions as determined by the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make two brief comments with regard to this. I am not going to discuss the amendments we have dealt with or the principle of the bill which has been adopted by the House, but I think there is one serious inadequacy of this bill within the framework as it is now establish. Since the government has agreed to pay subsidies only up to \$1,000 taxable income, this simply means that a great number of people in the upper ranges of that

\$1,000 and just beyond it simply are not going to be able to buy insurance.

You will have the kind of experience you had in Alberta where 15 per cent of those who needed it most, were not able to buy it. The Hall commission report said a person should have something in excess of \$5,000 to be able to buy his own insurance.

An hon. member: Do you believe that?

Mr. MacDonald: Right, and they, I think, had some authoritative studies on it. What you are going to do is to force everybody beyond \$3,700 to buy his own.

So we suggest that we should raise that sliding scale up to \$3,000 taxable income, and this will meet the point that was authoritatively documented in the Hall commission.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you that this government has violated one of its basic principles—that this plan is voluntary. Therefore, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who wants to pay to the government, through the division that The Department of Health is establishing under the Ontario hospital services commission, the amount designated for the standard policy, should be able to get that standard policy encroachment in exactly the same way as this government is going to give it, wholly subsidized or partially subsidized.

In other words, if you really believe your voluntary principle, let anybody who makes that payment to that division of The Department of Health, be entitled to get the coverage in the same way as those who are going to be partially or wholly subsidized.

These are two points within the framework of the principle of this bill, and our suggestion is that it should go back to the committee of the whole House to consider these two points, to consider amendments which would implement them, so that the bill, inadequate as it is, will be somewhat less inadequate before it goes into law.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, before this is called to a vote, I would just like to say on behalf of this party we support the motion moved by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party. We have gone, admittedly, over and over the various points of this bill, and I can well understand that the hon. member has made the motion he has merely to underline the fact that the people that we need to help the most, once we have covered this 1.8 million people, are being ignored. That, in essence, there are thousands of people in the province of Ontario who are not going to be helped one

little bit by this Bill 136. It has been a bill that, in essence, has put up a big front, but behind it there is little substance.

Many of the people who now appear on the surface likely to get some help are already covered by welfare. It is the people as a whole, spread across the board who need a decent minimum protection at as small a premium as possible. That is what is needed, and if this bill is referred back these problems can once more be gone into because, as we have discussed the bill, we have seen good amendments time after time go down to defeat. It only means that the people of this province are not being served as they should be.

And if, as the hon. member for York South has said, this bill is reconsidered, we can once again go into this problem of those people who are the aged, the people who are ill, who are obviously going to have to pay a much higher premium than even we at first thought. We thought maybe the maximum, which was shocking enough at \$180, would be the top. We now find that it is obviously going to be much higher than that for many people who can least afford to pay.

An hon. member: Who says so?

Mr. Trotter: Well, because the hon. Minister is afraid to tell us how much the premium is going to be, it is quite obvious to say it could be \$250. I agree on all-fours with this. So again in summation I ask the House to support the motion of the hon. member for York South in order that we can do as best we can in clearing up this bill which I think has been a shady deal for the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: I have grave doubts really that this amendment, which is more of notice of instruction, is in order—that is, for this particular stage of the bill, although I do have the notice of motion on the votes and proceedings as submitted by the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) regarding these two provisions as mentioned in this amendment for the required 48 hours. Perhaps this hybrid amendment should also require this much notice.

However, I am not going to be technical at this time, and will proceed with putting the motion as moved by Mr. MacDonald.

All those in favour of the motion will please say “aye.”

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if it is properly before the House then is it not properly debatable?

Mr. Speaker: I thought perhaps it should have 48 hours' notice.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is just an amendment to a motion. It is an amendment to a motion to adopt the report of the committee.

Mr. Speaker: But I understand that this is an instruction that Bill No. 136 be referred back to the committee with instructions; so I thought it was sort of an instruction, a notice of instruction, as well as being partly an amendment.

Mr. Bryden: But we have previously moved, without notice, amendments to committee reports. I do not mean to report from the committee of the whole House, but from standing committees—to refer back with instructions to do certain things—and it was always considered to be in order then, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I considered this a further stage because I had already received notice of instruction before; I thought that this was a further stage of that notice as it was washed out by not having the 48 hours' notice.

Mr. Bryden: We understood that we could not move that motion in that context; but I believe, sir, that it is in order to move it here as an amendment to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I am accepting it.

Mr. Bryden: I would like, if you will permit, sir, to make a couple of comments in regard to this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Bryden: I am happy to hear that the hon. gentlemen opposite look forward to my comments with such enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker: I think an extremely strong case can be made with regard to both the specific amendments which, we are suggesting here, the committee of the whole House should be asked to make. With regard to the first one, proposing that subsidization in part should be available up to a limit of \$3,000 taxable income rather than \$1,000, it covers a point which, I think, has concerned a great many people both inside this House and outside.

We are concerned, as I believe many are, with the substantial group of people who, shall we say, fall between two stools. Their incomes are not low enough to qualify for subsidization under the bill as it now stands,

and yet they will undoubtedly not be able to afford the full cost of standard contracts as provided by the insurance industry.

Take, for example, a family of husband and wife and two children with an income of \$3,900 per year. That would give them a taxable income on standard exemptions of \$1,200. It would just exclude them from subsidization; they would have to pay at least \$180 a year for a standard contract, possibly even more. We submit that such a family cannot afford that amount. Even a family with the same number of children making, shall we say, \$3,500 a year, under the present plan of the hon. Minister would probably have to pay about \$160 for a standard contract. The degree of subsidization the government would provide would be only \$20, roughly; I do not have the exact figures.

I submit that a family of four earning only \$3,500 a year cannot afford \$160 for a standard medical insurance contract. If the government would see fit to consent to the instruction posed here to the committee, then I think we could eliminate that problem to a considerable degree. It would mean that the sliding scale would be levelled out, spread over not \$1,200 of taxable income, but \$3,000. Thus, taking the example I gave before, a family of four could earn up to \$5,700 a year before it would be disqualified from subsidization. It could earn up to, shall we say, about \$4,400 a year and still get 50 per cent subsidization. That is realistic; that is related to some degree to the capacity of these people to pay.

As the bill stands now, there is a substantial group of people in the middle low income bracket who are going to be left out in the cold. In fact, they will be worse off than merely being left out in the cold because they will be required, through their taxes, to contribute to the subsidization of standard contracts for other people and yet will not be able to afford them for themselves. I think that the hon. Minister—I know that the government has pretty well closed its mind to any further suggestions, but I think that this is a suggestion it should consider. It has been the first opportunity we have had to put it before the House. This would, I think, eliminate what I would call a serious inequity and one which I think the hon. gentlemen opposite should be prepared to regard, themselves, as a serious inequity.

As to the second point in the amendment, it would empower the committee to make a detailed amendment which would implement in part what the hon. Minister himself said is the intention of the bill. He said the

intention is to make this similar to The Hospital Services Insurance Act. Under The Hospital Services Insurance Act, anybody can go to the government agency, the OHSC, and buy hospital insurance coverage. A great many people do not have to go to that agency but they may go to it. We are suggesting that the same should be true here.

A branch of The Department of Health which will be in charge of the administration of standard contracts for subsidized groups. We are suggesting here that the powers of that division should be expanded so that it could sell standard contracts also to other people who apply for them voluntarily. There would be no compulsion about it. But if they applied, it could make such contracts available to them. Thus those people could, in the exercise of their freedom of choice, to which the hon. gentlemen opposite claim to attach such importance, buy from the government agency or from a private carrier, whichever they wished.

I would suggest that this amendment would have two beneficial effects, as far as the bill as a whole is concerned. First of all, it would broaden the group covered by the medical services division of The Department of Health. We on this side have objected that, as things now stand, the medical services division is being asked to provide standard contracts to a group that consists almost entirely of bad risks. If this amendment were adopted, it would make it possible for that division to bring in also some good risks so that it may be able to reduce the rate below the \$180 the hon. Minister has talked about. I think it provides the division with a method of diversifying its risks just as, to a certain degree, a similar provision in The Hospital Services Insurance Act has permitted diversification under that Act.

Second, there is the whole question of the regulation of premiums charged by private insurance companies. We have suggested that the detailed provision of the bill on that point is ineffective and I am convinced that is true. It is going to be difficult to apply an effective maximum; but there is another way of handling this problem, Mr. Chairman, which has been tried in other contexts in other countries, and that is to set up a public carrier in competition with private carriers. It then becomes a sort of a balance wheel which regulates rates through the force of competition, thus making less necessary the exercise of compulsory powers. And in view of the difficulty of setting maxima, it seems to me that there is a lot to be said for the idea of having a public agency which will be

in the market along with the private carriers, offering standard contracts—I would suggest that it would not offer anything else—in competition with the private carriers. Then we will have a pretty good way of finding out whether the rates established by the private carriers are too high. If they are, perhaps legislative action may be necessary, but indeed it may be unnecessary because the mere existence of the public carrier undercutting the rates of private carriers will have a strong influence in bringing those rates down.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit that these two amendments, which we suggest the committee should have the power to make, would greatly improve this bill without altering its basic principle. The government is wedded to the principle; the House by majority vote has decided on that principle. All we are trying to do here is to improve the implementation of that principle. I think that both these proposals are constructive in that direction. I would hope that the government would seriously consider them, rather than merely dismiss them out of hand and use its majority to vote them down.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I would think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be made abundantly clear that, in supporting this amendment along with my hon. friends to the left, we are not in any way abandoning the recommendation of the Hall report—

Mr. Bryden: Nor are we.

Mr. Sopha:—that the fund for health care ought to be subsidized rather than the individual. I take it the amendment is drawn in the fashion that it is, because it must be consistent with the principle of the bill which this House has adopted and I think the record should be clear that we are not departing from—

Mr. MacDonald: Our earlier amendment at second reading contained these points—if it had been accepted.

Mr. Sopha: I feel, Mr. Speaker, without elaboration, that to subsidize the individual gives rise to too many bureaucratic nightmares and makes the whole thing administratively impossible. I have the greatest assurance that a year from now—well, not quite a year, about ten months from now—the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), after he has considered this over a long period of time, is going to be back here with substantial amendments to this Act before it goes into force because the intelligent

bureaucracy with which this province is blessed will soon see that this Act is impossible to administer in its present form.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment proposed by Mr. MacDonald that Bill No. 136 be referred back to the committee of the whole House, please say “aye.”

All those opposed, please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the “nays” have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the amendment will please rise.

As many as are opposed to the amendment please rise.

YEAS	NAYS
Bryden	Carruthers
Bukator	Cecile
Davison	Connell
Farquhar	Cowling
Freeman	Dunlop
Gisborn	Dymond
Gordon	Gomme
Lewis	Grossman
(Scarborough West)	Guindon
MacDonald	Harris
Nixon	Henderson
Oliver	Hodgson
Paterson	(Victoria)
Reaume	Johnston
Renwick	(Carleton)
Singer	Kerr
Sopha	Knox
Taylor	Lawrence
Thompson	(Russell)
Trotter	McKeough
Troy	Noden
Worton—21.	Olde
	Pittock
	Price
	Randall
	Reilly
	Reuter
	Roberts
	Rollins
	Root
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Simonett
	Spooner
	Stewart
	Walker
	Wardrope
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Whitney
	Wishart
	Yaremko—40.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 21, the "nays" are 40.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Next order of business.

Clerk of the House: The 55th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

On vote 701:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think we were talking, sir, about medical research when the estimates closed previously. I would like to add a few more statements in connection with medical research if I could and I am just going to quote from the Royal Bank of Canada weekly letter of February 1965, and I quote:

Research should not be allowed to lag. Canada's expenditure on medical research through the medical research council in 1964-65 is \$6.9 million. On the basis of gross national product compared relatively with the United States it would be \$90 million and on the basis of relative population, it would be \$126 million.

If I could quote from the Hall commission report, on page 106:

Total expenditures on health research in Canada in 1962, was \$16.5 million. Of this the province of Ontario contributed \$400,000.

From *Medical Education in Canada*, by J. A. MacFarlane, and I quote:

A practice which is carried out in the United States and has found some support in Canada is to permit the medical undergraduate at the end of his first or second year to suspend his medical course for one year and to work instead as a research assistant. He may take some collateral course work. This year entitles him to receive a bachelor's degree in science and this practice should be encouraged for it promises to lead its participants into an academic life and to increase the number of teacher-scientists who will come from our medical schools.

Just following on with this article that was published:

The support of medical research by

government is more liberal in the United States than in any other country and this is reflected in the award of the Nobel prize in medicine given 38 times, and Canada has won it only once.

I would like to make another comparison. In Sweden, in 1959, with a population of 7,000,000, they made \$16.5 million available in government funds for medical research. In Sweden investigators have obtained the Nobel prize in medicine eight times compared with only once in Canada.

In Britain £8,000,000 or more was made available for medical research, and significantly this exceeds greatly the federal support in Canada; and the Nobel prize in medicine has been awarded to British scientists 26 times.

When I sat down previously after discussing these estimates, I had been suggesting, sir, that we should be trying in every way that we could to get recognition through medical scientists. It will be my hope, and I offer it to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), that in some way we should strike a medal which should be presented for significant scientific research in Ontario. I would like to go back again to Dr. MacFarlane's suggestion, and that is young students studying medicine may have a year in which they would work in laboratories in order that they might be attracted into scientific studies.

Taking another, from Dr. McReary, dean of the faculty of medicine at the University of British Columbia, who says that:

In Canada we felt the additional impact of subsidization of students in the physical sciences but not in the health sciences. As a result of this subsidization of one branch of science, we in Canada have felt the drain of able students away from medicine more keenly than most countries.

I have figures on this. For example, from the DBS figures, federal government expenditures on scientific activities for the fiscal year 1962-63 show \$132,726,000 in physical sciences, and when you look at the medical sciences it was \$10,911,000. In the 1964-65 estimates, \$179,120,000 in physical sciences and in medical sciences \$13,112,000.

I have a feeling that you may feel that I am suggesting that the province should take over the whole of research. I am not doing this in any way. I listened very carefully to the point that the hon. Minister of Health made about an Ontario research council being set up similar to the Quebec medical research council. I think that the argument he raised

against this has validity in that he was suggesting that this is just another step and is not providing broad coverage. I have not seen the *Hansard*, but I understood that you had suggested, as well, that the reason Quebec set up a research council is that Quebec does not take research funds from Ottawa.

If you did say that, I would suggest that is inaccurate. In 1963-64, approximately \$1.5 million was granted by the medical research council to Quebec universities, including Laval, the University of Montreal and McGill. So that particular argument I do not think is valid.

I can see the point you were making about Ontario having its own research council while this is just another step, another layer.

On the other hand, when I raised this it seemed to me that there are regions in Ontario, not only geographical regions but regions of activity in which we could be doing research studies which we would be able to see more readily than they would in Ottawa. For that reason I still throw that suggestion out to you, to have a look at the idea of an Ontario research council.

From my own point of view, we see the outflow of medical students going to the United States. I think that you mentioned to me and I am sure with the medical insurance bill being debated—and I do not have the *Hansard*—I got the impression that you said there was a flow of graduate students coming back into Ontario again.

I therefore got the figures on the number of Canadians who are working and studying in the United States. According to a publication of the federal Department of Labour, in 1964-65 there were approximately 223 Canadians doing graduate work in the health sciences in the United States. I would like to re-emphasize that point: 223 Canadians are doing graduate work in the United States. In addition there were about 80 Canadian undergraduates in the health sciences in the United States. From these federal Department of Labour statistics, it is assumed that about one-third of the total number were from Ontario.

I would suggest, sir, that in view of the remarks that I have made that we have got to be doing far more in Ontario to encourage medical science and to encourage research. I suggest that this is particularly pertinent now with the fact that the grants which we were getting from the Ford foundation and other charitable organizations are now going to go to underdeveloped countries. I am convinced there is a gap in that area in itself, and I am also convinced that in

medicine we are not giving enough recognition to young people to go into scientific research. We are not exciting them with the drama of the test tube warfare and I would hope, as I said before, that the hon. Minister would encourage them, through awards as well as through further grants—and that also, when he goes to Ottawa to the coming conference, he will be putting forward a further firm approach to try to get more research grants for Ontario.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, we did stop at the question of research when we rose the other day, and I had very complete figures at the time.

The total figure that we spend here in the province on research is actually \$5,316,250—made up of \$3,365,250 in provincial funds and \$1,951,000 in federal funds. This includes research in almost the total spectrum of health services: alcoholism, drug addiction, the cancer foundation and institute, mental health research, maternal and child health, medical rehabilitation of crippled children, tuberculosis research and then, in general, public health.

This does not, Mr. Chairman, take any account of the capital funds we provide for research building, and I do not believe that I am in a position to tell you what they would be. They are not always as high as you might expect, but they are likely to be higher because, in keeping with the opinions of the late director of the Canada medical research council, we agreed that the provincial responsibility should be the provision of buildings and facilities. Nonetheless, there is a continuing programme of clinical research and this is quite active in respect of mental health research, Mr. Chairman. The programme is now co-ordinated by a prototype—if you will—of the proposal made by the hon. leader of the Opposition that we have an Ontario medical research council—the medical advisory council to the Ontario mental health research foundation, as of course has each of the other two foundations, namely, alcoholism and other addictions, and the cancer research foundation, has its own medical research council. There might be some validity to the argument that all these three should be brought together but each seems to feel that its area of interest lies in a particular sphere, and that it is well served by having its own medical advisory group.

The hon. member has mentioned something that certainly does concern us a very great deal. Over the past year, particularly, we have done fairly considerable research into the matter of figures, namely, these people,

graduates of our medical schools particularly, leaving out province, leaving our nation—the so-called “brain drain.” It was rather surprising to find that only 64 per cent of the students registered at Canadian medical schools are Canadian students; 36 per cent are, in the first instance, from other places. Of course, they are likely to go back to their homeland. Eleven per cent, for instance, are from the UK, and Commonwealth countries; 24 per cent are from the United States. I do not know whether this is a compliment to Ontario and Canada or not, or whether it points up the fact that we are better situated to provide places in medical schools, or our medical school courses are more attractive to students from other nations than are their own. One per cent comes from other countries. So this, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

I understand it is very hard for a student to get into a medical school; there is a far greater demand than there are actual facilities to teach doctors. Does that mean to say that 24 per cent of the medical students in Ontario are from the United States? Surely not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, this is not in Ontario, but I presume Ontario would likely be comparable to the other provinces; 24 per cent of the medical students in Canadian medical schools are from the United States. This is 1964-65.

Mr. Trotter: Surely it cannot be that bad. Mind you, Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility, I think, as a country to educate people, especially from the underdeveloped areas, but I think it is ridiculous if our schools are allowing 24 per cent to be Americans who have their own funds, their own schools. I do not care if those students are the sons of doctors who were from Canada originally or not, but surely that cannot be right. If it is, we should step in and stop it. It is a disgrace if that is the case.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These figures come from federal sources, so I would have really little reason to question them. But the fact does remain that we always have educated a fairly substantial number.

Mr. Trotter: But not in the case of the United States. If it was from Africa, that is another thing.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. member anything to back up his statement? You just cannot stand up and say—

Mr. Trotter: No, no, the hon. Minister is telling me this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are many Canadian students who by choice go to universities outside of Canada. Every Canadian student studying medicine, or any of the other professions, does not automatically study in Canada. He may go to the United States, he may go abroad, he may go to any one of a number of countries. There are no geographic boundaries to education. If some of ours go to other countries to be educated, it is only reasonable to expect some of them here.

Why I pointed this up, Mr. Chairman, was simply to show that the whole picture of this so-called brain drain needs to be looked at totally before we decide that a great many of our Canadian graduates are going to the United States.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, in view of the hon. Minister's remark about this high percentage from the United States studying in Canadian or Ontario medical schools, I am thinking of the shortage of doctors. The Canadian medical association had set as its goal the training of 1,500 physicians a year. From 1945 to 1962, Ontario produced about 37 per cent of all the doctors in Canada, and this means that Ontario should take as its goal the graduation of 555 doctors every year. This is absolutely necessary to meet the minimum standards required for adequate health care for everybody.

Now, if you look at the records—from 1960 to 1961, there were 297 doctors graduating from the four Ontario medical schools; in 1961-62 this number increased to 312 and in 1962-63 it dropped back to 303. This is approximately 250 doctors a year less than we need in Ontario. And what is being done about this? I raise this because the hon. Minister is saying that he is permitting this large number of students coming from the United States, who, he says, in all probability will go back there.

Last year, for example, there were 880 applications for the first professional year of medicine at the four Ontario medical schools. Of the 880, only 171 or 19.4 per cent were accepted. Is it possible that over 80 per cent of the applicants were unqualified? Well, Mr. Chairman, I think not. I think that frankly this government is being remiss in its responsibilities to provide the best health possible to the people of Ontario.

With my colleague, the hon. member for Parkdale, I am rather shocked at this fact, where we have this shortage of medical

schools, to know that such a high percentage are being used for the training of doctors who you know will be returning to the United States.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister—he mentioned the fact that there are young people who leave Ontario and go and study in the States and then come back to Canada to practise—could he tell us what proportion last year of the number of doctors who started practice here had their training in the United States?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot. This is an area where The Department of Health up until the present time, has not yet had any responsibility, apart from an overriding responsibility to be concerned about the provision of adequate numbers and adequate quality of trained staff. But we are doing studies in this area now, and I would say we are following these matters up quite steadily.

I would, however, point out that—again quoting from the federal government figures—from the year 1961 to 1965 the physicians in active practice have steadily increased. It was 8,040 in 1961 and in 1965 the number is 8,702. In a population-per-physician ratio, in 1961 it was one doctor to 776 population, and in 1965 practically the same, one doctor to 773 population.

I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition must understand, of course, as I know he does, that you cannot start developing or producing doctors overnight.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced what the province of Ontario had decided to do, and this planning is going forward. Four of the universities—the four existing medical schools—have already signified their intention to increase their enrolment of first-year students, and active planning is going forward for the development of an entirely new medical school, something that has not taken place in Ontario since 1951.

Not only is that going forward, but I understand that within The Department of University Affairs, and coming within the purview of the departmental committee concerned with these things, there is discussion already, before the one that is at least approved in principle has begun to build, about where the next medical school will be. So there is not any question but that this matter is very much before us actively. I repeat, while we have no legislative or delegated authority, we are taking this interest to ensure that there will be adequate numbers of doctors, dentists and other necessary health workers.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 14, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, June 14, 1965

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	4113
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	4139

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

On vote 701:

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, when we rose at the dinner hour, I believe that I may very well have led the hon. members astray with an answer I gave. I believe I may have left the impression that 36 per cent of our students in Canadian medical schools were of foreign extraction. This is not right. It is 36 per cent of the applicants for the first year. The number of students originating from outside of Canada and graduating from our medical schools in Ontario is just about five per cent, but the number applying for first-year placement in our schools is 36 per cent.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister could tell us how many of those in our schools, actually attending, are from the United States? You told us 24 per cent and surely that must be wrong; I hope it is.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I just explained. That is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and my deputy pointed out that this was the impression I left. There are not 24 per cent attending. Thirty-six per cent of all those applying for entrance as freshmen to our medical schools are of foreign origin, but the number who are admitted and finally graduate from our medical schools amount to five per cent. This is not further broken down in our records, relative to medical manpower. We do not know the country of their origin, whether they go back to the country of their origin and how many remain practising in Canada—but this is a very marked difference, between five per cent and 24 per cent.

Mr. Trotter: I am glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman, because I think two points are important on this. I realize as a country or as a province, whichever way you want to look at it, in comparison with the rest of the world, we have a great deal of responsibility to help

people who are from the so-called have-not nations. I for one do not object that our taxpayers would subsidize them, for let us face it, anybody who goes to university, whether taking a medical course or any other course, is being subsidized by the taxpayers. I do not object to someone from the have-not nations being treated in this way, because I realize this education, particularly for doctors, must be transported across our borders.

But I think our government should watch, and particularly the province of Ontario should watch and encourage the registrars in universities to watch, the registration of students from the United States. It is not that I am anti-American, but I realize that the Americans have a great many of their own colleges which are outstanding and their taxpayers are in a position to subsidize their own students. We are not in a position to subsidize American students, unless they are some individuals who are particularly outstanding and who are going to offer a great deal to medicine as a whole. But usually when they are that young we do not know.

There is the danger that many of our own Canadian boys and girls will not be able to get into medical school simply because we do not have the space for them. Therefore it would be of deep concern, if we were going to have a number of Americans whose fathers were originally Canadians. We all know that if a doctor has gone to a certain medical school here in Canada, his children often get preference. If he can say his father is a graduate of Queen's or the U of T, or something like that, the student gets the preference, even though the father lives across the border.

I think that we, as Canadians, should be most particular on who attends our colleges, because we have a responsibility, not only to medicine as a whole, but we have a responsibility to the Canadian taxpayer in a hard-boiled economic sense, and we have a responsibility simply in the patriotic sense. I think that too long have we been easy-going in this matter and I would hope that the hon. Minister would check into this question, as to how many Americans are

actually attending our universities, often on the grounds that their fathers attended our medical schools.

If there was all kinds of space there would be no question, but the important thing is that if a Canadian boy or girl wants to attend our schools, we should go out of our way to see to it he has the opportunity. We cannot control where he would go afterwards. I am not suggesting we do, except that by our example, by trying to stir up interest and enthusiasm, both in a medical sense and in a patriotic sense, we keep them in Canada, and more particularly from our own point of view, we keep them in the province of Ontario. But it would be ridiculous—

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Nonsense!

Mr. Trotter: Someone is saying "nonsense." But I again repeat—

Mr. McKeough: Let us keep them in Canada.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): That is not someone, that is the hon member for Kent West.

Mr. Trotter: But again I repeat, we want to keep them in Canada, and preferably in the province of Ontario. Certainly if the taxpayers are paying for them, we want to build up our own province. It only stands to reason.

Mr. McKeough: We want to build up Canada.

Mr. Trotter: And I, as a person in the province of Ontario, would be glad to see them spread throughout Canada. Again as I have said on a number of occasions, it is important that we have, if possible, a lend-lease system where we send them throughout the world. This is part of our social responsibility. But we, in the Ontario Legislature, have a first duty to the province of Ontario and it is a sad thing either when we see the brain drain caused by their leaving the province, or again when we are educating individuals, particularly from the United States, who we know are going to return there.

After all, many of the Canadian-born doctors who are now practising in the United States have more or less heard the siren call to the Yankee dollar, and to them we do not have any responsibility. The taxpayer has subsidized their education. Our responsibility is to the people here in Ontario. I think we should go out of our way to see to it that

the registrars of our universities bear in mind, and our hon. Minister of Health bears in mind, that Ontario scholars have first choice. I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister of Health would analyze his figures and give us, probably at some future date, to what extent the breakdown is of the non-Canadian students attending our medical schools.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I think the main office estimate is the appropriate estimate on which to deal with topics that relate to a number of bills that fall within the jurisdiction of The Department of Health. I would like to make a few comments and ask a few questions with regard to The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act.

Mr. Chairman: What item would this be?

Mr. MacDonald: I just explained that I thought the main office would be the appropriate place to deal with issues relating to legislation that comes under The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it actually is not listed under any vote because you do not support it, but it does come within the purview of the division of environmental sanitation, which is vote 711, if the hon. member would not mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine. Thank you.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on vote 701, I wonder if the hon. Minister could give a full report to the House at this time of the total number of individuals placed under The Homes for Special Care Act to the middle of 1965, and then a precise breakdown by Ontario hospitals through the province? The hon. Minister did say in reply to a question earlier this session that he would do so at the time of his estimates, and I for one should be very much interested to know where we stand.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The total number, Mr. Chairman, in nursing homes is 914 patients—these are bedridden patients. Sixteen are from Goderich, 26 from Brockville, 234 from London, eight from Owen Sound, 36 from North Bay, 40 from Hamilton, 107 from Toronto, 187 from New Toronto, 19 from Orillia, 63 from Kingston, 73 from St. Thomas, 69 from Whitby, and 36 from Penetang. In addition to that, the total number of patients on probation, that is in approved boarding homes, is an additional 713. Unfortunately, I cannot give the hon.

member the breakdown of whence they came by hospital. The resident ambulatory patients who have been discharged from the hospital and put in residential accommodation under homes for special care is 774. These persons are decertified. Again, I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member the hospital of origin of these 1,487 people. The total is 2,223.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, if I am to understand properly, Mr. Chairman, those patients whom the hon. Minister has referred to as in boarding home care—have never been in the overall figures given in various reports. They have never been considered part of the patient complement within the hospital itself. You always made this distinction on other occasions as I recall.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have, Mr. Chairman, but in the report they have always been included in the patient load.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have just one other question to ask the hon. Minister. What is the rated bed capacity of Kingston Ontario hospital?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wonder if the hon. member would mind taking that up under vote 713.

Mr. S. Lewis: All right, I shall not pursue it. I would like to make a couple of points, in view of the hon. Minister's response, Mr. Chairman, which I think are reasonably important. It is very difficult to establish the precise number or percentage of patients who are presently in Ontario mental hospitals, and who should be, according to the analysis made, in nursing homes or in alternative type accommodation in order to increase the continuing treatment capacity of the Ontario hospitals themselves.

However, an effort has been made in that regard. An effort made in the Metropolitan Toronto mental care report in which the patient population was broken into five separate categories, the first two relating to active and continuing treatment, and the last three were as follows—continuing medical and nursing care, nursing care, and domiciliary care. Now, applying the last three to the total numbers in the three hospitals at Toronto, Whitby and New Toronto, we had an overall average of 47 per cent—almost half—that this study felt should not be there. They should, in fact, be in nursing homes under The Homes for Special Care Act, or in alternative accommodation.

Now, let us take a look at what that percentage translates itself into in some of the

major hospitals in the province of Ontario, and compare that with the numbers that have actually been moved according to the figures which the hon. Minister just gave the House. St. Thomas, rated at 1,850 beds: there should be roughly 900 patients who should be out of St. Thomas. So far the hon. Minister has moved 73—73 out of 900. Whitby, 1,500 total patient-load, 700 should not be there, the hon. Minister has moved 69. Hamilton, total patient-load 1,700, 800 should not be there, the hon. Minister has moved 40. Kingston, total rated capacity must be well over 1,000 and I suspect it is closer to 1,500, the total number moved so far, 73.

In other words, in some of the biggest Ontario hospitals, something between five and nine per cent of the actual number who should be moved out, have been moved out, and I remind the hon. Minister that The Homes for Special Care Act was enacted in 1964 and that he has had considerable time since to institute it. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the fact emerges transparently clear from all of this that it is not going to be possible to relieve the patient population at Ontario hospitals by way of The Homes for Special Care Act. Although it is within itself in a limited way, a worthy pursuit, it is not in fact an answer. I suspect that experience will have shown the hon. Minister that it is not, in fact, an answer. And why in one sense is it not an answer? Let us take one, or two of these hospitals. Kingston Ontario hospital where so far we have been able to remove only 70—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This whole matter comes under the mental health vote, 713. I grant you that homes for special care item is under vote 701. All of the remarks of the hon. member are being directed toward the specific hospitals, and this comes under vote 713.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, I am dealing directly with The Homes for Special Care Act.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member listen to a suggestion that, because most of what he has to say has to do with the hospitals, I would be quite prepared to carry this matter of the homes for special care over to vote 713 for full discussion? Would that meet with the approval of the hon. member?

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not got my information here for—

Mr. S. Lewis: You have your information, I take it, on the mental health branch?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I have.

Mr. McKeough: Be reasonable!

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. member for Kent West in his appealing and seductive voice urges me to be reasonable. I shall, under the circumstances, be reasonable. There is probably only one other person in the world, Mr. Chairman, who agrees with me that his voice is seductive. I shall withhold to vote 713 and make certain comments at that time.

Before I give up the floor on this particular issue, I wanted to discuss some of the reasons why homes under the homes for special care are difficult to find. Now, shall we postpone the entire discussion until a later vote, or do you want to—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Do you mind? We will take the whole thing at one time.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, then homes for special care shall be under mental health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Vote 713.

Mr. Trotter: I was wondering if the hon. Minister could tell us why, when under the public accounts for the year ending March 31, 1964, we had voted \$60,000 for bursaries for medical and dental undergraduates, and during the year we spent only \$29,000, leaving \$31,000 unexpended. What is the problem that we cannot use it up, seeing that we are so short of people in this field?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer is very simple, sir, there were not applicants for the bursaries.

Mr. Trotter: Has the hon. Minister made any inquiries why there were not people applying, because we know that a great number of students apply, but cannot even get into our schools, either for medicine or for dentists? Is it that all those who managed to get in, or the vast majority, have their own funds, or—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the answer is that there are funds available to students who want funds, without the return of service which we have written in, as a condition of our bursary.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, in previous years we have voted for the Ontario heart foundation \$150,000 and for Illalee lodge in Cobourg, \$4,800. They are no longer in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should recall that we voted that in supplementary estimates earlier in this session.

Mr. Trotter: Was it the same amount?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Exactly the same amount.

Mr. Trotter: I do not have the staff, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister has, and it is sometimes hard to keep track.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): If I might ask a question, Mr. Chairman. May I ask about bursaries for nurses who want to take a course for Bachelor of Nursing Science? Are there bursaries for such students?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Bursaries for which, sir?

Mr. Troy: Bursaries for those who want to take a course to become a Bachelor of Nursing Science. Are there bursaries for them?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I announced that in the remarks I made when I presented my estimates to the House.

Mr. Troy: I am sorry, sir, but for circumstances beyond my control, I was not here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Troy: From whom do I get the information? From which branch?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: From The Department of Health. You can discuss that under the hospital services commission.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, on February 12 of this year, approximately four months ago, the registered nurses association of Ontario presented the hon. Minister with a request for what they described as a nurses' collective bargaining Act. This was legislation designed to provide for collective bargaining in their profession. I believe the actual bill was prepared by their counsel, who is both a QC and an MD. I should think that is a combination of qualifications that would suit him peculiarly to the particular task he undertook.

I will confess that I am not necessarily up to date on all the latest developments, although I try to keep myself posted. At the time, I understood that the hon. Minister said that he would consider this request for the legislation concerned. I have not heard any recent comments from him as to what he plans to do. We are coming close, I assume, to the end of this session. I see no

notice on the order paper for such legislation. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what his intentions are.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this has no place in my estimates, since there is item dealing with registered nurses or diploma schools of nursing. But I will say to you, sir, that I stated to the nurses, as I stated to the House, that on receipt of the brief and proposed legislation, I would put it before the government. This I did; it is still before the government.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, there may not be any precise branch for this, but if the nurses of the province of Ontario do not fall within the aegis of the hon. Minister of Health, then he will be hard put to explain where they should be raised.

This legislation, or the proposed legislation, came in considerable haste, Mr. Chairman. In fact, in an article in the *Globe and Mail* of March 11, 1965, written by Barrie Zwicker entitled "Nurses Controversy—"

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I am sorry. The Minister advised you that this did not come within the scope of his estimates at this time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if nurses and the problems of the nursing profession do not fall with The Department of Health, would the hon. Minister please tell me where they fall?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the education of nurses is the responsibility of the Ontario college of nurses, and the Act comes under the supervision of The Department of Health, but the authority is delegated to the Ontario college of nurses. I have given the explanation as to what happened to the bill as a courtesy to my friend the hon. member who asked the question. I really have nothing more to add to it at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: I can appreciate that the hon. Minister may not wish to add to it at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is not a case of not wishing. I stated, I think quite clearly, that I have nothing more to add to it at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then I am just going to ask him a question. If the hon. Minister does not wish to respond, these are his estimates; he is at liberty, of course, to refuse to respond.

I point out, Mr. Chairman, that we are not discussing nurses' education. I am discussing

collective bargaining in the nursing profession.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Would you give me the item that you are speaking on in this vote, 701?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We are discussing proposed legislation relating to The Department of Health. This is a clear responsibility of the hon. Minister of Health. He has had a request before him. We have asked a question, and we wish to ask further questions about it.

Mr. Sopha: I want to put in my protest on a point of order. Nurses work in hospitals, and hospitals come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health of this province and I—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): If you have no nurses, you have no hospitals.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. My friend the hon. member for Grey South is very wise in these subjects; he says if we have no nurses, we have no hospitals. Now I submit to you that whether there is a specific item or not in these estimates, anything dealing in a general way with health in this province comes under the aegis of the hon. Minister of Health, and he ought to answer in the presentation of his estimates.

Mr. Trotter: He knows it, too.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. It is an effort by him, you see, to avoid a very unpleasant and very embarrassing subject.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Under vote 701 there are some 37 items and these are the items we are discussing.

Mr. Sopha: My goodness, 1,000 nurses came and demonstrated outside. Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister should get up and inform us.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I think the point really is, as always, that the hon. member is trying to broaden out the estimates to deal with things that simply do not come under them. There are places in the procedures of this House where these matters can be discussed, but the Chairman has ruled, as explained by the hon. Minister, that in his estimates this matter simply does not arise.

We either have rules in the House or we do not have rules in the House; do not try to put it on the basis that we do not want to talk about the nurses. This matter has been discussed here before, but I am not

talking about nurses tonight. I am talking about procedure; I am talking about the inevitable process of trying to broaden out the estimates. They are now much broader and discussion is much broader than has ever been permitted in my time in the House. The hon. member is simply out of order.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order to what the hon. Prime Minister has said. Last year in this House, roughly at this time, but earlier in the session—under this first main vote, the hon. member for Parkdale focused a great deal of his opening speech—indeed, if my memory serves me, his entire opening speech on the problems of the nursing profession. The hon. member for Scarborough West followed suit to some degree and we subsequently raised and argued under this vote, Mr. Chairman, all of these questions Why was it not out of order then?

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Do you not pay any attention to the Chairman of the House?

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would come under item 16. May I suggest to you that it comes under item 16 first? Then I submit to you that it might very well come under 714.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

I would ask the Minister; does it come under item 16?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, it does not come under item 16, Mr. Chairman. That is a grant to the registered nurses association of Ontario to assist them in a campaign of recruitment for students into nursing.

Mr. Sopha: How about 714?

Mr. Chairman: I must rule that it does not come under item 16.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think it would be the more logical place to discuss all matters pertaining to hospitals under the hospital services commission vote.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister says 714, we can wait.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I would like to raise in regard to vote 701, and that is item number 11—an item of \$4,000, designated as “unforeseen and unprovided, as may be directed by the Minister.” I have raised this matter in con-

nection with certain other estimates. I am happy to say that most departments seem to have abandoned the practice of including in their estimates an item for matters that are “unforeseen and unprovided.” I am not going to make a major issue out of this, but I would suggest that the hon. Minister should abandon this particular item in his estimates. Under The Financial Administration Act it is quite unnecessary, and I believe that there is no need for it to continue. I suggest that in the interest of sound economy this type of item should be dropped from all estimates, including the estimates of The Department of Health.

Vote 701 agreed to.

On vote 702:

Mr. S. Lewis: Some time ago—I believe it was in 1961—a very interesting study of home care needs in Wellington county was carried out, demonstrating conclusively—I have the report in front of me, and the hon. Minister doubtless has seen it—that the use of public health personnel greatly facilitated the after-care hopes for a large number of patients. This study was made of all the county residents discharged over a one-week period from general hospitals in Wellington county and the city of Guelph.

I would be interested to know, Mr. Chairman, whether this study in itself has been followed up; whether the hon. Minister feels that similar projects can be extended to other counties in the province? What is the policy of the public health branch in the after-care programmes from general hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This study has been followed up, Mr. Chairman. The programme has just moved under way and we hope to make it a pilot project for health units in a semi-urban, semi-rural population. If it attains the objectives which the board and the director and the nurses of that unit and we ourselves believe, then we will expand it as rapidly as possible across the province.

We agree in the department, together with Dr. Dale and his staff, that this kind of a project which he has recommended on the basis of this study has much promise, but this one is just under way.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask again, in relation to the public health administration branch, Mr. Chairman, what contact there is between the public health facilities in the province and the mental health facilities?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: More and more, Mr. Chairman, the public health units are getting

into the mental health field. They are assuming their normal or natural function in respect of mental health, as they have done in respect of other health matters. They have, traditionally, taken responsibility for the preventive side of health care and the follow-up, which is part of prevention again, and more and more the public health units are getting into this field. They have been sending nurses for special courses in psychiatric nursing and mental health care to equip them to assume this new role that is growing in importance.

Now every health unit—I do not want to leave any wrong impression—has not taken it up yet because it is difficult to change the views of long standing, but more and more of them are taking it up, and more and more of them are making provision in that sort of programme for this sort of thing. They are going through a period, at the present time, of revision of their role. Some of the programmes which have loomed large in their activities over the past years are assuming less and less importance. They are looking for new areas and they are getting into programmes such as mental health prevention and mental health follow-up and more and more are becoming involved in this matter.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, can the hon. Minister give us any specific example of any public health unit across the province which is intimately involved in some way, and some outline of the extent to which that involvement commits them—the number of public health nurses, and other members of the staff?

I have not been able to find a unit which is, in fact, intimately involved and I am curious to know of one.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can think of four at the present time, but I do not have the specific details concerning each one. But the St. Thomas unit is for Elgin county; Windsor-Essex county unit is involved; Welland has been carrying on some very exciting experiments in this area, and last week, I think it was, I opened a new building for Brampton and Brant county health unit and was delighted to see that they had expanded their activities in this mental health area, too. Those are four that come to mind immediately.

Mr. S. Lewis: In view, Mr. Chairman, of the obvious decreasing area of traditional medical preventive features, does the hon. Minister foresee, or does he have in mind the day when the public health and mental health units in his department will be amal-

gamated as one, with the emphasis on public health shifted accordingly? I imagine that over the past half dozen decades we have overcome most of the original public health needs and public health efforts.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am rather disappointed to hear this type of thinking. Unfortunately, this is the type of thinking that is widespread. We may have controlled the needs for public health, but we certainly have not overcome them by any means. Just let us let down our bars one little bit and I shudder to think of what could happen with respect to the spread of epidemic diseases.

Then there are other programmes which are in keeping with our times, with the changing modes of life and with the changing mores of our society.

It is rather an exciting thought that the hon. member proposed, Mr. Chairman, and it is one that is being talked about increasingly in these days. I would hesitate to say that I could foresee the time when there will be one. It will come; I believe that, but I am not quite so sure that I am prepared to say that I can foresee the time when it will come. More and more it will mould in by a process of sometimes slow, but steady evolution, and certainly it will not come about by revolution. But it is moving in that direction, but it could take a long time yet.

Vote 702 agreed to.

Vote 703 agreed to.

On vote 704:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the mother and child health branch, I believe there was an experiment carried on in Ontario, trying to assess the number of still births and live births, etcetera, in the province of Ontario. It took place in 1963. There were slightly over 155,000 infants born alive in Ontario in that year; in the same year there were 2,294 stillbirths, and over 3,500 infants died before they came to their first birthday. I have two questions for the hon. Minister in regard to this problem. As a result of this survey, has his department come to any conclusions or developed any plans for the future? The second question concerns the great disparity of live births and the number that die in various areas. For example, in a three-year period 1960-62, the annual death rates under one year of age for 1,000 live births was 16 to 25 per 1,000 in Middlesex county; 26 to 35 per 1,000 in Prescott and Russell, and 36 to 45 per 1,000 in Glengarry, which is extremely high.

Could the hon. Minister give us any reason why the death rate for children is so high in certain areas, such as Glengarry?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the study is still under way. While it has been going on since 1960, it is still going on and it is not completed. It is not likely to be for some time yet.

The data collected refers to 80,000 deliveries, and this information was gleaned from more than 500 practising physicians and their patients. The disparity between the rates in various parts of the province are difficult at times to understand, but then when we take them on the basis of rates it is not a very good statistic, yet it is the one we always use. For instance, there were nine infant deaths in Glengarry but, of course, in 1963 the rate is 21.5.

Mr. Trotter: My figures in Glengarry show 36 to 45. What percentage does the hon. Minister have per 1,000?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Glengarry, 21.5. In 1963, there were nine infant deaths for a rate of 21.5. Muskoka, for instance, had eight infant deaths for a rate of 14.8. Manitoulin had a total of four infant deaths for a rate of 14.9. The rate, unfortunately, is not a very good figure, but it is the figure that is always used. It would be foolish for me, Mr. Chairman, to say at the present time we have plans to deal with this other than to continue through our public health units. Glengarry is an area that is well supported by a good public health programme. Indeed, it has the distinction of being the first public health unit as such in our province and is, therefore, the oldest one. It is very progressive in its outlook and they carry on good local programmes, but other than continuing education in the value of adequate and sterile pre-natal care, and educating the mothers in the manner in which to deal with new babies, at the present time we have no new knowledge to pass on.

We are concerned in the department about both our maternal mortality rate and our infant mortality rate. There is no denying the fact that in both cases they are the best rates in Canada, but this does not satisfy us because they are still, in my opinion, too high. Northern Ireland has us beaten for maternal mortality and the Netherlands, for instance, have us beaten quite roundly for infant mortality. We continue to seek ways and means of reducing our mortality rate and bringing it more into line with these other states. At the present time, we have no new knowledge other than to continue our

efforts through pre-natal care and follow-up care for the infant, to see if this will be successful.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I think we vote \$75,000 per year for the cost and expense of maternal and child health. I think it is also used for educational purposes; we spend about \$50,000 of that amount on education, is that not correct? I was wondering why we have the other \$25,000 that is voted. I was wondering if the hon. Minister could print some of his pamphlets in French; they are all in English, at present. I notice in some of these areas where the infant mortality rate is high—not necessarily Middlesex but certainly Glengarry and the Prescott area—there would be a large French-speaking population. Does the hon. Minister not think that we might use some of the \$25,000 not expended to translate our material into the French language?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are going into French-language pamphlets for health matters now.

Mr. Trotter: When is this going to be done?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Starting with this year's estimates.

Mr. Trotter: I am glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman, because it has been urged on this side of the House during the estimates on a number of occasions. I believe it was a year or two ago that the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) brought up this matter and we got a very negative answer from the hon. Minister, but I am glad to hear that he is slowly moving in this direction. I admit that the overall average of infant mortality in Ontario is not as bad as across Canada. As a nation, we rank very low with the other so-called advanced countries; we are away down as to the matter of infant mortality. Certain parts of Ontario rank almost as low as the lowest parts of Canada. I do think it is the language difficulty in some cases, so I am glad to hear that something is being done.

In regard to the pamphlets, when in other than the English language, are they going to be only in French or in any other language?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Only French, as far as we know at the present time.

Mr. Trotter: I might suggest to the hon. Minister that in certain large urban areas such as Toronto or Sault Ste. Marie, there is a very heavy Italian population, and the cost would be relatively small if you circu-

lated your pamphlets not only in the French language but in the Italian language. I think it would be a very good idea to look into it. I think about one-eighth of the population of Toronto is Italian, and there are also large segments of populations in urban areas that are Italian. Using this type of pamphlet for child care and for the care of the mother would be a very great assistance to the population.

Seeing that the hon. Minister is now going to use the pamphlets in the French language, I hope he will give some thought to putting these same pamphlets out in the Italian language. I know that in the case of labour regulations it is found quite feasible to put out pamphlets in a number of languages having to do with workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance and safety regulations. In the case of mother care and child care, I think the same thing should be done.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I ought to advise the hon. member that the city health department has its own responsibility; we do not subscribe to that in any way. I understand that it does provide pamphlets in at least eight languages.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, on vote 704, I wonder if the hon. Minister would be good enough to give us some information with regard to the oral smear test used by dentists in the detection of throat cancer.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I cannot give the hon. member any information about it except to say that it has been instigated by the dental profession itself and that is encouraging the use of this. I have no report on the findings so far. I believe that it shows great promise, as a good deal of the new psychological tests do.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. Minister, this, I think, would offer the hon. Minister some information. It is an extract from one of the papers, dated Toronto:

Only one in seven Ontario dentists is using a new smear test to detect oral cancer, even though the detection kit is supplied to them free, the dentistry faculty at the University of Toronto said today. The test is so useful that the dentists who did use it found cancer or pre-cancerous tissue in about one in every 15 patients, said a letter from faculty staff mailed during the weekend to every Ontario dentist attending the annual convention of the Ontario dental association.

Dr. D. L. Anderson said Monday, many of the province's dentists are neglecting their responsibility to detect oral cancer in its curable stages. Dr. Anderson said of the province's 2,464 dentists, only 377, one in seven, have made use of the tests started a year ago. Despite the lack of response, the test was responsible for the discovery of 61 malignancies, all in early stages of development.

The smear tests are provided by the faculty in co-operation with the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation. Mucus samples taken by local dentists are sent to the university for analysis.

It goes on to say:

Dr. Cecil L. Strachen, a former member of the federal Royal commission on health services, told the association that Canadian children are not receiving adequate dental care. He said that the dental profession has not shown it intends to render such care to any except those who can pay its fees. He said that while more children's dentistry is being done, new techniques have added to its costs and made it even more prohibitive to more people.

I would think this matter of smear tests for oral cancer deserves the attention of The Department of Health of this province. When these figures are quoted, sir, it would seem to me that it should become a matter of real concern to The Department of Health and to the profession of dentistry and I would hope that something can be done for the people in the province.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this matter is of concern to us. The responsibility for the cancer control programme is delegated to the Ontario cancer treatment and research foundation. This project to which the hon. member refers is a federal project on oral psychology, supported by the federal government, and initiated, I believe, by the faculty of dentistry at the University of Toronto. I think it is quite understandable that dentists do not willy-nilly take a sample from every mouth.

I read that same article which the hon. member read into the record tonight, sir, and I talked to some of my dental friends about it and they certainly were not in agreement with the views of the author. Indeed, they questioned his figures very seriously. We have no way of checking to see which dentist is using this smear and which is not. This cancer is not as common as many other kinds. Nonetheless, if there is any evidence of it or fear for it, the patient

should get the benefit of any tests. But the cancer foundation is the agency which acts on behalf of the government in the cancer control programme and I can assure you that it has shown a very great deal of activity in this new field of diagnostic psychology.

Vote 704 agreed to.

On vote 705:

Mr. Trotter: Under vote 705, I just have a few remarks here and some questions, Mr. Chairman.

The grants to the school for dental services. We voted for the year ending March, 1964, \$50,000. We spent \$31,000 and we have unexpended \$18,000. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, how they arrive at these grants, because when you check the accounts you see some sums vary. For example, the Chatsworth school, I think, got \$1,587; Simcoe \$817; Ottawa \$2,000. I would like to know how these grants are arrived at and why there is nearly \$19,000 unexpended in a matter that obviously is a great need.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the schools may enter into an agreement with the department to assist in the financing of a programme. The maximum grant available to any school is \$2,000, but to feel that because our estimate of this is coming down is evidence that the programme is being neglected, is not quite accurate. As health units, particularly the larger health units, come into operation, more and more of them are taking over the school dental programme and the need for this programme is steadily fading out of existence. I think that answers the hon. member.

Mr. Trotter: I remember, reading in the *Hansard* of March 5, 1963, you were asked how the grants were arrived at, and the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, used some terms as—for townships and municipalities of less than 5,000 population, the grants are 30 per cent; with a population over 5,000, the grant is 20 per cent, and I was not sure if it was 20 per cent of what.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is confusing this with the grants paid toward health units. In the case of a total rural municipality, by and large the health unit grant—and this is getting onto another vote altogether, a vote which has already been passed—paid by the government is 50 per cent of the budget. Above a certain population, it is reduced to 33½ per cent and then reduced on a scale to 15 per cent of the budget in the case of a unit, based on

Windsor, for instance, as the Windsor Essex county unit is.

This dental health programme is an entirely different thing. The grants are paid to municipal governments under section 91 of The Public Health Act and are provided either by a contract system where the dentist supplies the equipment, materials and his time and is paid on an hourly rate, or larger centres may furnish a clinic and the dentist there receives a regular salary to which the grants may be applied. But again, I repeat, because of the budgetary decrease, the programme is not disappearing. It is rather being taken over and included in a more complete public health programme.

Under 5,000, 30 per cent up to a maximum of \$2,000. This is the population and these are the figures I presume my hon. friend mentioned. If the population is under 5,000, the grant is 30 per cent of the cost, up to a maximum of \$2,000. Where it is over 5,000, 20 per cent of the costs, up to a maximum of \$2,000.

Mr. Trotter: Well then, Mr. Chairman, would it be correct to say that the grants for dental services have nothing to do with overcoming the shortage of dental services here in the province? For example, we were questioning you, I think, back in 1963 about the shortage of dentists, and you were of the opinion that we had to increase about 60 dentists per year in our schools in order to overcome the shortage.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In our dental schools.

Mr. Trotter: Yes. And instead of the students increasing in number at dental colleges, for the most part, they are falling. For example, in 1962-63 we had 126. That was a peak year. In the following year it dropped to 119 and now, I think, it is back somewhere in the neighborhood of 123.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with dental schools at all. These are—

Mr. Trotter: This would come under the first vote, would it not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I have nothing to do with dental schools. This is a dental programme in elementary schools.

Mr. Trotter: Well then, your argument is that the dental schools would come under The Department of Education?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, on vote 705, each year when the estimates of the hon. Minister are before the House, I have spoken on travelling clinics. For some years now the travelling clinics on the railways, the CNR and the CPR, have been up in northwestern Ontario, and the hon. Minister said they very likely would be there for many years on account of the great need for dental care in these areas. But there are a number of mobile clinics that, I understand, move about the province. I am having very great difficulty in getting one of these mobile clinics up in my area in northeastern Ontario. The problem—or at least part of the problem—has been, I understand, accentuated by the fact that it is so difficult to get the dentists to service these mobile clinics. Can you give me any information about the possibility of when we may be able to get one of these travelling clinics up in Nipissing? There are certain areas of that riding that need help.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, through the department we operate two dental cars and they are both operating just now. CPR from November 1, 1963, to October 31, 1964, visited three places, treating 634 children. The one on the CNR visited eight places, treating 1,315 children. Does the hon. member want to know the places it stopped?

Mr. Troy: In northwestern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, from the Quebec border to Lowbush River. Norembea, Brower, Frederickhouse, Hunta, Driftwood, Fauquier, Moonbeam, Harty, Opasatika—and I am afraid my pronunciations may be somewhat unintelligible, Mr. Chairman. Mattice, Pagwa River, Nakina, Auden, Armstrong, Savant Lake, Hudson, Amesden, Quibell, Redditt, Wade, Minaki, Malachi. From Capreol to Long Lac, Westree, Gogama, Foleyet, Elsas, Peterbell, Oba, Hornepayne, Stevens, Caramat, Hillsport.

From Cartier to Ingolf on the Manitoba border. Biscotasing, Ramsay, Woman River, Sultan, Dalton, Missanabie, Franz, Amyot, White River, Rossport, Nipigon, Dorian Ouimet, Pearl, Loon, Ruith, Upsala, English River, Ignace, Dymont, Wabigoon, Oxdriff, Eagle River, Vermilion Bay and Hawk Lake.

These are the places visited during last year. And the mobile dental clinic I am advised, has buses owned and operated by the Red Cross, and we believe there are three of those in operation.

Mr. Troy: But the names that you mentioned that are serviced by the railway cars are almost all in northwestern Ontario,

Vermilion Bay, Mattice, Savant Bay, and Eagle River. None of them are in the eastern part of the province.

Vote 705 agreed to.

On vote 706:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, on vote 706, I have a question on the order paper, No. 108. It has been on for several weeks and I wonder if the hon. Minister has answered this somewhere along in his opening remarks and perhaps I have missed it. Or possibly he could answer it tonight.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I answered it, Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks, and if I can recall from memory—I cannot remember the number—the ultimate from each school is anticipated to be 100 students per year. I would have to look up *Hansard*, but I did answer it in my opening remarks.

Mr. Paterson: I will check that *Hansard*, sir, and possibly it could be removed from the order paper.

Vote 706 agreed to.

On vote 707:

Mr. Trotter: On vote 707, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the important health problem we have here in Canada, and particularly in the province of Ontario, because venereal disease control seems to have been getting out of hand in Ontario more quickly than it has in the rest of Canada. I would like to put a few figures before the hon. Minister, and also quote to him some of the reports of his own department to see what can be done. It is well known to the hon. Minister that syphilis is increasing in Ontario faster than in the rest of Canada. I will just give you some idea. In 1944 Canada had 16,475 reported cases, while Ontario had 5,365 or about 32 per cent of the total in all of Canada. So that our rate in Canada was about 138.1 for 100,000. Ontario is slightly worse and the national average was 135.4 per 100,000. In the year 1950, the effects of the wonder drugs reduced a great deal of this problem and it seemed to be solved. This decline in the incidence of the disease continued until 1957—the year, incidentally, that the present Minister of Health assumed that portfolio. I know we cannot blame the hon. Minister for the increase. In that year Ontario had only 410 reported cases of syphilis, or the rate of eight per 100,000, well below the national average.

But in 1963—the last year for which full

statistics are as yet available—they show a tremendous increase in this syphilis rate. While the number of reported cases across Canada has climbed steadily to over 2,700, or 14.7 per 100,000, the rate in Ontario has been even more astounding. In that year Ontario reported 984 cases, or 35.3 per cent. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are higher than we were back in 1944. In ratio terms, Ontario is again ahead of the national average with 15.3 cases per 100,000, as compared with the Canadian average of 14.7.

Ontario has not had a comparable total since 1950. Now in dealing with this same type of disease, gonorrhoea statistics do not show such a damning indictment of our control of this problem. There has been a steady increase in gonorrhoea over the same period, but Ontario is doing slightly better than the rest of Canada. Obviously, there must be some inadequate measures for control here in the province of Ontario. To prove that I have to point to the annual report of The Department of Health here in the province of Ontario, and it is worth putting on the record. It says effective control of this disease—that is, speaking of syphilis—depends upon the degree of success achieved in locating, examining and treating, where indicated, as many of the contacts as possible in the shortest possible space of time. The method of control cannot be said to be operating efficiently when less than one contact per patient is reported, and when only 56 per cent of the contacts reported are located. It is evident that there is room for considerable improvement in both the quantity and quality of contact information provided with each reported case. And, in addition, for considerably increased activity in the level for reporting venereal disease, both the public and the medical profession will have to be educated with respect to the need for these objectives to be achieved if any genuine and permanent improvement in venereal disease control is to be achieved. This is from the report of our own department, and I would like the hon. Minister, if he could, to give us—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Could the hon. member tell me where he is reading that from?

Mr. Trotter: The annual report of The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What date?

Mr. Trotter: Sorry, the 1962 annual report; I took this from 1962, but the rate has increased since then—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh no, it has not. I put the 1964 on your desk some weeks ago.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, I know, but the figures I made were quite recent and I was quoting from the 1962 report. Sir, you cannot deny that this is an increase.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I certainly am denying them, Mr. Chairman, most assuredly, and I have the facts here to prove it.

Mr. Trotter: Well then, let us hear the facts.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have the DBS figures, the annual report on venereal disease in Canada in 1963, issued by the epidemiology division of The Department of National Health and Welfare from 1931 to 1962. Right down the line Ontario's record is better than Canada's. In 1931, first figures Canada, second Ontario in each case: 4.4, 4; 4.9, 3.9; 3.7, 2.9; 4.3, 3.3; 5.2, 4.1. There is no need to read all of them, Mr. Chairman, because the same thread runs through the whole fabric. 1956: 1.3, 1.2; 1957: 1.1, .8. Ontario and Canada were on a par in 1958. In 1959, Canada one, Ontario .8. In 1960, Canada one, Ontario .9. There are cases for 100,000 population. In 1961, Canada .9, Ontario .6; in 1962, Canada .7, Ontario .6. I think it is worth pointing out to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that the very fact that we are unearthing cases is not evidence that control has been lost, but I think it is evidence of the excellence of our control that we are digging out cases, bringing them to light and bringing them under treatment.

Mr. Trotter: No, just a minute, Mr. Chairman. Even your 1964 report, in two or three places, states this is going up, and has been going up for some years. I might even repeat, sir—page 27, the 1964 report, the 1964 rate, table three—showed a slight increase to 16.4 per 100,000 population from the previous year's rate of 15. This is on page 28 of your own report. Then they go on. There is still the same problem, as I said in 1962, that only 50 per cent of your contacts are being reported. This is again on page 28:

The average case of syphilis has usually had four to five relevant contacts. Effective control of the spread of this disease depends upon the degree of success achieved in locating, examining and treating, where indicated, as many of these contacts as possible in the shortest space of time. This method of control cannot be said to be operating efficiently where less than one contact per patient is reported and when only 50 per cent of the contacts reported are located. It is evident that there is room for considerable improvement in both the

quantity and quality of contact information provided with each reported case and, in addition, for considerably increased activity in the level of reporting venereal diseases.

Both the public and the medical profession will have to be educated in respect of the need for these objectives to be achieved if any genuine and permanent improvement in venereal disease control is to be realized.

This is your own report. I know, from what I have heard from your own clinics, that this is becoming a problem with the doctors. This is spreading. It may be that the so-called wonder drugs, as in tuberculosis, develop a reaction in the human body. We do not know, but the wonder drugs may not work as well as they did. But the fact remains that in all of Canada venereal disease is increasing and in Ontario there are a great number of cases, and they are increasing, and it may be because we have so many large urban areas.

It is obvious that in an area like Toronto, perhaps because it is a sea port, this disease is going to be more difficult to control. Your own report bears out that we have a long way to go. I do not know what figures you have or from what you are quoting, but I am quoting from your own report.

Then at the top of page 28, the bulk of the reported increase—the reported increase, do not forget—in syphilis for this year was in the latent stage.

This increase is, undoubtedly, in part the result of better reporting by physicians. It is equally true that better reporting, by itself, does not provide an adequate explanation for the continued high rate for infectious syphilis.

Even though the doctors are doing a better job of reporting, that is of private individuals, the rate is getting worse. Inevitably, the responsibility is thrown on The Department of Health. The figures that you reported to me surprise me, and I do not know where you are getting them. I am reading from your book, and this goes back certainly to 1962 and 1963, and obviously the hon. Minister of Health is not aware of the problem.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health is very much aware of the problem. He has tried to carry on a programme of venereal disease control and prevention. I wonder if the hon. member for Parkdale ever tried to investigate contacts in cases of venereal disease. I think he has to recognize that—

Mr. Trotter: What course would I take?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does not take a very long imagination, Mr. Chairman, to recognize the very grave difficulties the clinic staffs are up against. In fact, I am quite surprised that we dig out as many contacts as we do. If you read the rest of the report, you will see that five or six contacts is average for one case. Then you must try to have the infected person reveal the source of his or her infection. I have no apology to make for the fact that we do not get all of the cases, but that does not mean to say that we are at all complacent. This is an area where continual education is necessary and is carried on, but we would be dishonest if we tried to tell you that it is a sure-fire way of dealing with this problem. Of course there is not.

In the army and the other services, we had almost complete control. You could get almost any kind of information out of the men and women in the services and even then you could not find all of their contacts, by any means. How can we expect to do it in civilian life? I think that Ontario, when we put our records up against the records of any other jurisdiction, stands out very well and, again, I repeat that the fact that the cases are being brought to light is not evidence of its getting out of control but rather it is evidence of the increasing effectiveness of our control, in that we are digging out more cases.

Mr. Trotter: It is obvious that education needs not only the co-operation of doctors, which is improving, but this again would mean co-operation with the hon. Minister of Health and it would be a health control measure. Would the hon. Minister be in favour of instruction on this type of disease in our high schools, because the rate is increasing mostly among teenagers?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I believe that instruction in this is given in nearly all of our high schools, if not all of them, and special pamphlets have been produced for teenagers. This is one area of health education where we have had very wonderful co-operation from the teaching profession.

Mr. Trotter: There is certainly no course. I think it depends on the principal in charge. This education certainly is not very widespread. Would the hon. Minister be in favour of encouraging this in our schools?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do encourage it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Trotter: What means do you take to encourage it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In discussion, with the health programme. The health programmes promoted and carried on through The Department of Education or by the direction and encouragement of the Department of Education all come within the ambit of the interdepartmental committee and my department advises The Department of Education on health matters. This is one of the matters that is dealt with, and with a reasonable degree of effectiveness.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to speak on that subject for a moment. I have a daughter who is a teacher in physical health and education and I can assure the hon. member for Parkdale that while it might not be mandatory in the curricula of all secondary schools, it is in many.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, there has been a tremendous increase in German measles here in the province of Ontario. Probably for most children it is a mild thing and not as important as some other diseases and not nearly as dangerous, I am quite willing to admit, but German measles rose in 1964, I think, to a total of more than 11,000 cases, which is more than double the number of cases in 1963. The great danger in German measles is with women who are expecting children—I think within the first three weeks of their being pregnant. Has this department done anything to inquire into the cause of and the increase in German measles?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The department has not, as a department, but a great deal of research is going on in this area. Efforts are at present under way, I understand, seeking the development of a vaccine. The department has for some time made available gamma globulin for use by pregnant women where there is a possibility that the unborn infant may be damaged.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I understood the hon. member to say that venereal disease was pretty rampant in the high schools—

Mr. Trotter: I did not say it was rampant; the disease seems to be more prevalent among teenagers than among—

Mr. Cowling: I seemed to get the idea that you were trying to give the impression that the high schools were in pretty bad shape.

Mr. Trotter: I did not say that at all.

Mr. Cowling: That is usually what you say. That is exactly what you said; that is what

you say about most things. Now I am offended at that because I do not think it applies—

Mr. Trotter: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cowling: Just a minute—

Mr. Trotter: On a point of order, I did not say it was rampant and I did not talk about high schools. I said that the rate was increasing more among teenagers than among other groups. It is certainly increasing, and this is why education is important.

Mr. Cowling: I do not think that is much of a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there is any truth in what the hon. member is trying to insinuate. Is it a fact, or not? I do not think it is and I would like to have the hon. Minister comment on that.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is it rampant in the homes for the aged?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think we have dealt quite adequately with this. My hon. friend behind me wonders if it is rampant in the homes for the aged.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, it is rather tragic in this day and age that we have this new morality in youngsters from four years old. I notice that there is a boy of four years old who has a case of gonorrhoea. Did you find out the contact of that one?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: A case of that kind is one that is most easily found, Mr. Chairman. There is only one contact possible.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that we will gain anything by discussing these matters during my estimates. Of course I know the contact of the four-year-old child.

Mr. Troy: We may not gain anything, but I say it is a tragic—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, it is a tragedy—

Mr. Troy: More than half of those reported cases of gonorrhoea in 1964 are from the age group of 10 to 24 years old, and it is certainly a fine example of the new morality in this society.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to look realistically at this. There is not a doubt in anyone's mind that gonorrhoea is far less present among us today than it was a relatively few years ago. While we are very much concerned about

the increase, it is not rampant by any means and I do not think—

Mr. Troy: I did not say it was.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I know, but one is steadily gaining the belief that some of us seem to think it is rampant; it is not. We recognize that there are too many cases and we recognize that these are tragic things, but I can assure you that health authorities all over the country are equally worried about it, more worried perhaps than any others, and doing everything possible to bring it within control.

Mr. Troy: Are those who are treated by private physicians instead of clinics reported?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The physician must report the cases.

Vote 707 agreed to.

Vote 708 agreed to.

On vote 709:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, in relation to the medical rehabilitation branch, I would be interested in knowing the number of members of the staff of medical rehabilitation who have social workers' degrees at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Three, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: Three? What is the total staff complement of the medical rehabilitation branch?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Thirty-three, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: What is the average educational attainment of the staff complement of 33?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. member give me all his questions pertinent to the staff so that I can get them all—

Mr. S. Lewis: That is the last I have to ask.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 708 was previously carried in any case, we are on vote 709 at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would like to answer this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister is going to answer questions on vote 708.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Fifty per cent have university education and 50 per cent have

grade 13, with a course of inservice training following that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer a reflection or two on the medical rehabilitation branch. First, it seems to me that it is a very small branch for the work which it is undertaking. I read in the annual report of The Department of Health that 71 per cent of its cases are now cases of referral from Ontario hospitals. I think this is a highly desirable fact, but it seems to me that a branch of 33 workers is hardly sufficient.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, a branch of 33 workers, with only three of them qualified social workers, is very seriously lacking in the work it can do properly. It compares most unfavourably with the rehabilitation branch in The Department of Public Welfare which, if I understand correctly, will have ten Masters of social work in September or October of this year—a much larger percentage of university people. In fact, grade 12 or grade 13 education, with the very sensitive and difficult cases involved, is not sufficient.

But since we have two parallel government departments—one Public Welfare and one in Health—questions about recruitment must, therefore, be asked regarding The Department of Health and its medical rehabilitation branch. If it is possible to develop—I will not say a quality of staff because I have never believed myself that someone with a lesser educational attainment is necessarily inferior in the work that can be done—but I would think that three out of 33, with proper social work training, is a rather low figure. It is very low compared with the parallel branch in The Department of Public Welfare.

I think that medical rehabilitation has a major role to play, particularly in the area of Ontario hospitals. One of the problems relating to the after-care dilemma and the readmission rate, relates to the lack of a proper and viable rehabilitation programme. I think that health rehabilitation either needs expansion, or it has to be absorbed into the mental health part of the branch or, indeed, has to give up the ghost and let The Department of Public Welfare, which seems to be doing a much more energetic and vigorous job, take it over.

There is something profoundly disconcerting about a branch which has only 33 workers, of whom the largest part are untrained, dealing now in 71 per cent of its cases with the most sensitive problems of rehabilitation given in this society, the rehabilitation for the most part of the acutely

mentally ill. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that since these comparisons suffer when considered against public welfare, that great emphasis must be given either to recruitment, or to the redefinition of the branch. I am very perplexed as I read the generalities of the report that it can be considered no more than a sort of façade, although I have no doubt that within that façade the workers work to the best of their ability.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member should realize that the work the rehabilitation branch of The Department of Health does is largely with—in fact, almost exclusively with—those from our mental hospitals and tuberculosis hospitals, who present peculiar problems in rehabilitation. Most of our officers do not need to be social workers. I say this advisedly and with very deep conviction, because their main job is getting the cases back into vocational activity. The officers are largely involved in vocational rehabilitation.

The social service staff of the hospitals, and the social workers in the welfare department look after the social rehabilitation of these persons. But those with whom we are most actively involved are assessing the abilities of those who are discharged from hospital—and increasing numbers are being discharged from the hospitals for the mentally ill now—and arranging training for them or retraining. Then we also have a job-placement activity within our department, and herein we differ very greatly from all other rehabilitation activities I know. This is an area of rehabilitation which, in my thinking, is a very essential one, particularly for the type of people we are dealing with.

I think it is quite wrong to say that our workers are untrained. Many of the people we have on our branch have been in rehabilitation work for a very long time. Those who have knowledge of this speak very highly of their ability, and I am glad to note that the hon. member did emphasize the fact that though one has a degree it does not always signify that that person is the best one for the job.

I think, when the total results of the activities of our department and the effectiveness of the activities of this branch are looked at, it will be seen that this is a worthwhile activity. I think it would be a very grave error to meld this with The Department of Public Welfare, because it works in a different area altogether. Our people need a very great deal of post-placement support.

I happened to be visiting one of our

branches on one occasion, and while in the office the rehabilitation officer was called by one of his clients and he told me that this was the seventh time, I think, within ten days, that the person was about to quit the job. But each time on talking with the rehabilitation officer, he was encouraged and prepared to go back and face the problem all over again. This, in my mind, sets the mentally ill patient quite separate and distinct from the patient who has been sick, or has become handicapped as a result of an industrial or other type of accident.

Our people need emotional support in far greater measure than the average person who needs rehabilitation. I am quite certain, sir, that as the records of the branch are seen it will be noted that they have done, and are continuing to do, a very effective job. I can assure you, sir, I will fight very vigorously for the maintenance and the steady expansion of this branch.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister put it rather more effectively than I could put it when he said that the supportive services in the area of emotional security are perhaps the fundamental qualification in this field. While I admit to him that the vocational rehabilitation of this branch is perhaps pre-eminent, there is, even in his own report, a considerable position given to what is called social rehabilitation, precisely the area I alluded to originally.

I should like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain levels of education required to develop the sensitivity and the understanding necessary to give that emotional supportive of service. Those levels of education, I suggest—while not making this categorical—do require something beyond high school; when we are dealing with the rehabilitation of the mentally ill and their placement in jobs, as the hon. Minister himself has pointed out, the mere job-placement is the smallest factor. It is the emotional security that is felt attendant upon that job; it is the emotional security that may be felt in the problems of adjusting to the community, which is of consequence. It is by no means a matter of arranging an interview, slating a person and then dropping the case. With a mere 33 workers in a medical rehabilitation branch, of whom 50 per cent are high school graduates at maximum—and I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that some are probably not beyond grade 12—I suggest that the emotional resilience required would simply be lacking in some areas. And I am not overwhelmed by the availability of in-service training.

I can agree with the hon. Minister that

this is an indispensable branch in prospect, that it has tremendous importance. If that is true, Mr. Chairman, I would say, double the personnel of this branch, or triple this branch and set up an in-service training programme of six months to a year. Then let them go to town and do a job. Within the last six months, if memory serves me correctly, the rehabilitation branch of The Department of Public Welfare has been expanded out of all proportion to its previous number, and as a result the case loads have been reduced. It has done a very, very effective job. The rehabilitation branch of Public Welfare stands as an example throughout the province, and I say it without hesitation and with some enthusiasm.

That is not so with the rehabilitation branch of Health. It is partly not so because its level of qualification is not as high, because its numbers are not as high, because its jobs are not as well defined, although just as difficult, and because, by and large, I do not think it has received sufficient support from this government. I in no sense denigrate the efforts, hopes and objectives of the people involved. But I would think that if the hon. Minister is as serious as he says he is about this branch, he should give it a real fillip; give it a shot in the arm of great morale by providing it with greater funds and a greater sense of purpose and, indeed, greater numbers.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, when I was going home last weekend, I had the pleasure of going up with a specialist in the field which is covered by this vote. He was down in Toronto at the meeting of the Canadian tubercular association last week. During one of the discussions, doctors present said there was a difficulty in getting medical practitioners to do these BCG tests. I do not know if it referred to Ontario or other parts of Canada. It happened that there was a doctor there from Denmark, I believe, who pointed out that in the underprivileged countries, and in India, they do not use doctors for this particular test at all; they use technicians. Is it a problem in Ontario? Do you have this problem, that you cannot get doctors to do the BCG tests, or would it be necessary to train technicians to do this?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we certainly would not want technicians to do it. BCG has not become widely accepted in Ontario yet. It is coming into vogue. That seems rather a strange way to put it, because it is not a new thing by any means. There has been a very great deal of reticence to instituting a BCG programme. The director

who is the present incumbent of that office in my department believes in this very much, and has been promoting this programme. I think it is finding more favour because more and more the value of our former case-finding methods is being called in question.

For instance, we have to do a great many tests or chest x-rays to find one case of tuberculosis now. Many of us are questioning the wisdom of carrying on the up-to-the-present accepted type of case finding. I would say that BCG will again, by a process of education, probably become more acceptable. BCG in Quebec has been quite popular for a long time, and certainly in European countries it has been accepted for a very long time. But it has never been, so far, widely accepted in Canada.

I may not be completely accurate in this, but my feeling about this conference which just ended in Toronto gave evidence of a growing interest and a growing liking for BCG, so I would anticipate that it will become steadily more popular although, once again, not suddenly or radically so.

Vote 709 agreed to.

On vote 710:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to protest once again the lack of a policy for the pollution control of our air. I think four more municipalities in the province of Ontario passed bylaws covering this problem; now, I think, there are about 22 different towns and cities in the province that do have some type of bylaw that tries to control the poison in our air.

The truth of the matter is that this problem will never be solved within the province unless there is a law that covers the province from border to border. I realize that you get into problems on the border of Quebec and Manitoba and with the various states of the U.S., but certainly a lot can be done within the province of Ontario to pass a law that has some teeth in it. For no matter how conscientious one city might be in trying to enforce a bylaw, what good is it if a neighbouring city, not too far away, lets any factor do as it pleases? This, to some extent, happens. So if you are going to have any pollution control, you have to have a provincial law with teeth in it.

Even in the city of Toronto, where, being a large city, they have a real problem, they have made some improvements. But the fines under a local bylaw are often so low that it is a license to poison the air. We have had instances where some large firms have been letting the smoke loose, brought before the

court, found guilty and they are fined \$50. They go back and do the same thing all over again.

So we are not going to have proper control of this problem until the province sees fit to put in a strong law with fines sufficiently big enough that the large firms will take heed. If you fine a large firm \$50 a day instead of \$50 for the overall offence, it might not be so bad, but the municipalities simply are not doing it. Even the 22 that have passed by-laws and are laying charges against certain firms are doing it in a rather namby-pamby manner.

There have been improvements, but the situation got so bad in Toronto that there had to be improvements. If you come in by airplane toward the city of Toronto, you can see the smog on certain occasions sitting over the town like a heavy pall. And in Hamilton it is worse. This means that we have a very serious health hazard here in the province of Ontario. I am not going into all the statistics of how it effects bronchitis, the threat of cancer and all the various problems that it brings, but there is certainly an abundance of medical proof that living in an urban area, where you have a great deal of traffic, whether it is the fumes from a car or wherever you have these factories, increases the health hazard. The only way you are going to have any semblance of real control is a strong provincial law and, over and above that, where we make arrangements with neighbouring provinces and states.

But whether or not we have any arrangements with Quebec, Manitoba or New York, we certainly can do a great deal within our province. But it can only come from Queen's Park, because a local municipality, no matter how much it may want to control its own air, simply cannot do it. It is just a matter of common sense, and despite the committee report—we had a select committee on this problem in 1957—the recommendations of that committee, in large part, have been ignored.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has given any further thought to putting some teeth into air pollution control in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, I gather, has forgotten that last year we pointed out that the province was responsible for the control of chemical pollution and the only control that was left in the hands of the municipalities was the pollution caused by products of combustion—black smoke, it was usually known as. The province has been very active in the area of trying

to control other pollutants, first by the programme of approving all plans for installations which might be the cause of pollution, or for installations that are to be renovated or replaced and now, as announced in the remarks I made in the opening of our estimates, we plan to extend the regulations to cover existing sources of pollution. I am not sure that I understand exactly what the hon. member means by asking if we have put teeth into the Act. I do not believe that by punishing—if this is the thinking—we can attain the objective we seek. Somebody said some time ago that politics is an inexact science; air pollution control is also an inexact science, and I am still faced with these complaints that the control equipment or the control methods or agents available are not satisfactory yet. Until that time comes, and until we find satisfactory methods of control, I think it would be very unwise to start putting teeth into an Act if the means of enforcing it were not within our reach.

I know that a great deal is said about what is being done here, there and all over, but actually when one looks at air pollution control, the most success has been in the area of control of products of combustion, or black smoke. Often one hears of Pittsburgh and the wonderful things they did there. Of course they cleaned up their black smoke, because that is relatively easy to do.

Why do we leave this in the hands of the municipalities? Because this is something that happens from day to day and from hour to hour, and it will be totally impossible for the province to have an adequate staff of inspectors to keep this under control. The emissions which are more dangerous and of far greater importance, of course, are the emissions which come within our sphere of influence—the chemical and other types of emission apart from the products of combustion, and this is the area where we have to be active.

I see that 27 sources of air pollution were examined during the last several months since our regulations came into effect, five approvals were issued and one was refused, and preliminary planning discussions have been held with 17 companies which are planning construction during 1965. Surveys were conducted by my department at 57 plants in the province, and 21 complaints came to our attention regarding industrial sources and they were handled.

The department was involved in a joint study with The Department of National Health and Welfare, and the meteorological service of Canada, air pollution control

division. This had to do with the air pollution in the Metropolitan Windsor area and it was decided that this was being caused by sources in the vicinity of Michigan.

We are just about to participate in a conference in Toronto of authorities concerned with air pollution and air pollution control from all of Canada and all of the U.S.—it is a North American project. This is the first such conference held here, out of which we will collect not only benefits from the experiences of others who probably have been longer in this field than we, but we are rather interested to note that some of them are paying a good deal of attention to what we are doing and are interested in the programmes that we have under way.

The question of the effect on one's health is very much before us and is of very great concern to The Department of Health. This was why we asked the House last year to permit us to include support of these programmes in our public health programmes, and, as you will recall, we are supporting this in the same way as any public health programme. Not very many—only three—communities have taken advantage of this and three more are in the process of being given a programme. But this is not because they not interested; it is because they do not have staff to do the job and we set up courses of instruction for the staff. We also offer this service to the municipalities and train the staff at no cost to them. This, too, will take time but it is beginning to bear fruit and I feel quite certain that we can look forward to some better things.

It would be dishonest if I led the House to believe, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that we should take over the total air pollution control. I have already mentioned the almost-impossible task it would be to try to control pollution caused by products of combustion.

I explained during my preliminary remarks our most recent views concerning automobile exhausts. Here again, the mechanism or equipment is not satisfactory. The state of California—the only state on the continent which has done a good deal of work on this and has an Act of legislation on the question—is finding itself face to face with very grave difficulties in enforcing the statute. Now we learn that some of the automobile manufacturers have developed or are in the process of developing, a more effective control, something that is built into or becomes a part of the engine. My air pollution control branch is in discussion with them, in the hope that this will provide surcease from that very irritating source of pollution.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the reason why I suggested overall pollution control is this: I realize that enforcing the law has to be done at the local level, in the same way as the criminal code is a federal matter but is enforced by local police on the job, but this government began suggesting about 1957, or shortly after the report came in from the committee, that municipalities pass bylaws. Slowly, in the course of seven or eight years, 22 municipalities have passed bylaws and when you think of the 900-odd municipalities in Ontario, you realize that the vast majority just do not bother. About 22 out of 900-plus have complied, so that again it seems obvious that one municipality cannot control its neighbours. But these municipalities are the creatures of the province and the province can lay the ground rules.

Second, the 22 bylaws, even though you recommend one, vary from place to place. The minimum fines set out are silly. Here is an example in Toronto: A firm offending the bylaw a number of times, seriously, each time is fined only \$50. It is a licence to poison; \$50 is not going to stop any large firm, and the defence of the firm was that its plant had been there years before the bylaw was passed. If you are going to go by that, it means that they are going to go on poisoning the air until the plant falls down.

This is what I mean by saying that the province should have an enforcement agency with real teeth in the law and see to it that the municipalities, as the province's agents, enforce the law in the same way that the Toronto police enforce the criminal law that is passed in Ottawa. This is going to become a more serious problem as our province becomes more and more urbanized. There are more plants and more factories being scattered throughout Ontario, not just in the great Metro area of Toronto, but throughout the province. Unless you make strict ground rules for all the municipalities to follow, you are going to find that this problem is not going to be solved, it is going to be far more serious.

The hon. Minister has mentioned what Pittsburgh has done, and again you might turn to California. The problem is still, in many cases, just smoke, just what they have controlled in Pittsburgh. I know that there are many things that have not been controlled, that some forms of air pollution are harder to control than others, but the main offender to date has been this black smoke that comes shooting out of the chimneys of our large factories. This can, in large measure, be controlled and I think that the provincial government has been extremely lax in allowing this

to continue throughout the province of Ontario.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I am very curious about the effect of the department's industrial hygiene inspection in the large industrial plants in this province and I will pick two plants particularly. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell me how many inspections were made by the department in the last two years into the Steel Company of Canada, the Hilton branch at Hamilton, and the Dominion Foundries and Steel in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member put that as a question and I will undertake to get the answer for him but I could not possibly give it tonight.

Mr. Gisborn: It comes under this vote, industrial hygiene branch.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I grant the hon. member that, but I do not have the specific places that they visit on their inspections.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, I would then conclude my questioning and expect the hon. Minister will give me an answer to all my questions at the same time. I would like to know the number of inspections made by the field branch, and the nature of the reports that are compiled with the department. Also, parts of The Mining Act apply to both these plants, inasmuch as they have cinderling plants, and I wonder if the industrial hygiene branch of The Department of Health makes sure that the inspections are carried out by the mining inspection branch to assure that The Silicosis Act is being enforced in both these plants as to periodic examinations.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot answer the first part of the hon. member's question specifically, but I do know that there is very close co-operation in inspections between The Department of Health and The Department of Mines. Frequently the two departments go together on an inspection, and the complaint we most commonly hear with respect to silicosis inspections is that we are too rigid and that men who, in our opinion, or in the opinion of our clinicians, should not be exposed in high-pressure areas, find difficulty in getting certificates from us.

The Silicosis Act, of course, is quite separate. We only act as consultants in that regard, but, I repeat, many of the employees whom we will refuse to certify feel that we are too rigid in our interpretation and make it difficult for them to get jobs. That is not our concern. Our concern is to advise the

individual that in our opinion he should not be in that high-exposure job and, therefore, should not be certified.

On the number of inspections or the places which they go, I cannot give the hon. member at the present time, but I will find them. The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) advises me that he will be able to discuss the whole silicosis problem when his estimates are before the House.

In the type of work they did, they made 55 field investigations during the year 1964, but again they are not spelled out here. They examined 8,087 blood smears for possible absorption, they examined 113 blood specimens from workmen exposed to organic phosphorous, insecticides, and these were checked for cholinesterase activity. Lung sections from 32 workmen were examined for silicon content; in 19 plants, a total of 1,665 noise level determinations were made, and 35 plants were visited. A total of 287 air samples were taken, later were analyzed for the presence of toxic materials. Samples submitted for analysis by government departments and recognized agencies amounted to 381, involving 919 analyses; 3,129 urine specimens and water samples were made to assess the degree of metal inclusion, lead arsenic and such; analyses of 276 samples were suspected of mislabelling under the stuffed articles regulations were investigated.

That is a brief rundown on the field activities performed by the branch during the calendar year 1964. But I will have to get the specific factories that they visited and how often.

Mr. Gisborn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am interested in two plants and the inspections and nature of the reports, and I will expect them at a later date.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Did the hon. member mention the Steel Company of Canada—was it just the one plant?

Mr. Gisborn: The Steel Company of Canada—the Hamilton works—and the Dominion Foundries and Steel.

Vote 710 agreed to.

On vote 711:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I think we are back to something that deals with sanitation. Last year when we were discussing a number of Acts which come under this department, the hon. Minister indicated that he was reviewing the regulations of these various Acts dealing with business and professional groups. We had a little difficulty in

pinning him down as to exactly when there might be any conclusion to this review. Indeed, his comment with regard to the specific Act on which I wanted to raise a few points, namely, The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act, was, "I cannot promise they will be able to recommend changes next year because there are a great many difficulties and involved problems in them."

Now, during the course of the year, I understand that the directors of the board which is responsible for carrying out the regulations, had a study themselves, familiarly known as the Ingram study, named after the chairman of the committee. And in the minds of many people, this report was rather disturbing. For example, if I may just take two points, it suggested that the undertakers rather than the provincial government should decide who will serve on the board which administers the Act. Secondly, it suggested a \$200 fine for anyone who conducts a funeral without a permit from the board. Right now, as the hon. Minister will certainly know—and perhaps some of the hon. members—only a death certificate from a doctor and a burial certificate from a police station are required, and for cremation a coroner's certificate is also required.

So I have one overall question that I would like to ask the hon. Minister—whether or not the report of the Ingram committee has been received by his department, whether it is being considered and what is likely to emerge from his consideration?

Before I sit down, there are two other points that I want to comment on. One is that under the present Act, three of the five members of the board are licensed funeral directors. At present all five are undertakers; in other words, it is a complete monopoly made up of just those people and no other groups who may be interested in the conduct of funerals. The suggestion has been made, for example, that if three of the five were funeral directors, then the remaining two should be representative of, for example, a council of churches, and perhaps the memorial societies which are taking a more and more vocal place in this whole picture.

Mr. Sopha: And Ron Haggart!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, perhaps. I think he is rather tied up with other things. Whether he would want to assume a position on this board, I rather doubt.

Also, there is another point that I raised a year or so ago, and the hon. Minister I do not think made any definitive statement. That is in regard to advertising, regulation

28, subsection 2 under The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act. It reads now that no funeral director shall in his advertising include any reference to prices or conditions of sale. Now, in my view, Mr. Chairman, that particular regulation is precisely the opposite of what we should have. There is a growing body of people, particularly in what is known as the memorial societies, who feel that if you are going to rescue people from some of the excessively high cost of dying, it is going to be by making it a little easier for the family to shop at this rather trying time, and not come in with no idea at all as to what the costs might be.

In this connection, I was rather interested just this past week, in seeing a story in the *Toronto Telegram*, under the date of June 9, 1965, in which in his annual report to the Toronto memorial society, Mr. F. Malcolm Croggon reported that there are now eight Toronto funeral directors who are prepared to provide funerals for \$150 for those who want them, and apparently because of the regulations, people who are interested in finding out who these eight funeral directors are, can do so by getting in touch with the memorial society. There is, I think, across the whole of the North American continent, considerable soul-searching—if that is the appropriate term to use in this context—with regard to the high cost of dying and some of the near barbaric practices that seem to have crept into our funeral practices.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment first on the Ingram committee and what his department has done; and second, whether or not there is any consideration being given to a change in the regulations and particularly to the one with reference to advertising?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the Ingram study was never submitted to me. The board did not ask for any change in the regulations this year, nor did the association suggest that we should take the study under advisement.

There is no consideration being given at all at present for changing regulations. It is quite true that all five members of the board of examiners are funeral directors, but according to my understanding, the board is composed of five members; the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor delegates the chairman, the vice-chairman, and members of the board elect the secretary-treasurer. But the board of examiners is authorized to prescribe the qualifications for registration and the discipline of its members. It is also empowered to collect certain fees from the

candidates for registration and registrants for practice, such as examination fees, registration fees and annual fees. Out of these fees the board pays expenses, including the travelling and other expenses, of its members.

I have to repeat what I have said, I think, on each of the previous occasions when I have stood here trying to speak to this. This is an area of very great difficulty to the department, because our business, as The Department of Health, is concerned with the health overtones or the health aspects of these problems. I must say that I am still hard put to it to know where health is concerned in death, because now we bury our dead rather quickly; there are not the same health problems inherent in this that there used to be, or that were one time considered to be. I think that it is not the business of The Department of Health to get into the determination of business matters. It is true that under their Act, they have the power to control certain advertising; they believe themselves to be a profession and, as such, have the right to dictate, as all professions do, the type of advertising used.

I was led to believe that this was a good thing, and was in the interests of all concerned. Perhaps I was too gullible, I do not know. I do not think so. But it was never intended, in my thinking, that the power to control their advertising would militate against the public. I do know there has been a great deal of talk about this, and I also know that there are those in the industry who believe that the dead should not bury their own dead. But the fact does remain that the hon. member has pointed out very clearly, and I think this fact is not widely enough known, that one does not have to be embalmed and that one does not have to engage a funeral director to bury the dead. But I still believe we will continue to use them, because I do not think that very many of us want to do that last sad office for our own.

In summary, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the Ingram study was not referred to us, no change in regulations was asked and we did not undertake any change in regulations ourselves because we had knowledge that this and one or two other studies were going on, reports from none of which have come to us as yet.

Mr. Sopha: There is no question that the embalmers and funeral directors come under the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Health, I think.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: Well, has the hon. Minister read, for example, and I do not want to sound pedantic, the book recently published *The American Way of Death*, by Jessica Mitford?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: And perchance you have read *The Loved One*, by Evelyn Waugh?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Then we can talk on common ground. Does the hon. Minister not agree that some funerals in our modern society, to put it in as low a case as I can, are revoltingly elaborate? I think there is no question that some people are prevailed upon to overspend in paying proper respects, in their own view, to the departed person of their family. Therefore, is the hon. Minister not concerned that some of the abuses may exist in Ontario that Jessica Mitford pointed out in her excellent treatise? She took many years to prepare it, and it was particularly relevant to the state of California, but her treatise was nation-wide. She searched for information and statistics all over the United States. In these cultural configurations, it is usually true that when there is an example of extremism in any parts of our culture or folkways in the United States, there is, to some extent, a reflection of it in Canada, because after all, we are strung out along the southern border here and we have not much defence in depth to cultural manifestations in the United States.

Therefore I ask, is the hon. Minister not concerned? That is what my hon. friend from York South was getting at; he said very plainly that perhaps if you allow these people to advertise their rates, the prices will become more competitive. I am struck by some of the illustrations Miss Mitford used. She gives examples of the person who is not connected by blood to the deceased. He is not a close relative. He goes and tries to bargain with the funeral directors—morticians as they like to be called. My hon. friend used the word undertakers, but they are horrified at the use of that word; funeral directors or morticians, they like to be called. I detected the nuance in the hon. Minister's words when he said they like to think of themselves as a profession. I know exactly what he meant when he said that, and I want him to know that his slight essay of humour did not go undetected by all in the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member misunderstood me. There was no essay at humour whatsoever. I simply stated what I believe to be a fact.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I know. I am still with you. I am still receiving you.

Mr. Bryden: He thought it was humorous.

Mr. Sopha: When I was referring to the individual, Miss Mitford tells about his travails in going to some of these people and trying to pin them down to a price—trying to get them down to the lowest possible price, and all the double talk and falderal that such a person has to go through. One of the duties of people in politics is that we go to many of these funerals of leading citizens who depart this life and go to their great reward. I must say, speaking as one, that I see in many cases where the money would be more usefully spent and maybe might be spent in the form of a more lasting tribute to the deceased and his contribution to the community, than in paying for the elaborate last rites and the preparations for sending him off to the happy hunting grounds that is usually his just reward.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, one brief final comment here. I thought I detected in the hon. Minister's observation a growing feeling that it is not really relevant to his department; that he has no desire to meddle in the business arrangements involved in these various professions. But it was in his department in the first instance, because it related to health. Today, burying takes place rather rapidly and there are few remaining health problems. I suspect that the hon. Minister has a point. If he is not interested in pursuing a study of the regulations related to this and other Acts that come under his department, it might more appropriately—and I am not saying this facetiously or critically—come under the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). It would seem to me that he—

Mr. Bryden: Or the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko).

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Provincial Secretary, my hon. colleague says. I choked on that just for a moment.

It seems to me that the regulations, particularly of this Act, and notably in view of the second thoughts in the proposed rules that are merging within the organization itself—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): How about The Department of Mines?

Mr. MacDonald: The Department of Mines?

An hon. member: Or The Department of Lands and Forests?

Mr. MacDonald: My point, Mr. Chairman, is simply this, and I shall make it again in summation and sit down. The hon. Minister clearly indicated that he was not particularly interested in this, and he may well have a point. But I think that somebody on the government side should be interested in a careful review of all these regulations. If you are going to have some guidance from the Ingram committee, you had better bolster yourself, because I think that it will take you in the wrong direction.

Mr. Sopha: It might be a good idea if you are looking for things to appoint select committees to.

It might be an idea that the government should consider appointing a select committee to look into the cost of burial of our dead in the province.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not intend to leave the hon. members to feel that we were not interested. I thought it would be rather silly to carry out a review of the regulations when I knew that certain committees were working under the direction of the board of examiners on certain studies which they believe will have a bearing on the regulations. It would appear obvious that we are not going to get those reports now, and we will proceed with a review of the regulations, to what end, I am not in a position to tell, but I think it is quite safe now to assume that the Ingram report is not going to come to me.

Mr. MacDonald: That, in essence, is what you said last year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but the report had not been started then.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on this vote, would the hon. Minister let us know to what extent the government, or his department, is engaged in monitoring radioactive fallout in the province, either on its own responsibility or in co-operation with the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That was in the last vote—industrial hygiene. However, I will say to the hon. member that my department works very closely with the federal atomic energy board of Canada, and in addition to that, there is an interdepartmental committee at Deputy Minister level which has been carrying out very extensive studies in this matter over the past several months in Ontario alone. We do all of the testing that is done in Ontario, with the exception of some work

that is done in one or two of the universities. We have a radioactive fallout laboratory in Toronto and we do a great deal of background testing for other departments of government and for municipalities and agencies that request it from us.

Mr. Renwick: Would the hon. Minister let us know to what extent experiments are being carried out and whether there is publication of any reports about the experiments and the extent of the work that is being done? I assume that this is the proper vote because it covers the environmental sanitation branch.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No research work is being carried on by the provincial Department of Health; this is the responsibility of the federal government.

In the field of service for radiation protection, we conduct the carrying out of specific exposures to radioactive material for hospitals, mines, dial painting, and so on, examining and making recommendations regarding plans for medical x-ray suites; assisting in the atomic energy control board and enforcing regulations respecting the use of radioactive materials in Ontario; acting as liaison in the joint off-site reactor programme set up between Ontario and The Department of National Health and Welfare; carrying out laboratory and field research—this is field research, not basic research—on the amount of exposure to personnel operating medical and commercial x-ray equipment; handling emergencies where radioactive materials are involved; arranging monitoring programmes for mining and power reactor operations; acting in an advisory capacity to The Department of Mines and to The Department of Labour in matters pertaining to radioactivity and x-rays.

During this calendar year, 1964, our field workers investigated 215 radioactive hazards throughout the province. These were made in connection with radioactive problems in industry, mines, hospitals and other medical establishments, and at nuclear reactors and other locations. They examined plans for 33 medical x-ray suites; 26 industrial radiation installations were examined and recommendations made.

The Douglas Point nuclear power station has fallen behind schedule and is not expected to be critical until late 1965, but the hazards revealed by the federal reactor safety advisory committee continued during 1964. The station is still incomplete.

The hydro-electric power commission property at Fairport beach received condi-

tional approval by the reactor safety advisory committee as the type for a two-unit nuclear power station rated at 500 electrical megawatts. This has already been discussed in the House, I believe.

Radioactive pollution of public waters in uranium mining areas near Elliot Lake and Bancroft, upon which we have been keeping a watch since 1958, became a prime object of interest in 1964 and it was for this reason that the committee was set up at Deputy Minister level, charged with the task of developing remedies.

In conjunction with The Ontario Department of Mines, requirements have been laid on those uranium mines which closed down and are selling off their milling equipment to ensure that no such equipment is transferred to food or other sensitive industries. Such equipment transferred elsewhere is first decontaminated to a specified level, determined by the branch.

These are the things that the branch was connected with and a summary of the work that it performed during 1964.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister intend that any reports of the Deputy Ministers committee will be published or any information made available to the public in this general field?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to give that decision; this committee was set up by the government and not by my department alone. My department is involved in it only—

Mr. Renwick: Is the Deputy Minister of Health a member of this committee?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are four Deputy Ministers concerned, of which the Deputy Minister of Health is one.

Mr. Renwick: Was there a decision made to publish any of the results of the investigations or studies or work that is being done under the aegis of that committee?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think we will leave that question for the hon. Prime Minister to answer.

Mr. Sopha: I will say this to you: I watch all this fencing going on between the two of you with a good deal of depression.

The select committee on mining came away from Elliot Lake very much concerned about the problem there and it was put to us as simply as this, in terms that even the most uninformed layman could understand.

Years ago they used to throw out the uranium and extract the radium. Now our technology has developed to the point that they extract uranium and throw out radium. The radium goes on the rockpiles there, such as I remember from my boyhood in Cobalt. It has a half-life, if I am correct, of 1,576 years, and when rain or precipitation comes down on it, it finds its way into the watershed.

I and my hon. friend from York North (Mr. Mackenzie), who is not here tonight, my friend, the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. R. G. Hodgson), who is in the House, and the hon. member for York Mills (Mr. Bales) were on that committee. We were told that the radium sits in the rockpiles with that long half-life and it is draining into the watershed. It is finding its way down those watersheds into the Great Lakes watersheds. I had the impression when I left Elliot Lake that something must be done to contain that precipitation from getting into the watersheds or else there is a real danger of the pollution of the Great Lakes system with radioactivity.

I have seen learned reports about the "minimal amount," so-called, of radioactivity that goes in, but I have the fear, as a layman, that it will not always be a minimal amount, that it will build up into something serious, with serious effects to future generations of Canadians.

I have waited for the opportunity to say this, that I thought when this problem was revealed by one of the Metro newspapers, that the appointment of a committee of four Deputy Ministers, only one of them qualified in the field of public health, offered protection that was much of a panacea. I did not see, with all respect to those estimable gentlemen and their many years of service to this province, that they were very qualified to deal with the problem.

I wish the hon. Minister, for the sake of the people at Elliot Lake, who are concerned about this problem, and for the sake of other people in Ontario, would stop trying to shift the responsibility to the federal government. If anything has been done about this, if there is no reason for alarm, then let the government, this vague, general, amorphous body the hon. Ministers refers to—the government, whoever that is—say so, let some spokesman get up and tell it once and for all. If it is a serious problem, as we believed it was in the select committee on mining, let us hear what steps are being taken to contain the problem so that future generations of Canadians as yet unborn will not be affected by this radioactivity.

Vote 711 agreed to.

On vote 712:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Minister going to reply to the hon. member for Sudbury?

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to quote at any great length, but in an article in the *Toronto Daily Star* on January 23 of this year, The Department of National Health and Welfare disclosed that levels of cesium 137, one of the more lethal of radioactive byproducts, are increasing in large areas of the north and are approaching the danger point for human beings. Further on down it says:

Canada has to face the fact, therefore, that it has a continuing health problem.

I would have assumed, particularly after the intervention of the hon. member for Sudbury, that the Minister of Health of this government would have had something to say that could have been of some assistance to the people of the province of Ontario in finding out the extent of this danger; the extent to which this government is interested in it; what publications are going to be made of the findings of their committee and what future plans they have to cope with this problem.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member himself touched on the matter. It is a national problem. Atomic energy control lies within the purview of the federal government. We have been doing all we can to co-operate with them. So far I have nothing to report because I have not received any report yet. Until I have a report it would be rather futile of me to stand here and try to give any kind of an intelligent reply to the questions asked. I have noted them. The department and the government of Ontario are equally concerned about the people of Ontario, but I cannot say anything more about it because I do not know yet. Again, I repeat that basically this is a federal matter and we are co-operating and willing to continue to co-operate to the fullest possible extent with the federal authorities.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, are there any meetings taking place from time to time, and if so, how many meetings, and what are the subjects which are being discussed? Is there any likelihood that there will be a report in the near future, or will there be an interim report? Will there be any work done on this subject, or do we have to wait until next year to ask the same question again?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can only tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the Deputy Minister of Energy and Resources Management is the

chairman of this committee. I am not in a position to tell you when they will be prepared to submit a report because my deputy is not the chairman of it. They meet at intervals when they are called to meet, to consider the matters that are put before them.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I hope they just will not treat the report as the first report was treated. That one was tucked under the rug until somebody was very alert and discovered it and revealed its contents and made us acquainted with the problem.

However, on another subject, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the laboratory outlined here does any testing of drugs or medications?

Mr. Chairman: Could I ask the member, is he on 712?

Mr. Sopha: Vote 712, sir.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, before we leave 711, my last comment on this question of the radioactive material fallout in the atmosphere is to ask would the government seriously consider taking the public into their confidence about what is being done? I do not think that the people of the province of Ontario need to be treated like a bunch of school children. I think they should be taken into confidence by regular reports. And if there is nothing to report, say so. If there is something to report, let us have a series of periodic reports so that the people of the province of Ontario will not suddenly be faced with another scarifying situation such as developed a few months ago.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member was talking about the radiation hazard at Elliot Lake and in the vicinity of other uranium mines. These reports which he mentions now are published periodically, and they are the responsibility of the federal government. The Department of National Health and Welfare publishes a report.

Now, there was a time when the fallout was at rather high levels when we were publishing reports every day, but this, I think, is now down to being published once a month. They are evident in the newspapers if one watches for them. But they are the responsibility of The Department of National Health and Welfare, of the atomic energy control board.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, just a little further on this debate—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this was under vote 710. I answered the question out of courtesy because the hon. member had missed it.

Mr. Chairman: I will permit just a short comment, if you wish.

Mr. Farquhar: Well, it will certainly be short, Mr. Chairman. I have a resolution on the order paper to do with this very thing, and I hesitate to make a prolonged set of pronouncements in connection with the radioactivity in Elliot Lake. But I would like to point out, since the hon. Minister is saying that the federal government has all the responsibility in this connection, or has made a reference to this effect, he will agree, I think, that the only laboratory that can carry out determinations in this particular field is in his own department. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no! We only established our laboratory to augment the services that were being provided by Ottawa.

Mr. Farquhar: However, the laboratories doing what testing is being done in connection with radioactivity are under this department's control?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, the main laboratory work is being done by Ottawa. We augment the service that they provide, and we will make tests for other government departments, agencies or persons in the province who ask us to do them. We do some independent testing on our own background values.

For instance, we did work at Douglas Point. We did some background testing there before the plant was put in so that we would have controls to go by after the plant was put in. We do this in the interests of protecting our own people. We are doing the same thing now at Frenchmen's Bay, in preparation for the reactor plant that will go in there. We test grains, cereals. The bulk of our testing is done for experimental purposes.

Mr. Farquhar: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, your organization is actually doing the testing of water, I understand, in the various lakes in the area?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: For the Ontario water resources commission as requested.

Mr. Farquhar: That is what I understand. And because of these tests, I feel that there has been an extreme lack of the reports that have been referred to here. I certainly go along with the hon. member for Riverdale to

the effect that the people of Ontario are not children, and we should have access to the kind of reports that are presumably being made available from time to time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is the federal member there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we are in the position of consultants. If somebody asks us to do a job for them, we do the job and we send them the report. I feel it is their responsibility then to make the report public, or do with it what they will. But it is not my responsibility, nor do I have the authority to make public a report on a piece of work that is sent us to be done by some other agency. It would seem to me that the proper body to ask for these reports would be the Ontario water resources commission, but we can hardly make public reports on tests that we do at their request for them.

Mr. Sopha: Do these laboratories test drugs and medications in order to determine whether they have all the characteristics and qualities proclaimed for them?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, a branch of the Attorney General's crime laboratory does that for us. These laboratories are for public health, testing water samples and sewage samples, and clinical testing of blood specimens, bacteriology, biochemistry, pathology, virology, things of that kind. If you have got a bug and your doctor takes a swab and sends it in to us, we grow the bugs and tell you what they are and how to kill them.

Mr. Sopha: Do you have this place that tests medications?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General does it for us.

Mr. Sopha: They do it, or is it a federal government responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, yes. The food and drug administration, Mr. Chairman, does it for everybody. A drug cannot be put on the market until they have passed it. But you will recall shortly after I became Minister, we set up a system of assaying drugs which we bought for our own use. You will probably recall what we advised, the difference in price between generic drugs and trade name drugs. We set up a system of having samples of all our drugs purchased as assays, and the Attorney General's crime laboratory was equipped to do that sort of thing with a little expansion and they do that as a service for our department.

Mr. Sopha: I have been looking for some place in the estimates to ask about the medication Sistosan, which was invented by a physician in my community in Sudbury and is said to have haemostatic qualities widely recognized as such. I wondered if the department was familiar with it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am afraid I am not, Mr. Chairman. Unless we use it, we would not be assaying it. If it is on the market, that testing has to be done by the food and drug administration first. We have nothing to do with that. The name rings a bell, and yet I am not familiar with it, and I do not know if we use it in our hospitals or not.

Mr. Sopha: Well, could I ask you this as a medical man? Is the problem of haemorrhage completely conquered? Can medical science always stop internal haemorrhage?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. Internal haemorrhage can be attributed to many causes, and without knowing what the cause is, of course, one does not know very much about what to do with it. Sometimes an internal haemorrhage can be easily stopped. Some can be stopped by transfusion, some will stop spontaneously, some can be stopped by medical methods. But to say they can all be controlled would be quite wrong.

Vote 712 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will resume these estimates, and then after this, The Department of Mines and the final department will be The Department of Public Welfare. I would like to set aside an hour between five and six tomorrow afternoon to go back at the other bills and orders on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.35 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 15, 1965
Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	4143
Recess, 12.40 o'clock	4161

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We welcome as guests to the Legislature today in the west gallery, students from Lynden public school, Lynden.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), but he is not in his seat, before the orders of the day. Notice was given.

Mr. Speaker: I will see that he answers it tomorrow.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps we could revert back to these orders when the hon. Attorney General takes his seat.

Mr. Speaker: It all depends if we are through routine proceedings. If we are through routine proceedings, it is more difficult to revert.

Orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I might say we can revert later on if necessary. I believe there are two questions this morning. We can revert and have these questions ordered.

Clerk of the House: The fifty-sixth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

On vote 713:

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, before we get into the body of this vote, I undertook at the outset of my discussion of the estimates to make some comments on the matters that had been dealt

with by the hon. members for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) and Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis), since their remarks were largely directed toward this vote, 713.

I will try to deal first with what the hon. member for Scarborough West said. He led directly into the subject, and much of what the hon. member for Parkdale said was along the same line.

First of all, it was an interesting experience indeed to listen to what they said, and I could not help but smile as I recalled where I stood at the time I was about the same age as the hon. member for Scarborough West. I took a canter in theology at that time, sir, and I had all the answers to all of the social ills of the world. I knew exactly how to deal with them, I knew exactly how they should be handled and I knew exactly that they could be cured and I could cure them. I was not very long in theology before I realized how stupid and how wrong I was, and then I went into medicine with exactly the same idea.

I knew all the answers to all of the questions and all of the problems that had plagued medicine over the years and the centuries; I could solve and answer all the questions and deal with all of the problems. The only thing I learned above all else, sir, in the time that I have remained in the practice of medicine is, how wrong I was with my first impressions, how little I actually did know, how little I actually do know. In spite of the tremendous body of experience and information and knowledge that we have built up in the practice of medicine in all of its various fields, one thing stands out crystal clear above all else—how little we do know and what great gaps there are in our knowledge.

It is quite true that the hon. member can produce a great many documents. To borrow a phrase which is a favourite one of this group, they can document the case, chapter and verse. So could I, Mr. Chairman, when I was the same age as the hon. member for Scarborough West. I could get scientific papers and I could get the opinions and the decisions of outstanding people in the various fields, men who shared my ideas—as I thought again, foolishly. But they were not my ideas,

Mr. Chairman. Actually, my ideas were those that were being put forth by those people and I had particularly either wittingly or otherwise, sought out in the literature and in all of the writings and in all of the books, I had sought for and found, papers that spelled out the opinions in which I could believe, in which I had faith, and the ideas that were pleasing to me. But I had not taken the time, nor did I then have the experience, knowledge or the perception to subject them to the cold, critical analysis which must be, perforce, completely unprejudiced and dispassionate, but which is absolutely essential.

However, the salutary influence of time and experience, I hope, has done something for me.

The outstanding thing in the comments made by both the hon. members, sir, and one cannot escape this, is that they made a great to-do of the failures. There is not a physician practising medicine, there is not a person practising in any line of endeavour or human society, who recognizes, whether he chooses to or not, that there must be failures in all things.

He does not mention, for instance, that The Department of Health, through its mental health branch, has, until very recently, done practically all of the psychiatric treatment that was done in the province of Ontario, and that even today, with the much wider spread of private practice, with the establishment of psychiatric units in general hospitals, initiated and encouraged by the department, with all of this expansion, we are still responsible for at least two-thirds of all of the admissions and for all of the long-term care. With the exception of one or two relatively small private institutions, the province of Ontario, through its mental health branch and The Department of Health, is responsible for all of the long-term psychiatric treatment for the patients.

Nor did either one of the hon. members mention that 999 Queen West—the oldest hospital, it is true, and I will come back to touch upon this matter of age—is an important and integral part of the teaching programme of the University of Toronto. Mr. Chairman, can you or any hon. member in this House, or any thinking person in the province of Ontario, contemplate a snake pit—the name applied to it by the hon. member for Parkdale—being recognized as part of the teaching programme of the largest medical school in Canada, and one of the most modern on the continent? It is rather hard to tell.

In this recital of all of the failures—and, Mr.

Chairman, there are relatively few—they gloss over the thousands of successful cases who pass through this hospital, who have passed through it, and will continue. These successful cases, sir, can be numbered in the thousands, vis-à-vis the relatively few failures. We do not make light of our failures, sir. No physician with any conscience or with any deep and abiding interest in his profession makes light of the failures. Of course, we have patients commit suicide; we have had several patients commit suicide. Indeed, on one of the days on which this inquest was being held, a dance was being held for the patients. Apparently because one patient was rebuffed by the young lady whom he asked to dance, he walked out of the hall and drowned himself in Georgian Bay, on which our hospital is situated. This in spite of the fact that two of our attendants gave chase immediately, jumped into the water after him and risked their own lives in an attempt to save him.

These things will happen, sir. They happen with ill people and they happen with people who are apparently normal—we have suicides and murders and capital crimes of all kinds. This is not to excuse them or to make light of them, but to point up that the failures with which we meet are bound to come in the nature of things; the more freedom we give our patients and the more we widen our concept of the care and treatment of the mentally ill, the more calculated risks will have to be taken. Then great headlines come out that a patient died, found tied to his chair. Mr. Chairman, that patient was tied to his chair in exactly the same way as you would be if you were unfortunate enough to meet with an automobile accident and were found tied to the seat of your car. It is a safety precaution, a safety belt, a thing that many hon. members of the Opposition and many hon. members all through this House have been advocating that we make compulsory. This is what was meant by being tied. The only difference is that we used a strip of old sheet, rather than a webbing belt. But it serves exactly the same purpose, and any person who has anything to do with nursing the sick recognizes it. But there are, and will continue to be, times when even those who are not mentally ill, will have to be restrained in bed for their own safety and for their own good.

The hon. member for Scarborough West spoke about bold new experiments in many other places, but in doing so, sir, he left the impression—and I think he wanted to leave the impression—that we here in Ontario are

not attempting any bold new experiments. He mentioned, for instance, the experiment in Selkirk, with boarding-out homes, but he did not mention that this was not a government-sponsored thing; he did not mention that this was sponsored by the voluntary groups and the communities; he did not mention that for 35 years, Ontario has been in this field and has been carrying on with it quite successfully, and it has come to be accepted so much a pattern of our proceedings that it is scarcely noted now.

Again, he quoted—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not believe that the *Hansard* is yet before us, but, as I recall, I made it quite clear that that was a project in conjunction with the Canadian mental health association and the Selkirk hospital, and I indicated that quite explicitly when outlining the project.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I did not notice that the hon. member said that, and I accept his explanation. He did mention a good deal about after-care and how it was non-existent in Ontario, and I shall come to that in a little while. Perhaps now is probably the best time.

Apparently the hon. member does read the journals with an eye to what goes on in other jurisdictions, but ignores, as I have said, all references to Ontario. The family care, for instance, that he mentioned—in the American psychiatric association *Journal* of 1963 and the author was Dr. Walter Barton of Boston, gives the following figures for patients from mental hospitals and family care:

In the United States and Canada:

New York State 2,880; Veterans' administration for the entire nation of the United States of America 2,697; California 2,412; Illinois 1,573; Ontario 1,300.

I will not go down all of the others—practically all of them are American. But I might point out that British Columbia had two, Quebec had 43 and Saskatchewan had 98.

Now, on the basis of relative population, if we work on the same basis as British Columbia, we would have ten patients; if we were doing the same as Quebec, we would have 60 patients; if we were doing the same as Saskatchewan, we would have 686. But there are 1,300 patients in after-care, and this has been documented by my own staff and printed in journals which are accepted by scientific people all over the world.

Now, the hon. member spoke about Gheel in Belgium. I wonder if the hon. member has ever been there? I was, and I hope that we never adopt something like Gheel here in Ontario. It is not something to be proud of, and I could look at it with the eyes of one who has some knowledge of the profession and some knowledge of the needs of mentally ill patients.

The shortage of psychiatrists was again brought up, and if there is no doubt in any of our minds that this is so, only the other day I read an article on medical manpower in the United States and Canada, a part of which reads:

Even with the increasing interest in psychiatry, in 1970, we fully anticipate that we will be about 285 psychiatrists short here in Ontario to meet the desired ratio of 1 psychiatrist to 10,000 population.

I would say very seriously, Mr. Chairman, and point out to you, sir, that I know of no specialty in medicine that is more generously supported out of public funds than is the specialty of psychiatry. Psychiatrists join our staff—and that is where most of them are trained—at a much better income than is provided others by bursary or by way of honorarium or emolument, and this goes on all through their training. But in spite of that, only limited numbers are being attracted, albeit the past five or six years show one or two exceptions. There is a tendency to an increasing number.

The hon. member pointed out that the government was at fault for the staff morale, and I have to say again, sir, very seriously, that I refute this absolutely. Indeed, during a bitter and rather lengthy controversy in institute cases a little while ago, two of our good superintendents had occasion to write me their views concerning this. I quoted extracts from one of the letters here in the House. The other letter was published in one of the daily papers here in Toronto, and was there for everybody to read. I am very much concerned, sir, because of the apparent downgrading. This may not be intentional, but there is an apparent downgrading of the professional integrity and ability of our staff.

For instance, when we have hon. members standing up in this House and suggesting that because a psychiatrist is in the employ of the government, his evidence in a court of law is governed by the position he holds. I say to you, sir, that the legal history of Ontario—and my legal friends will know this better than I—will show that when a difficult case comes before the courts and psychiatric opinion is needed, the place to which the

courts turn for that opinion, is The Department of Health. Departmental psychiatrists are called in practically all the important legal cases when expert testimony is needed.

I would submit to you, sir, that because these psychiatrists are employed by the department and the government, this is evidence, in my thinking, that they are more likely to give a dispassionate and an unprejudiced view. They are on salary; their fees are not dependent on the outcome of the case, or anything else; but that is quite apart. It is my judgment that the majority of professional men and women—the majority of men and women—let us broaden it out completely—want to give as good evidence as they can, regardless of what their status in life may be. I think that this tendency to question professional judgment is probably more detrimental to staff morale than anything that we might be doing, or failing to do.

My hon. friend from Sudbury (Mr. Sopha)—and I was rather surprised at him, because he, too, is a professional man—referred to our staff so often, not particularly The Department of Health staff, but all public services, as bureaucrats. There is something disgraceful about that word, “bureaucrats.” Here are men and women trying to do a good job for the people of Ontario—as indeed they are doing—and I would like to—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Is it a term of opprobrium?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In my thinking, yes, and in the manner in which you use it. Perhaps I am judging too much the inflection with which you use it, or the inflection of voice that you apply when you do use it.

Mr. Sopha: I think you are a bit irritated at the *Globe and Mail* this morning, let us face it!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not one little bit! Not one little bit!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): No party uses the term “bureaucrat” in reference to civil servants more than the Tory party.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not care who uses it, Mr. Chairman, it is a word that I do not think should be applied to our civil servants. They are public-spirited men and women doing a job to the very best of their ability, and we have in our service—and strangely enough we still manage to attract—outstanding persons in every field of endeavour.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Minister protests too much.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The Minister is not protesting too much, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is trying to join those of his colleagues in saying a word on behalf of those who have no right—and we had an instance of this in this House yesterday afternoon—or opportunity to stand up and say it for themselves. I say without hesitation that I take a very dim view of the remarks sometimes directed toward my staff. I will take all the nasty remarks you would like to give me. There is an old saying that I was taught as a child: “Sticks and stones will break my bones, but names will never hurt me.” You can call me what you like, but leave my staff alone unless you are in a position to judge them, and judge their ability, and judge the quality of their work.

The hon. member said a good deal about the costs, and the hon. member for Scarborough West went into this rather extensively. But, Mr. Chairman, the costs in our hospitals are not computed on the same basis as the costs in the general hospitals to which he referred. For instance, there are no capital costs included in our costs and on the basis, without going into lengthy detail, of this year's budget the per diem costs estimated to provide 8,476,000 on 30-day patient care will be \$8.65 per day. Now this is not a proper costing, because more than 40 per cent of the persons under our care—and I want to make that distinction, they are not patients, they are persons under our care—more than 40 per cent of them are living with us. All that is shown as far as this costing is concerned is their food costs and in many cases some clothing costs. They are not hard on their clothing and do not use a great deal of it. Therefore, the costing in our hospitals is quite different and on an entirely different—

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask the hon. Minister a question? I want to get the figures correct. Did the hon. Minister quote into the record just now a figure of \$8.65?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On the basis of this year's budget.

Mr. S. Lewis: On the basis of this year's budget. Is that a figure which is comparable to the \$6.96 which I read into the record?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, \$8.19 would be comparable to this figure.

Mr. S. Lewis: In other words, the hon. Minister is reading in a gross cost and I was reading in a net cost?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: I would point out to the hon. Minister that I specifically eliminated the gross cost when I read in the general hospital costs, so that the comparison would be valid. I removed from the OHSC figures the non-allowable income and the capital factor so that the costs would be exactly parallel and so that I would not mislead this House. I was careful to do so, so I think if he is going to make comparisons he should similarly make them on the same parallel level.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Then, Mr. Chairman, again I have to admit that I did not get the exact quotes of the hon. member, but in that case the comparable figure is \$8.19 per day. It compares with the cost in chronic institutions of the kind. I reviewed our experience with tuberculosis sanatoria when I became Minister of Health. There were fairly large numbers under care in these sanatoria—hospitals which can be compared with the type of hospital that we operate—and if their costs had increased on the same ratio as ours have done, provided they still had the same number of patients, the costs today would be very comparable. This may sound a little bit involved because they have not the same number of patients.

As I said in my remarks on the estimates, there are fewer than 900 tubercular patients throughout all of the hospitals and their costs are somewhere between \$13 and \$19 per day now. But compared with other similar hospitals—and I am quite certain my superintendents know this quite clearly and quite thoroughly because they are knowledgeable of these figures—our costs are on a par, indeed our costs in our hospital schools exceed those of the state of New York, which is supposed to be one of the wealthiest jurisdictions on the North American continent. But this is quite apart. If our costs were established relative to the type of care that was being carried out—the active, convalescent, chronic, and domiciliary treatment—there would be a far different picture than there is at the present time.

It is also very interesting to note that in our discussions, which have been going on with the federal authorities for a long time in our attempts to work out a basis for the inclusion of mental patients under The Hospital Insurance Diagnostic Services Act, the figure that they estimate for all of Canada for only those who would be eligible for hospital support is \$10.50 per day. This removes all of the last two categories. We have our patients divided into three categories; the last is purely custodial, and the second last is those in need of some medical

but largely nursing care. We separate them out completely because they would not be eligible under the present Hospital Insurance Diagnostic Services Act agreement, and the per diem cost estimated by the federal people for all of Canada is \$10.50 per day. This specious comparison of costs is quite out of order and quite out of keeping with reality.

There is not any doubt that the hon. member for Scarborough West has gone into this matter very thoroughly and he deserves a great deal of credit for the study that he has obviously put into it. He has built up, which is inevitable, some real knowledge on the basis of personal experience, but I wonder if he has not yet to master the art, may I call it art, of applying sound judgment to the things that he sees and hears and reads.

After all, Mr. Chairman, it is an inexorable law of life that the real artist learns that the canvas of life is not achieved by making broad sweeping strokes as with a paint ruler, but rather by using many brushes of all and sundry sizes, large and small, and with slow and sometimes halting moves, that steady and evolutionary progress comes about. It is not by revolution that we have reached the place where we are in this life and in this our society, but rather by the slow and sometimes, I repeat, halting and quite often discouraging process of evolution, with many successes, sometimes many failures, always some failures, but by trial and error this is the only way that our final success can come about. It is only in this way that we can ever make a worthwhile contribution to life and society.

So it is with our work; we have our failures and we have our successes, we have our progressive people and we have those who are less so, and we have our institutions that are carrying on bold and daring experiments, and sometimes they fail and sometimes they succeed. In balance, some good comes out of all of them. All of us have our hares and our tortoises, but who at this juncture will say that one is making any better or any more lasting contribution than any other? I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that each one is carefully adding his piece to the entire mosaic, so that only posterity will be able to judge the total effect.

Both hon. members have pointed out the fact—and my friend the hon. member for Sudbury drew attention to it—that the *Globe and Mail* supports one of them at least in saying that nothing has been done or little has been done since 1959. Mr. Chairman, I have to—

Mr. Sopha: Both wrong!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I have to agree that all three of you are wrong. Indeed, after I came to the office this morning, having read this most—

Mr. Sopha: I was trying to be kind to you.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not trying to be unkind to anyone, Mr. Chairman. I put before you the facts as they actually are, and when I arrived in my office, just from memory I jotted down things to recount once again in the House, because I think they are worthy of repeating. Since 1959, the following capital progress alone has been made:

Brockville—we carried on an extensive renovation; Kingston—we built an entirely new hospital; Whitby—we built a large expansion and a school for nursing; Toronto—we built a new hospital; Orillia—we built a large replacement; Gravenhurst—we bought the existing sanatorium; Hamilton—we built a new hospital; Woodstock—very extensive renovations following hard on the heels of a new hospital, opened I think in 1958; Goderich—a new hospital; Owen Sound—a new hospital; Palmerston—a new hospital school about to be opened; London—we are in the process of rebuilding; Port Arthur—a large expansion; Cedar Springs—a new hospital school.

In addition, Beck sanatorium was purchased from the London health association; Edgar radar station was purchased from one of the departments of the federal government; community psychiatric hospitals have been supported almost totally from a financial standpoint in Ottawa, Sudbury and Windsor, and all three of them are operating; planning for the Windsor hospital is almost complete; at South Porcupine a new hospital building is under construction; at Penetang, an extensive replacement has just been called, I think, for contract; and psychiatric units in general hospitals have provided 500 beds, all since 1959.

This alone, Mr. Chairman, without any of the things upon which it is difficult to put a dollar and cents price tag, have come about in that short space of time.

It is not a question of staffing or the medical orientation of psychiatric service. I think the hon. member for Parkdale was concerned about this, and I believe also the hon. member for Scarborough West mentioned it, particularly in his Throne debate speech, but they believe that our orientation was wrong. I think the hon. members lose sight of the fact that at one time, when psychiatry burst

upon the medical scene, there were those daring and young souls who thought that psychiatry was the answer to all the medical problems. They too have learned the lesson that I have learned and that thousands before me have learned, the lesson which I predict my young hon. friends across will learn, when they have as many more years over their heads as I have over theirs. They too will learn that psychiatry is not the answer to everything. Every problem of life is not a health problem.

The psychiatry we are practising is medically oriented and we make no apology for this. To say that they are being medically oriented to the exclusion of other disciplines, is not due to a change in policy with respect to the participation of other disciplines, but a misinterpretation of the administrative goals of The Department of Health. The goals are based on the assumption that mental health activities are exclusively the responsibility of the mental health branch. Herein lies the first and gravest error, Mr. Chairman.

In the past, a limited number of personnel have attempted to cover the entire field of behaviour disorders and, consequently, have been able to do it inadequately. In an attempt to do one thing well, that is to treat psychiatric illness, an administrative decision has been made to concentrate departmental resources on treatment services, which are, by definition, under psychiatric direction, but which will always require the participation of a number of other disciplines.

Appropriate treatment can be provided only when both inpatient and outpatient services are available and related.

There are two other tasks to which psychiatric and other mental health personnel can make a contribution, but in which they do not necessarily play the major role. Firstly, prevention of psychiatric illness, mental retardation, and behaviour disorders in the broad sense; and secondly, the control and management of disordered behaviours.

These are the tasks which involve families, the schools, the courts, social agencies, churches, general medical services, labour, management, communications and entertainment media, and almost any social institution or group that plays an important part in the life of the particular individual under consideration.

Our primary function at the present time is to provide treatment in provincial facilities and to encourage and assist the development of local treatment services. We have also encouraged our staff to contribute to the solution of these more general problems, both

as consultants and as citizens, participating in community efforts. I know it is a matter of serious concern to my staff to find means by which the potential resources of community agencies can be mobilized and developed to meet these needs, and to dispel the idea that activity in the field of mental health is a government monopoly. I think this is one of the greatest problems in education that we have to face at the present time.

On the matter of staff, Mr. Chairman, the hon. members would attempt to point out to you, sir, that the ratio of our staff to patients is much less than other areas and other jurisdictions. First of all, there was a question about why only certain hospitals were used for the training of psychiatrists. This is not of our doing. We have nothing to do with this at all, except to co-operate with the university. Graduate training in psychiatry is the responsibility of the universities; they have chosen the hospitals which they will use. These schools are at the University of Toronto, the University of Western Ontario, which uses London and St. Thomas, and Queen's University, which uses our hospital at Kingston.

We are in constant conversation with the dean and the faculties of the various medical schools in an attempt to encourage them to use more of our hospitals so that both of us would profit in some measure.

There is no prescribed ratio of psychologists or many other of the disciplines recommended by either the psychologists, in the case of psychology, or the other disciplines as the case may be. All of these may change with the type of programme that is in progress in the particular hospital. There have been no statements of staff-patient ratio issued by official agencies or professional associations in the past seven or eight years. This, I think, is a good thing, because, here again, you cannot have a stereotyped programme. Whatever the programme is, you must have the staff and gear the staff to the programme that is underway. By this refusal, or lack of making statements on standards, it is recognized that the changing philosophies of treatment and patient management invalidate, to some degree, the staff-patient ratios which were established previously, and that no organization today will very vigorously support.

I know that comparisons are sometimes odious, yet one must have comparisons, because how does one measure the efforts that one is expending unless they have some other yardstick by which to measure them? I already pointed out that in talking about our staff and about many things relative to our

hospitals the hon. members had both neglected that only 56 per cent of our people under our care are under psychiatric treatment, and those requiring nursing or domiciliary care—I was not able to give the exact figures—account for 44 per cent. I have the figures here now.

From a publication, Mr. Chairman, "Mental Hospitals, Manpower Needs, Psychiatrists," published in the United States of America, it is estimated that at least 10,000 more psychiatrists are needed now. I mention this sir, only to point up to you, as I have said many times before; that psychiatrists are in short supply all over the world. There seems to be no solution to the problem, although every jurisdiction concerned in this matter of treating the mentally ill are very much concerned and are bending all efforts. The American government, I think it is well known, has for a long time been providing substantial support to the training of psychiatrists and those other disciplines involved in the psychiatric programme, as has our own government here in Ontario.

In the same book, it is worthy of noting that most of the people in need are children, the aged, or patients with low incomes. We have tried to do something about the latter, but the scarcity of psychiatrists for children's care is very clear at the present time.

By way of comparison, I have tried to pick out some of the progressive jurisdictions which neighbour on us. In Ontario, inpatient only, we have one psychiatrist to 135 patients. Michigan has one to 152. New Jersey has one to 153. Ohio has one to 274. Massachusetts has one to 95 and California has one to 76. For some reason, California seems to attract more psychiatrists than any other jurisdiction in the North American continent.

But even by these various yardsticks—and all of these are wealthy jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman; at least as wealthy as Ontario, in some cases considered to have a higher standard of living—we rank very well with them.

The growth in staff—and this, I think, is another piece of evidence that will refute in some measure the statements that nothing has been done over the last six years—has been rather marked. This is over a ten-year period from 1955 to 1965. Ward staff has risen from 3,980 to 6,489. I thought I had the comparable figures for patient load, but I find I have not got them with me at the present time. But it is rather interesting to note that the rate of patients in hospitals per 100,000 population today is the lowest it has been since 1936. This, of course, includes those

in residential units and this includes all of the bodies in hospitals.

Our professional staff in the same ten-year period has risen from 252 to 460. That is excluding nurses. Our clerical staff has risen from 292 to 780, domestic from 549 to 2,125. The maintenance staff has risen from 348 to 750; the farm and gardening staff from 135 to 265; nurses from 553 to 930; hospital aids from 1,468 to 2,836; hospital attendants from 1,914 to 2,833; altogether 3,980 to 6,489. The total staff in our institutions has increased from 6,003 to 11,420.

Mr. Chairman, that excludes Thistleton and the Toronto psychiatric hospital, which are quite frequently left out of these because other very large programmes are going on, making it difficult to compare them on a reasonable basis with the other hospitals.

The hon. member for Scarborough West touched upon the homes for special care and was about to state something. I will make only a few remarks, because I believe I asked him to withhold his remarks on this until later on. I gave a wrong figure yesterday, Mr. Chairman. I said 2,223 were removed from our hospitals. The number should have been 2,410 and I will withhold further comments on this programme until I have heard what the hon. members say.

I did touch on after-care. We have never pretended that after-care was an outgrowth of the hospitals. Again, we have encouraged our staffs in the field to make themselves available in a consultative capacity and, as good citizens, to participate in things in which their knowledge and training can assist. They can offer assistance to the communities in which they live. But we have not assumed that this is an outgrowth of the hospital, yet it is rather interesting that in October, 1964—and this was a figure picked at random—we had 6,977 patients in after-care through our outpatient departments.

Mr. Chairman, to say that we are doing nothing in after-care, of course, is certainly refuted by this, and this is the statistic taken directly from the records of our department.

There is one matter, sir, which I had hoped when I came into these estimates I would not have to touch upon at all, but it was brought up. I think it is time to put in clear and unmistakable perspective, this matter of bringing to the floor of the House cases—unless by desire of the patient, or his family, and this is the right of every patient and family—that have been dealt with and have attained some publicity and notoriety or whatever one may have. I refer in this case to the Fawcett case. I had hoped that this

would have been allowed to lie, because, after all, there is no denying the fact that this case was very thoroughly considered, rightly or wrongly is not for me to judge. I hope I shall never reach that stage in life where I think that I know better than the courts of our land, and whether the decisions made by the courts of our land are right or wrong is not for me to say.

I can only say that this patient was adjudged by many psychiatrists to be ill. This judgment was sustained in the courts. On two occasions, at least, application was made on behalf of this patient for a writ of habeas corpus and in neither case was it granted. I feel that to put the department in the position of saying to the courts, "You don't know what you are talking about," after all of the evidence had been called for and I would hope adduced, this would be—I cannot find any word in the extensive vocabulary of our English language to describe our actions in a case of that kind. This is not our function. This patient was adjudged to be mentally ill, and I am quite prepared to accept the judgment of the psychiatrists employed by the department.

I am very concerned about this. I am very concerned about the apparent inconsistency in some of our thinking. For instance, in the *Globe and Mail* on January 20, there was a very sensible, I thought, and a very sound editorial written as the lead editorial, "The public has a right to know it is protected." This was a case where a young lad had gotten into difficulties, indeed was tried for murder, was committed because he was mentally ill, and apparently at the time of his trial it was said by the judge, or it is quoted here, the judge said, "If you find the boy not guilty because of insanity, he will probably spend the rest of his life in a mental hospital."

First of all, I have to say with very great respect, that no judge should make a statement of that kind, because none of us is in a position to know. Just because the boy was ill at the time he committed the crime, or charged with committing the crime, does not mean to say that he is going to stay ill for all of his life. And because he committed murder while he was insane is not to say that he may not get better.

However, I did not quote this to comment on the editorial, or to comment on what the judge said, but to show that the editor obviously felt that there was a very grave responsibility resting upon the doctors in charge of patients of this kind to make sure. I believe our responsibility is that the

patient's interests are looked after and everything possible is done to restore the patient to the fullest possible mental health. At the same time, our superintendents and our staffs have a very grave and great responsibility to the public, although it is not as well spelled out as for doctors or members of the other disciplines. They believe their duty is to the patient, their first duty is to the patient, but they are good citizens and they are aware of their responsibility to the public. It is with this in mind that their judgment is, at least, partly arrived at.

I think if one were to read the very complete account of the Fawcett case, which appeared in the *Toronto Telegram* of May 12—a double-page spread was devoted to this—I think it will give one a better appreciation, a more complete appreciation of the total case if we, as laymen, are going to sit in judgment upon the judgments of the courts. This case went to the highest courts in the land. I do not know anybody other than the Legislature that has the right to overrule them. And I am quite certain the Legislature would think carefully before they would step into a matter of this kind. Indeed, sir, the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, I believe, certainly put words in my mind, and I believe he quoted them. I have not had an opportunity to check *Hansard*, but I say this in all kindness and with very great respect, he stated on May 25, 1965, as I caught his words; "Anyone else who would meddle in a medical decision should have his head read." With that, sir, I rest my case.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on this matter of Fred Fawcett, I want to emphasize one point. When I was speaking on this—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, since I did not raise it in my earlier remarks, I shall not make reference to Fred Fawcett at this point, except to say that in one sense, like the hon. Minister, I wish the case would rest. The man is on his farm and in free society and so be it. Let us not harass him or his case further in this Legislature. I think that there are certain aspects within the mental health branch which need to be discussed, but I hope that they can be discussed free from that particularly notorious illustration.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make some remarks in response to the hon. Minister. He dealt with certain of the features I raised. I am going to raise some of them again because I do not feel that satisfactory answers were forthcoming.

Let me begin by saying that I hope the hon. Minister is not excessively self-conscious as to his age. I always thought him a reasonably buoyant personality, a man who is obviously not of excessive years, and he need not show any self-consciousness by imputing to me being under-age. I appreciate that that may be a factor, but he need not be concerned.

Let me also say to him, Mr. Chairman, that theology and medicine never claimed for themselves infallibility, and it is interesting that the hon. Minister should have taken that approach upon entrance. I did not claim at the outset of my remarks any stretch of infallibility. I made it quite clear that my remarks were derived from some reading in the field, and from extensive visits with superintendents in his own department. And on that basis, I would offer some reflections.

The hon. Minister cited silly old tired aphorisms, the old Disraeli aphorisms—that if you are not a socialist when you are 21, you have no heart, and if you are not a Tory when you are 50, you have no head.

Admittedly, the hon. Minister did not use that particular tired cliché. But that is the substance of his reply. It just does not meet rational argument. It does not meet an effort to document an ill-illustrate a case. It is a neat side-stepping procedure, but it will not do.

I thought the hon. Minister made one rather good analogy, Mr. Chairman, when he talked about his mental health pattern as a canvas on which one painted. I would be the first to say in this House, that the hon. Minister of Health is by no mean stretch of the imagination any kind of Rembrandt. In fact, his work is not even worthy, if I may put it that way, of the Dorothy Cameron gallery. It is one thing to make spacious sweeps of the brush. It is another to indulge in pop art, to splatter paint on the canvas in an irregular, unco-ordinated and undefined manner, and that is what has happened to this department. It is in fact the hon. Minister's responsibility, and no one in the Opposition ever suggested that it was the responsibility, or the integrity, of his own staff that was concerned.

We are dealing with departmental policy, and it is departmental policy which is now under discussion. The hon. Minister says that it is necessary to be dispassionate. Of course it is necessary to be dispassionate; but opinion is also critical, and it is the responsibility of Opposition to level criticism, hopefully constructive criticism, and that was the effort. You do not denude that criticism by a cold, calculated and dispassionate

reserve which robs the very sensitive and important field of any substance.

Now let us deal with some of the individual things which the hon. Minister raised. He raised 999 Queen Street, in, if I may say, a character of phrase and intonation that bespoke sadness not to say petulance. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that all the remarks about 999 Queen Street, the Toronto Ontario hospital, that have been made by this member, have come from the report of the superintendent of that hospital. They have not come from hearsay; they have come from the man who governs the operation of that hospital. Therefore, if the hon. Minister takes out after it, he is not taking out after the Opposition; he is taking out after that report.

I do not intend to read all of this report into the record again. I would just remind the hon. Minister that in the superintendent's words the buildings are worthy of the 19th century; that efforts to get new quarters have been consistently abortive; that the per diem per capita is "scandalously hypocritical"; that the standard of care at \$8 a day could not be beyond a "medieval standard;" that the staff complement is not sufficiently large; that there is no definition of the future of the hospital; that the readmission rates are soaring because of the pressure on beds. All in the superintendent's report. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I have never read this portion of the report, but I might as well read it into the record now.

When the hon. Minister talks in that earnest and somewhat, if I may suggest, facile manner about integrity of staff and morale, and how we, on the Opposition side, are undermining morale, let me read this paragraph from the annual report of Dr. Paul Christie:

Meanwhile, the day-to-day life of the patient is to a great extent in the hands of auxiliary staff of both sexes who receive their training as hospital aides and attendants within our own organization. The skill and loyalty of these employees remains the indispensable foundation of the hospital. Here too, however, we find ourselves in great difficulties. Of about 120 female hospital aides, 26, or more than one-fifth, were newly appointed during the year to replace those leaving the hospital almost entirely by resignation. For male ward staff, the situation was even more distressing. Out of a total staff of 160, 69, or 43 per cent, were new appointments during the year. This compares most unfavourably with the turnover in the same group during 1962.

Now, sir, I drive this next sentence home:

In the opinion of hospital management, it reflects the serious decline in morale of staff of this and related categories resulting from service-wide developments beyond the control of this hospital.

Now that is the superintendent of the hospital concerned: the serious decline in morale of staff. As I said, Mr. Chairman, I have never read that paragraph into the record before, because I thought the point was sufficiently documented. But if we are to continue to be subjected to this specious reasoning that Opposition criticism of the Ontario hospital structure is what undermines morale, then it has to be put on the record.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, let it be said, that it is characteristic of institutional groups that when outside attacks are unwarranted, they retrench; they solidify, their morale becomes greater in the face of those attacks. Let me assure the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the situation at 999 remains grave; it remains across the board in the Ontario hospital system, and it has been documented by all the men involved. So much for the Toronto Ontario hospital, except that we still wait to hear in this House for the first announcement about when the buildings will be started, and when the first sod will turn.

Next, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Health sought to refute statements made about the attrition of staff, and the shortage. He talked about psychiatrists and the lack of a psychiatric ratio. Let me say several things in this regard, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I quoted a ratio of the American psychiatric association of one to 100. If the hon. Minister refutes that such a ratio exists, then he refutes something which is accepted by everyone in the field.

Second, it is, in fact, possible to establish a ratio for social workers and psychologists. The concept of the clinic team of one psychiatrist, two social workers and a psychologist, while not infallible of itself, is a generally accepted concept applied to all kinds of mental health programmes. It is not invalid to apply it to the Ontario hospital system.

Third, the drop in psychiatric staff is very, very serious. It is critical beyond description. It is not enough to say that we are trying, or that we offer certain inducements, or that there is a shortage across the board. The drop in staff is not merely related to the Ontario hospitals; it is related to the entire system across the province.

I have in my hand an edition of *Canada's*

Mental Health for May-June, 1965. On page 51 are advertisements for staff. To let the hon. members of the Legislature see how serious the problem is across the province, let me read some of them into the record.

Certified psychiatrists wanted at the Royal Victoria hospital in Barrie to open a new wing.

Psychiatrist needed in Sudbury to open the wing.

Psychiatrist needed in Peterborough to work in the Peterborough civic hospital.

Psychiatrist needed for the York county hospital in Newmarket.

Certified specialist in psychiatry needed for Brantford.

Certified and experienced psychiatrist for Belleville.

Belleville has been advertising for two years to get a psychiatrist to open up a wing in the general hospital; they have still not been able to do so.

Mr. Chairman, within the department, in the field of social workers, you have this range.

The province of Ontario to participate in co-ordinated programme of patient care in community and hospital setting. Appointments available in—

and this is within the province's own system:

—Brockville, Cedar Springs, East York, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener, London, New Toronto, North Bay, Orillia, Port Arthur, Penetanguishene, St. Thomas, Smiths Falls, Thistletown, Toronto, Whitby, Windsor and Woodstock.

With the first salary range starting at \$4,600 per year, with a bachelor of social work degree.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that not only is the staff shortage critical, but it need not be—it simply need not be. In the field of psychiatry, the salaries are so out of line with the practice of private and community psychiatry that there are no comparisons to be made. Indeed, the inducements that are given, to my understanding, are even less than in the province of Quebec and the province of Saskatchewan. But you cannot expect psychiatrists to remain in the Ontario hospital system at the salaries that they are presently paid. If the hon. Minister thinks that a change in salary will not make a difference, I challenge him to raise his salaries to substantial levels commensurate with the community and to watch the response in his Ontario hospital institutions.

As far as social workers and psychologists go, Mr. Chairman, the shortage in the Ontario hospital system of those ancillary personnel in the clinic team is more dramatic and more pronounced than any other similar parallel in other fields, whether it be in community psychiatry, children's agencies, family agencies, or even in some of the educational guidance areas.

The social workers and psychologists simply will not come in to the Ontario hospital system, partly because of the sense of futility and geographic isolation of many of the hospitals, and partly because of the preposterously low salary range at which they begin.

It is all very well, Mr. Chairman—reverting for a moment to psychiatrists again; the House will forgive me if I move in a less than fully-organized fashion—for the hon. Minister to stand in this House and say that a decision of the college of physicians and surgeons is not his decision—it is a decision arrived at in conjunction with the university medical teaching provisions—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did not even mention the college of—

Mr. S. Lewis: I know you did not, but I am assuming that it is the college of physicians and surgeons which sets certification requirements.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no. It is the Royal college.

Mr. S. Lewis: The Royal college, well—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not being facetious, Mr. Chairman. It is a different body.

Mr. S. Lewis: The Royal college. Yes, I follow you. I should have said that it is the Royal college which sets certification requirements in conjunction with the universities. It may be that the hon. Minister has not set them; but it is not enough, Mr. Chairman, for him to wipe his hands of the subject in so superficial a fashion. If the results of that decision will be a continuing attrition of staff in one hospital after another; if the results of that decision will be to undermine the psychiatric complement in more than half of our Ontario hospitals, then the hon. Minister of Health for Ontario has to come to account in this Legislature.

He does not operate in a vacuum; the Royal college is subject to Acts of this Legislature. We are the law-making body in the land; you do not wipe your hands of it by

saying that they made the decision and that you did not. It smacks of the sticks-and-stones jingle, which is equally inappropriate to the subject under discussion.

In a very recent article—I think it was in the *Toronto Daily Star* of Saturday, June 12—it was pointed out that whereas some 49 psychiatrists had left within the last 12 months, only 17 had come to take their place. Mr. Chairman, even though the hon. Minister may quote ratios that sound good on the surface, of psychiatrists to patients, a great many of those psychiatrists are part-time and a large number of those psychiatrists are in training. They are not certified psychiatrists—they are not even at the diplomate level—and the understanding is that those psychiatrists should be doing more training than serving; but in fact, of course, they are considered part of the complement because in our desperation we have to use every human being to the full.

I can appreciate the immense problems in the field of psychiatry, social work and psychologists' education and training. I simply say this, Mr. Chairman, that never in this Legislature has the hon. Minister put forward a manpower plan—not once. Nor has his colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile).

We have never had an analysis of manpower needs; we have never had an analysis of the various career levels; we have never had an analysis of a five-year or a ten-year plan, and until we get a manpower document worthy of the name, it is not sufficient to sit back and say that there is a shortage everywhere. We want to know where that shortage manifests itself, why, and what provisions are being made.

In the great \$114 million grant made in October, 1964, I believe it was, the relationship of that money to the field of psychiatry was not defined in this House, except in the broad general terms that it was for medical schools and medical education. I say to the hon. Minister that his responsibility does not end with psychiatry; it relates to all the adjacent fields and we have nothing, absolutely nothing.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, let me make a point that may not be known to hon. members of this Legislature. Between the years 1951 and 1954, the federal Department of Health and Welfare conducted a manpower study in these fields across Canada. The only province that did not participate was the province of Ontario. The national Department of Health and Welfare is again contemplating a nationwide study of manpower needs in these

areas, and the province that still has not announced its intention to participate is the province of Ontario.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the reason the province of Ontario did not participate in the early 1950s and has not given evidence of participating in the mid-1960s is because of what it would reveal about our manpower allocations and resources. It would cast this province in a frame of shame from which there would be no retreat.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the staff situation, for the moment. I would point out to the House, as a parting shot, that one of the other things that gives the hon. Minister's figures a little more substance than otherwise they might have, is the change that is about to take place on July 1, 1965. The situation now is rosy in comparison to that date when training terms are up and when hospitals such as Hamilton and London reach a crisis situation.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister talks about the per diem rate and he tries to defend it. I must say that I was somewhat nonplussed. I did not think that any Minister could conceivably defend those per diems—per diems that I read into the record of \$6.96 a day. He talked with some favour, no less—some enthusiasm, no less—about the per diem rates at the hospital schools in Ontario. Let me remind hon. members that the per diem rates at the hospital school in Orillia and Smiths Falls for the year 1963-64 were \$5.82 a day.

That may compare favourably with some other jurisdictions, but such comparisons are thoroughly odious in themselves. They have no relevance in this Legislature.

The figure of \$5.82 a day is a disgraceful figure; \$6.96 a day is a criminal figure, and the comparisons with general hospitals, with chronic hospitals, with convalescent hospitals, with training schools, with reform institutions and with industrial farms, are all essentially valid, Mr. Chairman. They are social services provided in an institutional framework and the hon. Minister has no argument whatsoever until he does something about his per capita per diem.

I pointed out to him in my earlier remarks, Mr. Chairman, that the per capita per diem that he was now paying in his mental hospitals was barely above that being paid under The Homes for Special Care Act, and The Homes for Special Care Act is designed purely and simply for nursing and domiciliary care. It makes no pretensions at treatment whatsoever. Obviously, the per diem rates are an unqualified scandal. They do demon-

strate the pennies-for-the-mind mentality on the government benches. I do not know what the hon. Minister has to do to persuade his Treasury board comrades, but he had better do something, and do it quickly, before we have one unhappy explosion after another.

Then the hon. Minister went on to the field of after-care and he rebuked me for making reference to Gheel in Belgium. Let me say to him, Mr. Chairman, that all I said about Gheel was that about 300 years ago, after-care began in Gheel. I hold no brief for its present operation; I admit quite willingly to the House that I do not know about its present operation.

Let me make one or two observations about the hon. Minister's reply in regard to after-care. Our criticism of after-care, Mr. Chairman, is again related to the remarks and the facts and the opinions adduced from members of his own staff. The documentation is from his own material. I read into the record of this House a quotation from Dr. Pratton of Kingston Ontario hospital wherein he felt that we were now doing a disservice to the patients in mental hospitals by sending them home within a three-month period, because there were no after-care services in the community sufficient to provide for them. To suggest that there were 1,300 cases on after-care in a discharge situation of thousands in the province of Ontario, I suggest, is also specious.

After-care, Mr. Chairman, consists of more than prescribing drugs for the patient who has left. Yet in one Ontario hospital after another that is all that after-care consists of. After-care in its most fundamental sense involves following the patient back to his vocational readjustment and to his emotional, community and family readjustment. The hon. Minister himself admitted in this Legislature yesterday that in his medical rehabilitation branch he had 33 workers. Now he tries to make a viable case in this Legislature for a functioning after-care programme with 33 workers in the medical rehabilitation branch. The Opposition should collapse in smiles were it not such an unhappy tragedy.

Every one of the superintendents I talked to—and I say this without qualification, and I do not intend to compromise their integrity or stature because I think I report them faithfully—and all the material I read, suggested that the soaring readmission rates in the Ontario hospitals related primarily to the absence of a vigorous after-care programme. In Toronto Ontario hospital the rate relates even more inexcusably to the pressure on beds. But in Hamilton and in Whitby, for instance, two

of the biggest hospitals, and in St. Thomas, with the biggest inpatient complement, after-care is the absent factor in the readmission rates. The two indeed can be strongly equated.

I make one final observation, Mr. Chairman, on this point. I suppose the hon. Minister has advisors far more esteemed and knowledgeable in this field than I will ever hope to be. But I think we are in error in accepting the proposition that there should be in excess of 6,000 patients in after-care, so-called through outpatient departments. Are our mental hospitals treatment hospitals or are they revolving doors? Do our patients simply come out of the mental hospital and then go back to the outpatient department and then ultimately re-enter again? Outpatient departments should not be dominated, I suggest, by after-care patients. That is not a wise use of outpatient departments. Outpatient departments are our link in the chain between the hospital and the community; outpatient departments are the referral channels for our whole spectrum of community agencies. They should not be harassed and choked by after-care patients on the verge of readmission. And there are, in this province, some superintendents who agree with that proposition, Mr. Chairman.

At the Toronto Ontario hospital—and I was interested to note this—only ten per cent of the outpatient department can be described as after-care. Fully 90 per cent come from the community channels of referral. Now that is a community programme worthy of the name, and it is an intelligent distribution of after-care responsibility. After-care, as we understand it, as most jurisdictions understand it, involves the use of social workers, public health nurses, general practitioners, and VONs, following the patient into the community, into their homes, and doing social service work in that environment. It does not involve the patient clogging an outpatient department. That is not after-care, that is just a fill-in, that is a desperate gasp to close a system in disrepair and, let it be said, in disrepute.

So much for some of the initial arguments in these areas that the hon. Minister made. But the one argument that he made merely in passing, and that I want to make some further remarks about—not lengthy the hon. Minister will be pleased to know, but strong—is this question of the medical versus the community factor. I spent a large part of my initial presentation on this aspect, so I shall not belabour the point now. I realize it is not as exciting as talking about per diem

payments, and attrition of staff, and readmission rates, and after-care. But it is, Mr. Chairman, I suggest, fundamental. Either in the year 1965 we are setting out on a proper pattern of mental health services, or we are establishing a pattern of services which we will hereafter forever regret. I am profoundly worried that it will be the latter pattern.

Let me remind the House what Dr. Nicholas Hobbs said in the 1964 edition of the *Journal of Orthopsychiatry*:

There is a chance that the new mental health centres will be nothing more than a product of the general urbanization of America, a movement from country to city. Twenty years from now, people may moan not over bricks and mortar, but over glass and steel. There is a real danger that we shall succeed in changing only the location and the architecture of the state hospital. If the new centres turn inward toward the hospital, they too will be monuments to failure.

That is part of the essential thesis I am making, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the hon. Minister: psychiatry is not infallible, and psychiatry does not have all the answers. Yet, Mr. Chairman, let me say to him that psychiatry is dictating all the answers. The book, *More for the Mind*, written as it was by eight psychiatrists—unlike the British and American patterns—sets down a pattern of psychiatric wings and medical models which I suggest to you is inconsistent with the community pattern.

It is very difficult for me to define in words in this Legislature precisely what one means by a community pattern. But essentially it is this: First, that mental health services should not always be affixed to hospitals, be they general hospitals or Ontario hospitals; secondly, that some mental health services should be consciously located in the community, rather like the Toronto mental health clinic is at present, or the London mental health clinic has been for some time; third, that community channels in the best sense be exploited.

I showed the hon. Minister in my opening remarks—or tried to show him—what was happening in the province of Ontario. In the eighth annual statistical summary on community health services in Ontario, it showed that 60 per cent of all the new cases at our clinics are coming from general practitioners or other health services. So not only do we have the medical model in the sense that it is situated directly within a hospital umbrella, but we even have a medical model in the

sense that all the referring agencies, or a great majority of them, come from general practitioners and health sources.

What happened to the other areas, Mr. Chairman? Let me refresh the memory of the House. Family agencies 1.6 per cent, children's agencies 3.9 per cent, educational agencies 8.8 per cent, self or parent 11.1 per cent, friends or relatives 2.1 per cent. In other words, all of those things which we consider to be properly and profoundly representative of the community are not presently reflected in our community mental health centres.

The excuse which the hon. Minister offered this morning, I frankly found distasteful. It is not a fact that the mental health branch of the province of Ontario is only one of several groups responsible for developing these community features. The mental health branch in this province, the policies enunciated by the hon. Minister, are primarily responsible for striking the community pattern.

In every jurisdiction in North America where a good community pattern operates, it stems from the mental health, public health, preventive mechanism, and that mechanism now resides in The Department of Health first and foremost. It may be very well to bring in all your other community agencies, and it is important that they be involved. But the original point, the impetus, the motivation, must come from this department, and more specifically from this branch.

It is fallacious, I suggest, to argue otherwise. And I profoundly hope that we are not sacrificing a community orientation, one of the most exciting and dramatic developments in the whole field of mental health, to this obsession with the medical model, like some relentless broken record which refuses to take in community concern.

I do not know what the hon. Minister's intentions are. Perhaps he will broaden out into the community. Perhaps he will educate the police, and educate the clergy, and establish contact with the schools and the general practitioners, and do all these things that community mental health centres should do. But as yet, Mr. Chairman, there is very little evidence, a minimum of evidence, and I found this report on the referral channels, frankly, heartbreaking.

The only saving features of this report were the few institutions I quoted which had established community channels. The one thing which characterized them and distinguished them from all others, was their location in the community as distinct from

the hospital. I think that the argument is, therefore, a fairly strong one.

I had not intended to do this at the moment, but obviously it is akin to what the hon. Minister has said, so I shall go on.

In a state of great distress and concern in 1964, the Conservative government in the province of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, suddenly realized that 44 per cent of its people in Ontario hospitals—I use the hon. Minister's figure—were wrongly there. They required primarily domiciliary or nursing care, and nothing beyond that. In other words, close to 50 per cent of the patients in our mental hospitals should not, in fact, be there. Although last night I did not have the hon. Minister's figure, I had come to the conclusion it was 47 per cent, on the basis of this mental care in the Metropolitan Toronto report. So I am quite happy to accept the 44 per cent figure.

In a move which was a decision both of panic and resourcefulness, we established The Homes for Special Care Act in the province of Ontario, and that was to take the burden off. Then, last night, we had, after at least a year of operation, some of the results of that Homes for Special Care Act. I want to remind the hon. members what the hon. Minister said. In St. Thomas Ontario hospital, out of some 850 to 900 patients who should not be there, we have moved 73. In Whitby, out of some 700 who should not be there, we have moved 69. In Hamilton, out of some 800 who should not be there, we have moved 40. In Kingston, out of over 700 who should not be there, we have moved 73. In Toronto, out of 550, we have moved 107.

And so it goes, Mr. Chairman. In other words, The Homes for Special Care Act has very serious limitations. Indeed, it may, in the future emerge as something which filled an initial gap; but the whole principle, Mr. Chairman, of moving mental patients, *holus bolus*, into nursing homes, and even further isolating them from the community, is a principle under question. I am not sure that that entire rationale is justified. I must admit to the hon. Minister that it is an area that perplexes me and one to which I should like to give more thought. But I am not at all sure that that itself is justified. In fact, I noted to the House in the discussion of after care last week that the psychiatric home care programme in Saskatoon, run by the university hospital, was placing people between the ages of 57 and 90 in foster home programmes in the community; that they have not resorted to a nursing home programme; and where they did have nursing home programmes, they

had found them unsatisfactory. So we may, two or three years from now, regret the entire pattern.

But, Mr. Chairman, even if we do not regret it, it has become obvious that The Homes for Special Care Act cannot of itself do the job; it is, as yet, another diversion from reality. What are some of the obvious reasons why it cannot do the job? They are very simple, Mr. Chairman. Take Kingston Ontario hospital.

Kingston Ontario hospital is located in Frontenac county. The hon. members of this House may be interested to know that in all Frontenac county there is not a single nursing home. Not one in the entire county, the county of origin of Kingston Ontario hospital.

Hamilton Ontario hospital. Any of the nursing homes on which it might have call are located out in the Niagara peninsula. It would, once again, cut off the necessary and established tie between family and patients. And, of course, at precisely the point where The Homes for Special Care Act came in, the worst scandals relating to nursing homes derived from Hamilton itself, so the superintendent of that Ontario hospital obviously had to work slowly. Thus we have 40 out of 800 moved—something in the vicinity of five per cent of those required.

I suggest strongly, Mr. Chairman, that we are just not going to find The Homes for Special Care Act sufficient. We are not going to be able to license enough new nursing homes, because they are not there. The pressures on them are already great, and the alternatives that are required relate to foster home placement, such as the Winnipeg plan—and there is no parallel to it in the province of Ontario—where a group of volunteers act as the intermediary in looking through newspaper advertisements, finding room and board, checking them out, and then the hospital matches the patients.

It is one of the most effective uses of the volunteer I have ever witnessed, and we are sorely lacking in the use of volunteers. We occupy the time of our top professional staff, of the few social workers we have, in finding homes, frequently, for recently discharged mentally-ill patients. That is absurd. It is a most inefficient use of manpower and we must develop a volunteer programme related first to foster homes, second to halfway houses, third to ex-patient clubs, fourth perhaps to government nursing homes, run and operated by government to take the heat off and bring the staff requirements up. But something—anything—which will allow us to turn to continued and active treatment in the Ontario

hospitals, so that we do not necessarily undermine the treatment resources of that hospital when 50 per cent of the patients are not, in fact, there for legitimate psychiatric purposes.

I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that I respect the sense of urgency from which The Homes for Special Care Act flowed. I respect the incredibly difficult circumstances under which the director of the tuberculosis division works. I have a feeling—the hon. Minister can prove me wrong—that this one man worked alone for a large part of the time in setting up homes for special care. Homes which should involve some 12,000 to 13,000 placements were handled by this one earnest, indefatigable, forlorn figure, who, for several months, tried to establish it on his own. If you want to have a viable Homes for Special Care Act, then establish it as a separate branch in this department; do not tuck it in under the main estimates but bring it under the mental health branch. Give it an exclusive place of its own and do a job. I trust that we will see something of that.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to leave this branch at the moment, having reiterated some of the themes, but I am going, before I take my seat, to make two observations because they will lead to other areas of this branch which I hope will be discussed this afternoon.

First, in almost every Ontario hospital I visited, Mr. Chairman, close to 50 per cent of the patients at the outpatient clinic were under the age of 16. In fact, I think I have the statistics in the community mental health branch in front of me. I shall take a moment to read them into the record. The total patients treated in 1963-64, 17 and over, 11,500; 16 and under, 7,100. But I notice that as of December 1963 the active cases had a considerable majority of "under-16s." In other words, our outpatient clinics of Ontario hospitals are now being asked to provide child and adolescent care.

Even more frightening, Mr. Chairman, in a place like Ontario hospital, Hamilton, 15 to 20 young adolescents, young teenagers, roam the wards of that adult mental hospital for lack of any community services for disturbed children and adolescents.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the area of disturbed children and the lack of facilities is something which we can come to later today when we pass through the general mental health pattern. But it is a very critical area, and it was demonstrated again by merely analyzing the trend which prevails.

The second thing I want to say before I sit down is that I want to hear what the

hon. Minister says in response to suggestions that the mathematics in this mental care in Metropolitan Toronto report are wrong. I am prepared to accept that I might have been wrong, but I would like to know where. I suggested in this House that this report shows, if you compute proper calculations, that we will be 1,000 psychiatric treatment beds short in Metropolitan Toronto in 1970-1971.

I want to know what the answer is to that. I dwelt on it at some length; I want to know how we begin to justify these specious reports that have come out ever since they dropped the hon. Minister into hot water last year.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I for one continue to be disappointed in this department. I offered to the hon. Minister, on the basis of considerable thought, without suggesting that it contains the wisdom of Confucius, an analysis of the mental health pattern and some of the more aggravated features of that pattern. We received this morning a very dubious confrontation of some of the points made. It is such a desperately critical area that I do not think that the hon. Minister can be allowed off lightly. We must continue to press for some of the more specific answers and some of the more specific questions. As this debate on this branch evolves, that is what we in this party shall do, because the state of mental health in the province of Ontario is critical, unco-ordinated, uneconomic and profoundly disorganized. Above all, Mr. Chairman, I suggest it is heading in the wrong direction—away from the community, into the hospital; away from prevention, into illness. I cannot repeat that often enough and the hon. Minister must surely give us some basis for his judgment and his feeling.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, there is one particular matter to which we did not receive an answer from the hon. Minister. I know it is a matter which he said he did not want to have brought up. That is the matter of Fred Fawcett. It is not a question so much of the individual in this case, but it is the circumstances around the man himself.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that when I was making my remarks I said that I did not doubt the ability of the psychiatrists who have been working for the government, but it most certainly puts the psychiatrist who is in the employ of the government in a most unenviable situation when he must make a decision which certainly would be questioned by the general public.

I think what we need in this province, and I regret very much that the hon. Minister did not tell us in his answers to some of the remarks made on this side of the House, is to provide for a system whereby an individual who is incarcerated in one of our mental institutions, or that individual's family or his lawyer, has some privilege as of right to appeal to a board that is not closely associated with the government.

I have said in this House that the government has a first responsibility to the public to protect us from such individuals who may be a threat to the general public, but we also, as a government, have a responsibility to the inmates in the mental institutions, to be certain that they are not kept there against their wish and also that the public knows that no individual is being kept against his wish.

The hon. Minister has said, "Who is to question the courts?" He obviously questions the courts because despite the fact that the ruling was made that he was insane, he was eventually released on the say-so of Dr. Boyd. It puts Dr. Boyd in a rather odd position that despite the fact of what the court has said, despite the fact that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) would not move in this situation, and despite the fact that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) set up a committee to examine this whole situation, Dr. Boyd, on his own, released Mr. Fawcett.

I do not think that the glossing over of this problem by the hon. Minister is at all satisfactory. I think he has a responsibility to this House to tell (a) how it is that Fred Fawcett was eventually released, despite all the contrary opinions of our courts, and (b) what steps the hon. Minister will take to see to it that this situation does not happen again, or even gives the appearance that an individual is being wrongly held.

Again, I suggest to the hon. Minister that what we need in this province is a committee of, let us say, a psychiatrist, a lawyer and a layman, who are not in the employ of the government, so that it takes the problem and the responsibility and the unenviable situation away from the psychiatrist who is in the employ of the Ontario government. Certainly our psychiatrists are overwhelmed with work as it is, without putting on them this responsibility which is certainly open to public scrutiny at all times. I hope before we are finished with the discussions on mental health estimates that the hon. Minister will give us some answer and not gloss over the situation.

Again I say, we do not want to embarrass Fred Fawcett any more, for heaven only knows the man has had all kinds of publicity and if his unfortunate circumstances have done anything, they have focused the public attention on the great danger there is of an individual being improperly held. I do not think at all that our doctors in our institutions try to hold people improperly; I think they can make mistakes and I think that the pressure of work makes it almost impossible for them to cover these situations as they should be covered. But the case of Fred Fawcett leaves an awful lot of unanswered questions and the hon. Minister has a responsibility to this House and to the public of Ontario to see that they are answered.

One other thing that has been emphasized in this House time and time again—it was brought up in this particular debate, as well—and to which the hon. Minister still does not give an answer is the question of staff. He gave us a quotation this morning that the morale was fine among the people in our hospitals here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not.

Mr. Trotter: You said earlier that the morale—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I told you what I believe is the reason for poor morale, but I did not say the morale was fine.

Mr. Trotter: I am glad, then, that you realize that the morale is not fine, because you did not give us any answers as to what you are going to do. On many occasions members of this House are accused of undermining morale, and yet we even have quotes from Dr. Christie in the newspapers, showing the morale of the people is hurt by the very fact that the welfare rates are boosted. We find that the attendants who have less than two years' experience are making less than what a family man on welfare would receive. Surely the hon. Minister should have some answer to this problem.

I do not want to go into all the figures again—that a married man on welfare with a family receives \$3,600 and the attendants start at \$3,120, and so on down the scale. But certainly the hon. Minister has a responsibility to see to it that the men and women who work in his hospitals here are receiving a proper pay. You are not going to get properly trained people, unless you give them a decent wage. Isn't getting properly trained people a good way to take so much of the pressure off the psychiatrists in our Ontario hospitals?

Let us face the fact that a lot of the patients in our Ontario mental hospitals are there more for chronic care than they are for getting psychiatric treatment. Some of them have been there for so long, because of the policies and the attitudes in the past, that their mental condition has so far deteriorated, it is going to be extremely difficult to bring a good many of our patients in our hospitals back into normal life. But they require decent care and it is asking the psychiatrists to do too much simply to look after these people when they know there will be very little response. That is why I think that of the 1,247 patients at 999 Queen, only slightly more than half are receiving active treatment. But what about the other half? Certainly, with properly trained help, our psychiatrists could receive a great deal of help.

We have had no suggestions from the hon. Minister about what efforts are being made to improve the manpower situation in our hospitals, what efforts are being made for recruiting for training, and what efforts are being made for raising the salaries to bring them up to a decent standard, so that you will have people who will take an interest in this. Some of the doctors in our mental hospitals have spoken on this matter regarding pay. For example, Dr. J. C. Bryce, who is at the London Hospital had written an article in the *London Free Press* entitled: "Mental Patients Treated as Second-Class Sick." How often we have used that expression on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, in regard to those who are mentally ill, being treated as second-class people. Dr. Bryce said this regarding pay:

Money alone is not the answer. Dedication is needed, but there are so very few who can be dedicated on \$3,000 per year when they can be equally dedicated to something else on \$6,000 a year.

These men see this problem day to day. The present Minister, Mr. Chairman, has had ample opportunity, over the years he has been Minister of Health—since 1959—to bring about a considerable change in the wage scale of the attendants in our hospitals. He can talk all he likes about the civil service rates of pay, but it is incumbent upon him to bring this problem to the hon. Treasurer of this province (Mr. Allan) and to the Treasury board to see to it that the pay scale in our mental hospitals has to be raised.

Dr. Bryce has said the crying need is for staff, and this because mental illness represents a retreat from reality into a world of fantasy. The patient runs away from his

world of fear and only people can coax them out of their well-defended island of retreat, sometimes on a one-to-one basis only. I might suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this House, that the present hon. Minister of Health is retreating on an island with regard to this whole problem; and he has more or less retreated in the realm of fantasy instead of coming to grips with the tremendous problem we are faced with. The turnover in staff at Queen Street is 42 per cent to 50 per cent. And it is similar in most of our large Ontario hospitals. Obviously, we are not taking proper care of our patients when we have an attendant looking after 120 patients by himself on the night shift, 30 of them being bed patients. It is obviously an impossible task for a man to change the necessary beds, to see that these people get the care they need. It is a miracle, Mr. Chairman, that there have not been more people lose their lives from fire and otherwise in our large institutions because of the poor staffing that we have.

The hon. Minister said in his remarks this morning that there is bound to be suicide and various accidents take place in these large hospitals. I do not doubt that for a moment. But the trouble is that these personal disasters could in many respects be avoided if we had the proper administration, and if we had the proper care. It seems, time and time again, that the only time these problems of the crowding of our hospitals for the mentally ill and for retarded children are brought to public attention is when some child has died, or some patient in our mental hospital has died through an accident that could be avoided, or through suicide.

Again, it has been pointed out by the head of the Canadian mental health association that we, in a large area like Toronto, do not have a 24-hour service as they do in some areas in Europe or in Vancouver, where people who are mentally ill, who are threatening suicide, can go. The vast majority of our clinics seem to close down around 5 o'clock. What we need in this city, and in other cities throughout the province of Ontario, and in other municipalities, be they the size of a city or not, are more of these centres, where someone can go who is threatening suicide.

Now we know that this works, because even over the telephone—the Salvation Army has established a telephone clinic, it might be called—where if one knows of them, they can call and talk to the member of the Salvation Army, who in many cases, manages to talk the sick person out of committing suicide. But the rates of suicide, especially in

large urban areas, have been increasing. In fact, I quote from an article in the *Globe and Mail* of May 3, 1965:

Suicides are killing more people in Toronto, for instance, than die in traffic accidents, Dr. Griffin said.

Dr. Griffin, as most of us know, is head of the Canadian mental health association.

In Vancouver there was a 24-hour a day psychiatric service available, he said. I am still heartily ashamed of Toronto and other Ontario centres with their lack of psychiatric services. People in urgent need cannot be taken immediately to a general hospital and get psychiatric care, as they do injuries and accidents.

Well, the hon. Minister has told us that this is going to improve, and he accused the hon. member for Scarborough West of being too young, that once he gets a little older, he may perhaps have a better judgment on these things. But after you have sat over here for a while and watched how slowly the government moves, one can understand a person of any age, being frustrated in the government's mincing steps that it takes to solve these problems. When we point out the importance of having these clinics that are needed, the hon. Minister can immediately cite some particular clinic that is now in existence. But it is evidence, at the same time, that we are not nearly coming to grips with the problem as that problem requires.

For example, they had a very successful clinic in Cobourg. It was one of the out-patient services developed in this province that was of great service. I think that the clinic that was set up in Cobourg helped over 2,000 people, and yet once the doctor in charge of that clinic, Dr. Cormack, left, the clinic closed down. And despite pleas to the hon. Minister and the various excuses that have been given, nothing has been done.

This was a tragic situation in a place the size of Cobourg. And it comes essentially from the lack of organization in Queen's Park, a lack of drive and a lack of initiative. So the hon. Minister can complain all he likes about some of the hon. members being too young and not seeing the problem as a whole.

Probably they have brought a fresh approach to this problem, and can see the tragic situation that is developing here in the province of Ontario because we do not take the action that has been required, be it in retaining psychiatrists, whether through bursaries; through education; and even in the area of getting assistance through staff. That could be solved if the hon. Minister had the will and had the effort to do something.

Now, I want to emphasize a bit more on this vote the need for community mental health centres. I quoted earlier what the superintendents of the Kingston Ontario hospital had said about our lack of after-care services, the fact that instead of having a re-admission rate of 15 per cent of those patients who are discharged, we are having an increasing readmission rate now moving from 35 to nearly 50 per cent. In other words, about 50 per cent of our people who are discharged are returned. It is strictly the result of a lack of our social services, through our health department, through our lack of after-care and because of our poor community mental health centres.

We know, as the hon. Minister admits, and as the hon. member for Scarborough West has gone into in some detail, that our community mental health centres should be part of the community. It should be an integrated unit where the patient can go at any time—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May I interrupt? We will resume this, Mr. Chairman, after lunch.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

It being 12.40 of the clock, the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 15, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

On 750th anniversary of Magna Carta, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Thompson, Mr. MacDonald	4165
Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, continued	4167
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, on second reading, continued	4196
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. White, agreed to	4198
Remembrance Day Act, 1965, bill intituled, Mr. Reaume, on second reading	4198
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. White, agreed to	4201
Minors' Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Reaume, on second reading	4201
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	4203
Recess, 6 o'clock	4203

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if we may revert to orders of the day, I would like to make a very brief statement which perhaps will not be considered contentious. It occurs to me that in the 98 years of this Legislature, there are probably many more occasions when contentious matters have been discussed than when we have been in agreement or common accord, but I think there are some very fundamental principles of this Legislature on which we do agree.

Today, June 15, is the day on which we might think back and remember Magna Carta because it was 750 years ago today that the final arrangements were made to complete what might be termed one of the more memorable encounters during the history of man. Seven hundred and fifty years ago there took place something that has had very great effect through the subsequent years. If we look back at the history of that time, it was on May 24, 1215, that the barons entered the gates of London. They were joined there by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton by name, and members of the clergy, the mayor of London, other people in public life, and community leaders, for the avowed purpose of obtaining a charter from the king—a king who was considered by his people to be a lawless king, and a king who considered himself really to be above the law.

It was in this confrontation that he found that he had to grant a charter against his will, confirming the laws and liberties of the people. It is 750 years ago today that King John affixed the great seal of England to Magna Carta, and in so doing he bowed himself to the rule of law, making the rule of law binding on himself no less than it was binding on his subjects.

When we think about it and examine the history, Magna Carta did not, in fact, produce any new principle, any new concept of liberty, but what it did was to crystallize, to bring into one piece of paper and back to life, and to confirm some very ancient liberties that had been eroded away over a period of time. It was a practical means to redress

grievances arising from encroachments upon these very ancient liberties.

Through the years, Magna Carta as a document has become a shield or a buckler, if you want to put it that way, behind which constitutional liberty has been able to take cover. Magna Carta established a principle which has been elaborated upon by many succeeding generations and, of course, the principle is simply that in a free society men are ruled by law and are not ruled by other men.

If we look at two of the 63 clauses in the charter, there are two that appear to me, at any rate, to be most important, and I might just make comment on these. The 39th clause reads:

No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, exiled or in any way destroyed except by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.

And the 40th clause is:

To none will we sell, to none will we deny or defer right or justice.

Sir, the historians who dealt with the development of Magna Carta since those days, claim that these clauses very clearly contain the right of habeas corpus and the right of trial by jury, that these two great principles are set out in the two clauses that I have read. Habeas corpus and trial by jury are considered to be the most effectual security against oppression which has yet been devised by the wisdom of man. There is a famous British historian by the name of Sir James MacKintosh and he had this to say about Magna Carta and its development:

To have produced the Magna Carta, to have preserved it, to have matured it, constitute the immortal claim of England upon the esteem of mankind. Her Bacons and Shakespeares, her Miltons and Newtons, with all the truth which they revealed and all the generous virtue which they inspired, are of inferior value when compared with the subjection of men and their rulers to the principles of law and justice . . . These mighty spirits could not have been formed except under equal laws, nor roused to

full activity without the influence of the spirit which the Magna Carta breathed over their forefathers.

Mr. Speaker, we are well aware that everything was not settled, of course, at Runnymede on that June 15, 750 years ago. I think from our experiences in this chamber we know that nothing really is ever finally and completely settled. But the principles of this charter and act were subsequently challenged by the man who signed it, by the king himself, by his successors, and perhaps we will have other occasions. Sir Winston Churchill once said that whenever the state, swollen with its own authority, has run roughshod over the rights and liberties of the people, it is to the doctrine of the Magna Carta that appeal has again and again been made, and never, as yet, without success.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite significant that on this 750th anniversary of the charter, through the action of this Legislature, one of the most eminent jurists that we have in this province, and indeed in Canada, is in the midst of an exhaustive inquiry, and it might be fitting if I were just to read his terms of reference so that we may recall what he is doing. One of them is, of course, the relationship between the state and the power of encroachment which may be contained in existing legislation and which may be sought in future legislation, and second, the means necessary to maintain and strengthen the guarantees of civil liberties which are inherent in our citizenship and in the great tradition from which it has evolved. Basic to this tradition is Magna Carta.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, none of us knows, when Mr. Justice McRuer will complete his inquiry, but I think we are all at one with him in his desire—and I have discussed it with him—to do a full and comprehensive task so that when his report does come here it will, I would hope, constitute a very important milestone, not so much in the development perhaps of these rights, but as Magna Carta did, in a preservation of the rights that at present exist. That is why I am happy to mark this 750th birthday in this House today.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Prime Minister stood up to speak and suggested to us that he wanted to speak about a subject which he felt would not be as contentious as other subjects which we have had in the House, one of my hon. colleagues turned to me and said, "Better watch this and decide whether we are for or against it." He then went on to clarify that he was speaking of

the Magna Carta and, of course, sir, all free men recognize the fundamental principles which this charter has enunciated.

But we also recognize that it was not an easily won battle. It was among the barons and the people and the king. There were men with an inspiration in their hearts that they wanted to see a clearly stated law, and they were determined that there would be an equality for men. It was a hard, tough struggle as we all recognize to get this platform from which they could move on to other developments of political and economic freedom.

I think, sir, as we recognize this day and look back on this charter which took place 750 years ago, we must also recognize that we can never rest on our oars, that we always have to be examining the freedoms which were won for us, and seeing that there is not a corrosion of these freedoms. Really, on this day, when the hon. Prime Minister has given emphasis to Magna Carta as crystallizing the ancient freedoms of our society, I think we also should be thinking of the fact that it is only by eternal vigilance on all our parts that these freedoms will be maintained, and it is only by a constant examination of modern civilization and modern government, and of the encroachments that can so easily take place on the life of the individual—if we have the same inspiration to be constantly alert to defend the rights of all free men—that then indeed the work that was laid 750 years ago will have the result which those men had wanted.

I feel that in this House, in giving recognition to this day, and to the crystallizing of our ancient rights, this is giving us a new energy and a new aspiration to move ahead in the constant guarding of these ancient rights.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, an occasion like this almost invites one to reflect for an hour, or to speak but briefly. I assure you I will do the latter. But I think it is interesting, while acknowledging that Magna Carta is one of the cornerstones upon which our freedoms and liberties have been built, to tear aside many of the myths that have been built about what happened on that green at Runnymede 750 years ago.

If I may pick up, for example, on a couple of comments that the hon. leader of the Opposition has made, about men who came with a great spirit of liberty in their hearts seeking it for others, and that we today are fulfilling what they were attempting to do at Runnymede, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that simply was not the case at all. What happened at Runny-

mede was that you had a group of barons who, in the modern phraseology, which Mark Harrison captured in a Toronto *Daily Star* story yesterday, were after a union shop. What happened at Runnymede was that a group of barons had found themselves victimized by a lawless king. They were not really thinking of the liberties of the little peasants scattered around England; they were thinking of protecting their own self-interests.

But in seeking and establishing their own self-interests, they did it on the basis of principles. In the phraseology of the poet; freedom has broadened "slowly down from precedent to precedent." We have taken those principles and we have fought for their broader realization down through the years. Indeed, the hon. Prime Minister is correct. It may very well be that Mr. Justice McRuer today is really examining, once again, a broader application of those principles in terms of the problems that the individual faces today in relationship to his society.

But let us not get too idealistic and romantic about the freedom-inspired barons who gathered at Runnymede. In Mark Harrison's terms, they were seeking to build a union shop. Well, all union shops are built on principles, and if you can broaden those principles so that the same protection of rights is extended to everybody, then we have the genuine freedom that we seek. I am sure that all of us in this Legislature want to do just that.

Clerk of the House: The 56th order. House in committee of supply. Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

(continued)

On vote 713:

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned for lunch, I was making a few remarks on community mental health centres. This is something that has been sadly neglected by the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario; something which we have failed to learn from has been done in other jurisdictions such as Denver, Colorado, and Fort Logan down in the United States, and even beginning in Saskatchewan, in Yorkton. That is the importance of developing the community centre, not only in that it saves us money, but that in the long run it helps the patient.

For example, in Denver, Colorado, they have a 400-bed centre. By a centre I mean

it is a community centre which is virtually working 24-hours a day. The patient does not have to live in. The patient can go voluntarily. They are well supplied with personnel and the emphasis is not on bed space, but on personnel. It is something that we here could very easily follow.

They have in Denver this 400-bed space and it cares for as many people, through their system of day care, as would take a 4,000-bed hospital under the system that we have used here in the province of Ontario. It is staffed with the number of people required to take care of a 4,000-bed hospital, but the emphasis is on the individual patient, not on the bed space. Admittedly, it costs there approximately what would be in bed space, \$28. We have got to face the fact that if we are going to treat this problem of mental health with any vigour and energy, it is going to cost us more than the \$8 that we are spending today.

But when we look at it even from an economic point of view, Mr. Chairman, when we know that we could reduce our readmissions to 15 per cent, and instead we are hovering around the 50 per cent readmission mark, we can see that in the long run we are going to save money. In the systems that have been developed in some of the states of the United States, they find that a maximum time for a patient is often 90 days but in order to be able to effect any semblance of a cure in that time they have to catch the mental disturbance or the nervous disturbance at an early age, therefore their system of detection in making their community centres open to the public is most important. We have a long way to go.

I would like to make a few suggestions, in summing up, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), in giving some answers to the remarks, did not deal with that eyesore, 999 Queen Street. We keep coming back to that because it is a symbol in this area of all the things that should not be done. True, personnel is the most important thing. It is the attitude that the people have, but it is virtually impossible to get personnel or to develop an attitude in a building that is so outmoded. Whether it was crowded or not, it is still archaic and outdated. But when we are faced with the fact that even on a relatively conservative estimate it has 400 patients more than it should have, it is obvious that we have a very serious situation. That situation at 999 Queen will only be met in a number of ways: by improving the system where you can discharge your patients

and have a better after-care system; having chronic hospitals for those who are really more or less physically ill or beyond a cure; the halfway houses needed for those that still need supervision, but who possibly could get out and work during the day; and again, as part of the after-care system, the community mental health centres.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he have some programme that could start in the immediate future and I hope at the next sitting of this House, that they make arrangements that some place like 999 Queen Street is demolished. Because it is in a central area, you could build in its stead, probably using the front wing that was built there, a community centre. It is in an area which is easy to reach here in a large urban area and could serve a first-class cause, that of doing something about mental illness.

As long as you leave a building such as that standing you are always going to be faced with the eyesore which I say is a disgrace to the province of Ontario. That is one thing I would suggest as an immediate programme. Then in order to place the other patients who obviously are going to have to be moved to different types of hospitals, you are going to have to build more mental hospitals in this area and in other large urban centres.

If we would take an analysis, Mr. Chairman, of how the rural areas are served in this province, we will realize that they are sadly lacking in mental health care.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that the psychiatric wings in the general hospitals are a good thing, but as I emphasized earlier, the general hospitals take only the short-care patients. Any patient going to require care over any length of time—and there will be many of that type of patient—is going to require the large Ontario hospital. When I say large, I hope that the new hospitals that are built will take care of no more than 300 patients.

In many ways, this is old theory to the hon. Minister of Health. But the shame of it is that very little or nothing along this line has been done. I know that the hon. Minister earlier today cited the various hospitals that had been built, but it has been very slow and tedious. They scarcely take care of the backlog and they most certainly do not take care of the growing population that we have. We would not have the London hospital so crowded, or Woodstock, or 999 Queen, or Whitby, if we had a proper system of outpatient care, after-care or Ontario hospitals that are of a decent size. If

the hon. Minister would plan to do away with, as he has begun in London, a hospital such as 999 Queen, it would be a long step forward.

The hon. Minister hardly touched on 999 Queen, and anything that he did try to answer was nothing but a lame excuse for a scandalous situation that is existing here in this area.

Another matter affecting a large urban area like Toronto, when we try to press the theory that patients should be close to the community and close to their families, we find that many of the patients in Whitby are from this area, which is certainly not part of their home area. And if you checked where some of the patients in Whitby or 999 Queen come from, they come from all over the province of Ontario, which is completely contrary to the modern psychiatric theory that a patient should be close to his home.

The very dates of our hospitals, going back to 1846 and to 1890, show that our Victorian thinking symbolizes a defeat for our society, and this is the second thing that I would like to emphasize. Still within the government of the province of Ontario we have the old Victorian idea of the lunatic asylum, and London and Woodstock and 999 Queen are all symbols of the type of thinking that still exists here in the province of Ontario, despite the fact that the hon. Minister attempts to list a few of the hospitals that have been constructed by this very wealthy province over a period that has been far too long.

Third, I think the use of drugs, Mr. Chairman, has shown that by this type of therapy we can keep a patient active in society. I know that there are many types of illness that cannot be cured by drugs, but they have gone a long way in getting the patient back into society. But the effect and the use of drugs are not nearly as helpful as they could be, if we do not have the proper after-care services. And we just do not have them in the province of Ontario.

Some of these hospitals that have been developed in the United States have literally taken the locks off the doors. I realize, Mr. Chairman—and this is the fourth item—we have to use commonsense in taking the locks off doors. Those who are criminally insane certainly must be incarcerated, but in the vast majority of cases, it has been shown that the open door policy does succeed. But still in the province of Ontario, at least 50 per cent of our patients in our mental hospitals are still governed by the so-called locked door policy, despite all the psychiatric and medical knowledge that is available. We are

very slow to move in this direction, and I think that because a patient has, in many cases, been kept continuously under a locked door, when he is eventually set free he sooner or later, ends up in the hospital. We started to move from the closed-door policy to the open-door policy, but what we have, in essence, is a revolving-door policy in the province of Ontario.

The fifth item in summing up—and I will not go into the figures again on this, Mr. Chairman—is the complete disorganization in amassing the personnel here in our Ontario mental hospital system. It is not just a question of getting psychiatrists, it is a question of getting trained people. Not necessarily professionally trained people, but trained to an extent that they can be of assistance in looking after patients. The system in Fort Logan in the United States has shown that you do not have to have as many psychiatrists as is sometimes claimed. If you have an understanding staff with some knowledge, they can take a tremendous load off the psychiatrists.

Sixth, Mr. Chairman, we lack in our hospitals—just wander through some of the larger mental hospitals in Ontario—we lack segregation. Now I know there is some attempt to segregate the patients, and I do not blame the superintendents in charge because I know that they make an effort. But because they are crammed to the doors, and because they do not have the facilities, it is most difficult to segregate those who need real psychiatric help and those who are going to be more or less chronic care patients. It is the lack of proper building and lack of proper material. You cannot expect a psychiatrist who, in many cases, has so many patients, to carry out custodial work instead of psychiatric work.

Again, I urge on the hon. Minister that we segregate our patients, and this is my seventh point. I here keep emphasizing again and again that the readmission rate here in the province of Ontario instead of 15 per cent, is a shocking 50 per cent. We have a long way to go, and I think it is because we still have an asylum approach, the old Victorian asylum approach, and we have not reached out for that new frontier which is the breaking down of the apathy of the public and worst of all, the apathy of government.

I would be the first to admit, Mr. Chairman, that the public has been apathetic to the problem of the mentally sick. Despite the fact that it is by far our greatest social problem and greatest health problem in Canada and in Ontario, the people are just not in-

terested. It is something they still hide. The hon. Minister at one time put out a very good film on retarded children, "One on Every Street" and it would be of help to this cause of doing something for mental illness if more such movies could be shown. I, for one, would be glad to see this House vote funds for that sort of thing. I believe the movie, "One on Every Street" came out about four years ago, and I still hear people say how good it was.

It is only by the government taking some leadership in this field that they can overcome the public apathy. The trouble is that the government itself in its own policies, has been so mincing in its steps. As we return to what former Prime Minister Frost used to say, "We do a little here, we do a little there, and wait till next year." This is not only typical of the government, but it is particularly typical of this problem of mental health.

So again, you have a long way to go in this literally new frontier in the thinking of social well-being for those who are mentally ill. We need an overall approach, Mr. Chairman, that not only takes care of the community clinics, the day care and the night care and the use of volunteers and this, I think, has increased tremendously because of the interest of the superintendents of the various hospitals. Without exception, they have done a great deal in this field.

But one other item in this overall approach that we have sadly neglected is reaching the disturbed children. We know how little facilities there are in the way of treating children who are emotionally disturbed. And I would recommend to the hon. Minister the brief of the association for emotionally disturbed children, when they urge that there be guidance clinics set up in the schools, because a child may go to a clinic within the school walls before he would want to go to a clinic in a mental hospital or even to a clinic in a general hospital here in the city. We know that of the people who have gone to the clinics for mentally ill, about 40 per cent of them have been children who are 16 and under. It is far wiser to check any mental disturbance at a young age than wait until the disease has advanced. We are then bearing the heavy cost of trying to cure someone seriously ill or keeping them as a hopeless mental patient over the years.

Now, we have, of course, our emotionally disturbed children in the extreme cases who are retarded. I realize there is a large difference between one who is retarded and one who is emotionally disturbed, but let us bear in mind that those who are emotionally disturbed can in many ways be completely

cured. But even for the retarded children, our whole set-up under our present government shows—and we have gone into this time and time again—that our hospitals are crammed like sardines in a can. Time and time again you hear people who have been in these hospitals and are greatly disturbed because their children are there. I cannot understand why the hon. Minister seems to completely avoid even in his remarks the problem of retarded children; this is a large and neglected field.

It was interesting to read, Mr. Chairman, in the *Record News*, a paper in Smiths Falls, reporting when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) called on the hospital at Smiths Falls, the Ontario hospital school for retarded children. It said this:

Premier John P. Robarts paid an unscheduled 45-minute visit to the Ontario hospital school on Saturday afternoon, his first to the institution which has come under considerable criticism lately due to the reports of overcrowding and short staffing. He met with superintendent Dr. H. F. Franks and did not see any of the wards nor any of the patients.

I do not know if that report is correct or not, but I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he not just talk to the superintendents who are, without exception, dedicated men. But if they went through the wards they would see the problems they have to deal with. This is one of the major troubles of this administration—it is too distant, they are not taking the interest they should. I remember when I was through the Orillia hospital, I was told that Dr. Dymond was the first Minister in 20 years to go through the hospital, so I give the hon. Minister credit for that. But you can see the neglect that there has been, and the lack of interest. Even a few weeks ago, the hon. Prime Minister of the province that close to the hospital, right inside the doors, did not bother to go into the wards. This is where the problem is, and this is what is disturbing to those people interested in this problem and why it is disturbing to the parents.

When we are on a committee like the committee on the aged, and we visit some of these mental hospitals, a lot of the hon. members do not want to go through some of the wards. They say that if you have seen it once you have seen them all; it is too upsetting and it is too disturbing. I am afraid this is the attitude the government has had over the years, and the attitude the public has had. We have to face up to this, that it is too disturbing, it is more or a less a matter of out of sight, out of mind.

But it is the duty of the government to give leadership in this very sad, very urgent situation, and I am saddened to hear the hon. Minister give what I thought were very weak answers to the various problems that were brought to his attention. On the matter of emotionally disturbed children, we—both parties in this House—have mentioned on various occasions the problem of Jamie. Again, it is a name and we are not trying to publicize individuals, but they symbolize the sad lack of proper facilities in this province. And again, the hon. Minister has no answer. It is like talking to a stone wall, it seems, year in and year out when these same matters are brought up. And we see that little or nothing in relationship to the extent of the problem is being done by the government. The lame excuses that the hon. Minister has given in his answering remarks, Mr. Chairman, is overwhelming evidence that in essence this government has no intention whatsoever of coming to grips with this problem of mental health, which is very serious here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister does not want to reply in toto, maybe we can put some quite specific questions to him; that would make his lot easier.

If that is the case, let me begin with the one which continues to perplex me, and about which I am most exercised. On my mathematical calculations, I think that the report on mental care in Metropolitan Toronto underestimates the need for psychiatric beds by 1,042. Between 1970 and 1975, I suspect we will be over 1,000 beds short and I think that the logic and rationale behind the computation in this report was specious in the extreme. I think it is a very important medical issue that we are, in fact, to be 1,000 beds short.

Perhaps I can just take a moment to review for the House what is involved.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): For the fourth time!

Mr. S. Lewis: Not in this instance, my hon. friend. It is not by any means the fourth time, unless the hon. Minister wishes to reply before I set it out.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I am not going to get up, Mr. Chairman, while somebody else has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister is quite welcome. I will subside.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have no cause to argue with the report, and I find it very difficult to understand why, if a report does not agree with what our preconceived notions are or may be, it is wrong. The report is well based on the experience and statistics arrived at through long and hard experience, and statistics that are used by other jurisdictions, as well as statistics based on our own experience here in Ontario.

The need of active treatment beds has been estimated by federal authorities as 1.2 per 1,000. The present population of our in-patient service in the Ontario hospitals is about 2.4 per 1,000 and it is agreed that 56 per cent of 2.4, or 56 per cent of those who are in our care now, actually need hospital attention. This would give us a figure of 1.3, and this is the figure that the formula of the Agnew committee used. I repeat, sir, I find it very difficult to understand why this particular report should be of so much lesser quality than all the other volumes of this extremely broad and searching report that have been submitted and have been quoted frequently in this House. My staff has discussed this with me, and we are of the opinion that the projections used as a basis for these conclusions are quite realistic. If our experience continues to be as it has been over the past few years, it might well be that there will be a surplus of beds at the end of the period, rather than any shortage whatsoever, as Agnew suggests in his report.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I will certainly take up that challenge, and deal with this a little more precisely. Let me inform the hon. members of this House that the federal figure is not anywhere in the report, the figure to which the hon. Minister refers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did not infer that it was in the report, nor did I say that what I stated came from the report, but I have access to other information, just as the hon. member has, and I think I am at liberty to use it when it is necessary.

Mr. S. Lewis: By all means let the hon. Minister use what information he may, but I am using the information contained in this report, on which the projection is based. Now, this report makes three initial facts clear.

First, that in the international hospital federation meeting in Europe in 1962, the ratio per thousand for mental illness is two to 4.5 beds per 1,000.

Second, in an American study, similarly recent, the ratio for beds per 1,000 is 3.8.

Third, in the British survey, the most authoritative in the world at the moment, based as it was on a five-year analysis, the minimum ratio of beds per 1,000 population was set at 1.8.

This report itself accepts a ratio of 1.26 on the very questionable basis that our bed needs are presently accurate, and that there is not likely to be a change between now and the year 1970-71.

First, Mr. Chairman, our bed needs are presently not sufficiently adequate. Secondly, what about what is happening in the field of mental health at the present time? The introduction of drug psychotherapy has opened up new horizons which will doubtless be exploited by ever-increasing numbers of people. The development of psychiatric wings is going to increase the incidence in the process of identification, so that more and more cases will be known and referred.

The stimulus provided by bringing Ontario hospitals more into the community will improve the channels. Everywhere, in every jurisdiction in the world, it is recognized that the 1.8 figure is an absolutely minimum figure. But this report, for reasons of its own, chooses 1.26 per 1,000, and makes the quite incredible argument that because the waiting lists are only 30 to 50 at certain hospitals now, therefore we will not have any waiting lists in the future, and we can accept this 1.26 which presently prevails.

Now what I have said, Mr. Chairman, is based on the evidence of this report. Why did they cite the international hospital association and the American study and the British study, if they were irrelevant? On the basis of their report, the minimum figure which is valid is 1.8 beds per 1,000. If you apply 1.8 beds per 1,000 to the projected population in 1970, of 1,930,000 in Metro Toronto, you come out with a need for 3,474 beds, which is 1,042 beds in excess of what the report presently recommends.

This report is so complicated in its calculations that it is very difficult to comprehend; but I have discussed it with some people and I have tried to work it through, and I think that what I put before this House is valid. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we may be making a very serious miscalculation. The hon. Minister should not simply wave it away. That is not sufficient.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that he re-examine the report. As to my questioning of the report as a whole, Mr. Chairman, let me tell the House frankly and honestly what I

bed. I think that when the original report came out on the hospital bed crisis in Metro Toronto, and predicted a 2,360 bed shortage, the furor which followed so embarrassed the government that each subsequent report was necessarily tempered in its contents. I think that is true of this one, because the observations it makes are so obviously trite. I think it is also true of the report on private hospitals, in some of the observations it makes. Let me say that we will allude further to this report and its subsequent content as this estimate goes forward, because we are by no means near the end of it.

I respect the work that went into this, but I question the calculation, and I question the degree of confidence with which judgments are asserted. Even if the hon. Minister and I have to come to an honest disagreement on the figures, I urge him to take into account the mathematical contradictions of this report, or he will find himself 1,000 beds short in 1970.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think I can only add that I will be guided by the hon. member's suggestion that we take the report into further consideration. We are, at the present time, persuaded that these figures are sound. I would refute them. I think again my opinion is equally valid as the hon. member's, and perhaps has a little more solid foundation in fact, that all jurisdictions in the world do not accept the 1.8 figure. Indeed, all jurisdictions at the present time involved in the care and treatment of the mentally ill, are very much concerned about this idea that great numbers of beds still need to be maintained and built.

You ask what is happening in psychiatry today? I make bold to predict, sir, that what is happening in psychiatry today is exactly the thing that was happening in tuberculosis ten years ago. When I came into this department six years ago, there were requests for additions to tuberculosis hospitals, and that then they were crowded to the doors and had long waiting lists. Almost overnight the picture changed. And this matter of treating the mentally disturbed, the psychiatric patients, is in such a state of fluidity today, that I can foresee the time when the present ratio of beds will be quite in excess of our needs.

It is with this caution in mind, sir, that we are trying to plan our future, and I resist very strongly, and again I repeat, I think my opinion has some possibility of being based on something more solid than reading newspapers and so on, and magazines and the opinions of lay reporters. I believe that we

are on the right track, and that the provision for beds for the mentally ill is right.

More and more people are being brought out with psychiatric illness. More and more are coming forward early. More and more of them are being treated successfully in the doctor's office, in the outpatient department of hospitals and clinics, and in the clinics after they have been hospitalized. I disagree most vigorously and actively with the hon. member when he says that the outpatient department is not a place for after-care. Of course it is. When you discharge the patient from the hospital, where do you tell him to come back? Their own doctor's office or to the outpatient department? If he knows anything about the practice of medicine, he will know that is acceptable and is accepted. It is done, and more and more—

Mr. S. Lewis: Is it done in the Toronto Ontario hospital, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. Unless there is a point of order.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, we will follow.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: More and more this will be used, and more and more, the length of time—and this is being probed—spent in hospital will become shorter and shorter and the same number of beds we have now will be capable of serving our greater population. We have found this in the space of five or six years that it might be cut by three-quarters to what it was at one time. I forget exactly the figure.

This is what we found in tuberculosis, and this is what we will find, I am quite sure, in mental illness. Those who are coming forward early and being admitted to hospital early, particularly to short-term active or intensive treatment units, their average per patient stay is something in the order of 23 days.

In our Ontario hospitals where the patients come to us when the illness is more solidly established, even the average per patient stay is under three months, whereas only a short time ago it was years or for a lifetime. This, of course, is causing a greater turnover in beds.

Yes, of course, there are readmissions, but I think that some of us, and I think that some of my colleagues, are overly preoccupied with this matter of readmission. A cardiologist does not care how often a patient with heart failure is readmitted to hospital. Of course, if he needs hospital, that is the place for him to go.

The total length of time in hospital can easily be reduced, even with frequent read-

mission, so long as the eventual outcome of the illness is satisfactory.

On page 36 of the report, the hon. member will notice that:

By 1970, alternative facilities are provided for those approximately 709 to 925 residents previously mentioned before in the two Ontario hospitals in Metro who do not require active psychiatric care. The need for active treatment psychiatric beds in Metro by 1970 would be reduced by that number.

And that brings me to the comments he made about the homes for special care. He says it will not work. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is jumping to a conclusion. I submit to you, sir, with greater validity and with far more foundation in fact, that it will work, that it is working. The Act was passed last session; the regulations were not prepared until late summer and then we found difficulty in getting homes of the standard which we believed was essential. But a great many people in the province were willing to bring their homes up to the standard and the plan actually began operating on December 1.

In that time, nursing home cases alone amounted to 914 and by the end of this month there will be more than 1,000 cases out. In a matter of five or six months, sir, I maintain that this is a fairly solid achievement. I am quite certain that this will work and that this will relieve the pressure of the space in the hospitals, which can be used for active treatment psychiatric care.

Of course, some jurisdictions did not like the nursing home business and some have had bad experiences with them, but that does not mean to say that we should not try it; that does not mean to say that we cannot learn by their experiences and avoid the pitfalls into which they fell.

The programme of boarding homes or half-way houses, or whatever you want to call them, for ambulatory patients is just in the process of developing, because we put emphasis on the removal at the first stage of those who are bedridden and need nursing care and who are demanding a good deal of nursing care in the hospitals.

Now the other phase of the programme will come into operation and I am quite certain that it will work just as successfully. I may advise you, sir, and through you, the House, that we are encouraging the support and active interest of the mental health associations and other community groups and organizations who have been interested in this.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that I said little about retarded children. I did

announce the programme that we had proposed, arising out of the deliberations of the interdepartmental committee which had proposed to government a co-ordinated plan. Here is the kind of comment I got from one of the people who is one of the most active leaders in this whole field:

Congratulations! What a blueprint you have nailed to the wall. I have seen the copy of your speech yesterday and rushed it home to read it aloud to—

His wife.

When I had finished we could only just sit there, bedazzled with delight.

Mr. Chairman, here is a couple who have been in this area, who have a retarded child and who know from personal experience all that is involved in this, and this is their reaction to the government's programme. This, to me, sir, is of far greater import than anything my hon. friend from Scarborough West can say about it.

In the matter of emotionally disturbed children, again I have not said anything about that because I want to deal with it in its proper place. He has used figures and I think the very fact that his figures were so sweeping and so broad is the most eloquent testimony of the grave difficulties in this area. He suggests that the incidence of childhood schizophrenia is 2,000 to 3,000 in Ontario—I believe these were the figures that he used—and on the basis of our population would be 300 to 500 per million, if my mathematics are correct. It is strange that our figures should be so out of tune with the British figures—for instance, 76 per million, and the county of London with 81 per million. This estimates a total number of schizophrenic children in the United Kingdom of 5,000. Yet here is a nation with ten times the population of Ontario. I think this is completely wrong, Mr. Chairman, and would lead the world to believe that we are a province of schizophrenics, which is certainly not the case.

I grant you, Mr. Chairman, when I look around me, I see a great deal of evidence of emotional disturbance that I would like to have an opportunity to diagnose and prescribe for.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): So do we!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but I can judge perhaps with a little more validity than you can.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, my hon. friend, I will have you caught for practising medicine without a licence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor, please?

Mr. MacDonald: You had it until you began to give it away.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I will not give it away.

The hon. member for Scarborough West suggested a need of 15 to 20 beds per 100,000 population, or 150 to 250 per million for the emotionally disturbed. Here again, sir, all his emphasis is placed upon beds and we say that this is wrong, that the emphasis must not be placed upon beds, but upon the proper care. Yet the British figures for the beds existing—I am using them because he quoted them so frequently—show their existing beds are eight per million population.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I will get back to some of these individual points; but just so that we do not run headlong into error, as some of us are prone to do, I did not quote British figures on bed ratios; I quoted figures which were submitted by the Canadian mental health association and the Canadian psychiatric association to the Hall commission meetings. The figures that I quoted were on the basis of clinics per ratio of 25,000 children and numbers of beds per ratio of 100,000 children. If those sources are wrong, let the hon. Minister say so. I did not use the British sources.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the figures quoted by the Canadian psychiatric association were 20 for 250,000 population or 80 for 1,000,000, in special units, plus a small number in pediatric hospitals and hospital schools for the retarded—a possible total, including everything, of 100 beds per million of population.

This brings me to the hon. member's proposal that emotionally disturbed children should be taken out of the Ontario hospital schools. This is not the British opinion either, Mr. Chairman, and this is not the opinion held by those knowledgeable in the field. Let me quote from the 1962-63 United Kingdom report of the chief medical officer of The Department of Education and Science. The report is entitled "The Health of the School Child," and I quote:

While psychotherapy may offer some help to a few psychotic children, it would be quite unrealistic to suppose that there are a sufficient number of psychotherapists

with sufficient time to treat the majority. Beyond this, and nursing care in an institution—which many psychotic children do not need—if sufficient support was given by parents there is little that strictly medical care can, at present, offer in the way of therapy.

However, Mr. Chairman—and one can go on quoting *ad infinitum*—I do not think that any of us is agreed on what should be included in the total number of emotionally disturbed children and what percentage of that total number needs active treatment and what percentage will gradually grow out of it themselves with the ordinary guidance and support that they receive in the home and the community.

Recognizing that this is an area where there is need and in which many departments of government are concerned, we are setting up now an interdepartmental committee to approach this in the same way that we did with mental retardation. It will be representative of The Departments of Health, Education, Public Welfare, and Reform Institutions, and of The Attorney General's Department. Out of its studies of the whole matter in the collating and collecting of all of the information and a new review of all of the briefs that have been submitted, we will propose to government and then to this Legislature a co-ordinated programme, after the same fashion as we have proposed to this House at this time the programme for dealing with mentally retarded.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, earlier this session, this party, in good faith, suggested to the hon. Minister that what he required was an interdepartmental committee of precisely those departments. If, in fact, this committee has now been constituted and will meet and will come up with something valuable, then we will be glad to hear it, even though the hon. Minister disputes the justification for its establishment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I must ask the hon. member to correct that. I did not dispute, in fact I have just finished saying that the government recognizes that this is an area of need in which many departments of government are involved, and on this basis and for this reason it has decided to approach it in this manner.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well then, let us not quibble over the precise figures that have been quoted. Newspaper editorials, learned articles, professionals in the field, politicians,

everyone, has quoted a variety of figures; but all of them have agreed on the need. This is the first expression—dramatic in its import—I suggest, from the hon. Minister, that he is prepared to invest it with the same sense of urgency. I must say to him that the scheme which was outlined for retarded children in his lead-off in the estimates was a hopeful one; if he can come back for emotionally disturbed children in the very near future with a similar scheme, then I think the work in the Legislature, and in the public, will not have been in vain.

Let me say to him, Mr. Chairman, that I, too, brought his lead-off speech home and read it to my wife. I guess some of us do that. Her reaction was also a silent one, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps for different reasons, because some people are literally paralyzed by the effrontery of some of its contentions. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are still aspects of the hon. Minister's lead-off and his subsequent remarks which require serious debate.

Let me take some of the points he has just recently made, one by one, and let us go at them. I am not going to analyze them mathematically—as I said earlier, I am not a mathematician—whether the 1.2 versus the 1.8 figure is a proper one when estimating the required number of beds. But I will say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know where he gets any figures lower than 1.8. The British figure of 1.8 is a contraction of the present figure of 3.3, and it is a contraction based on the fact that they are developing tremendous areas of community-centred psychiatric treatment; treatment at home, treatment in foster homes, and there is no such parallel programme in the province of Ontario. We in this province and in this party are not suggesting an inordinate number of beds; we are suggesting a minimum number of beds coincident with the need and along with that a programme for community centre care. That has not been forthcoming; it is pretentious to suggest it has.

The hon. Minister talks about the average patient's stay prior to after-care. Everyone knows that the average patient's stay, particularly in the psychiatric wings is diminishing in time. That will be an historical trend in the psychiatric field; but I question his parallel between tuberculosis and mental illness. It reminds me of an original and earlier parallel he made in this House between the common cold and emotional disturbance. It strikes me that it is just roughly on a par of revelance. He further

says that in The Homes for Special Care Act we have managed in one year roughly to place 1,000 people—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I said in six months. On a point of order.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, since September, 1964.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: December.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine, six months the Act has been in operation, and we have had a large number of nursing homes licensed. The hon. Minister can correct me; we have had over 50. I think that we broke through this area. I granted him that earlier.

I point out to him that on his figure there are 10,000 to 12,000 people requiring placement and what I simply said was that The Homes for Special Care Act of itself would not do the job. All the alternative facilities would be required. I then went further and suggested that we may be completely off in the wrong direction—that nursing homes as such are not the place for discharged mentally ill patients, that experience in other jurisdictions has shown the degree of isolation, the lack of contact with family, the questionable standards that prevail from time to time. This House has been embroiled and will be embroiled in problems of nursing homes before this session ends. They are not inviolable, they are not perfection and yet we want to shift 10,000 or 12,000 people to them under this one Act in a short period of time. I suggested to him, Mr. Chairman, and I reassert it, that there are other alternative procedures which may have to be pursued.

Since the hon. Minister raised it, because I had intended to hold it for a moment, let me come back to this question of emotionally disturbed children perhaps for the last time now that this interdepartmental committee has been set up.

What has this Minister done in the field of disturbed children and adolescents? Virtually nothing, Mr. Chairman. We have Thistletown hospital with 64 beds; as much for research as for treatment. Thistletown, which, unless the hon. Minister comes to its defence, is rapidly becoming the white elephant for emotionally disturbed children.

In six years of Thistletown we have not had a single solitary report tabled in this Legislature. Not one. And no one knows what is happening at Thistletown by way of research. I have heard it said—many have heard it said—that great things are being done at Thistletown, that great strides are being made. But where is the evidence of

those strides? Why cannot the hon. Minister come before this House and give some demonstration of what the research has found? He is on record in newspaper articles—if necessary, I shall dig them out—as saying that he and his researchers at Thistletown do not know what to do about emotionally disturbed children. Year after year we heard that “we did not know what to do about the treatment of alcoholics” until finally the hon. Minister came in with a programme of treatment and abandoned this preoccupation with research. It is time we stopped researching emotionally disturbed children, not in the absolute sense, but in the sense that research is relegated to its proper level in the scale of values; and that we give a new emphasis to treatment and that that new emphasis should come quickly from this inter-departmental committee.

Think a little more about the hon. Minister's department. He has a unit at Smiths Falls hospital school, a unit of between 90 and 96 mentally ill children in that school. These are psychotic children; these are schizophrenic autistic children—prognosis of nil. What Dr. Franks told me when I visited Smiths Falls hospital school—and the hon. Minister can deny this if he will—is, and I give him the exact words of the superintendent: “For this entire ward of mentally ill children at Smiths Falls, we have one-half of a psychiatrist and one-third of a psychologist.”

Now, let me remind the House of something, Mr. Chairman. In other areas in this society, in other treatment centres like Warrendale, like Ottawa Protestant children's village, like Sunnyside children's centre as a third example, in other areas of this society, severely disturbed children require one-to-one treatment at a minimum, and if it is not one-to-one—it is at least one-to-two or one-to-three. And for over 90 children—at least, that is what there were when the federal Department of Health and Welfare made its survey in 1963—in the unit at Smiths Falls we have one-half of a psychiatrist and one-third of a psychologist. It is the most shocking condemnation of governmental policy I have ever witnessed. If the hon. Minister wishes to say that these children should not be out of Ontario hospital schools, one might grant him that because there is no alternative route. But at least, Mr. Chairman, let him provide those needs in those schools. These are not retarded children; these are mentally ill children, and they have been successfully rehabilitated in experiments all over North America, but not in experiments under the regis of The Department of Health.

There are some very mystifying things about this department where emotionally disturbed children are concerned, indeed, as I said, where the whole pattern of mental illness is concerned. Our waiting lists for children's services are inconceivable. I had a mother in my own riding who phoned to make an appointment for her child at the sick children's diagnostic clinic, and was told she would have to wait a year before they could even put her on some kind of a list. The hospital survey of children's needs in Metropolitan Toronto dramatically itemize the incredible problems of overcrowding.

As I said, in all the Ontario hospitals visited, at the outpatient clinics, close to 50 per cent of the people coming to the clinics are adolescents under the age of 16. In eastern Ontario, there just are not any children's services, Mr. Chairman, with the exception of a little clinic in Ottawa. There are none. Indeed, the hon. Minister, I know, is thinking about a special adolescent and children's unit at Kingston Ontario hospital. One would feel rather more reassured if he would announce it, but there just are not any diagnostic facilities for disturbed children in the eastern part of the province.

Mr. Chairman, the situation becomes ever more severe as you analyze it. This department, Mr. Chairman, in its unreserved wisdom, sees fit to deny subsidies to some of the best treatment centres on the continent. It will not even grant places like Warrendale medical approval. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that what we have here, what bedevils a lot of this, is the incredible rivalry, the internicine warfare within the profession. You would think we were fighting over the most lavish array of services, instead of the most restricted modicums provided for the children of Ontario. I remember that the *Globe and Mail* said editorially April 27, 1965, and I quote, speaking of proven and tested methods:

All these methods work, and most of the practitioners of one method are at war with the practitioners of all others like a lot of religious denominations, each convinced that it has the only line to heaven. With their internal feuding they cannot bring the single strong pressure to bear on the government to force treatment for the children to whom they are all dedicated, and they provide innumerable excuses for the politicians to do nothing at all.

Well, they certainly provide innumerable excuses for the government politicians to do nothing at all. It is up to the government to take a stand if the feuding professionals cannot take a stand. The hon. Minister can-

not simply rise in his seat and defend Thistle town in that plaintive voice, that we are still researching, or the assertive and truculent voice, that we are researching in the absence of any treatment design. It is not enough.

Whatever the number of children, literally thousands are being damaged by the absence of programmes in this department. All the hon. Minister can do is offer a departmental committee. Let me remind him. In this session, The Department of Reform Institutions has announced an increased treatment ratio for young children at its Hagersville training school, and has discussed with the Ottawa youth bureau the concept that no children under 12 should go to training school at all—that is the concept of detached workers. So in its modest way, the reform institutions branch has moved ahead.

Under The Department of Public Welfare, we have had increased subsidies in The Children's Institutions Act, which should facilitate some treatment, and we have had some excellent changes in The Child Welfare Act. So The Department of Public Welfare has moved ahead.

Under The Department of Education, we have had announced a willingness to consider legislation for special classes. We have had an establishment of teachers' courses over the summer for developing sensitivity in teachers, developing their ability to identify emotionally disturbed children. So we have some modest gains in The Department of Education.

Even in The Department of the Attorney General, as a result of "Jamie," we have had some little progress. I am thinking about properly staffing our detention homes.

Only in this department, Mr. Chairman, and no other, has the Minister been totally and irrevocably and belligerently delinquent, because all you have and continue to have is Thistle town and Smiths Falls and words. Not even a nod in the opening speech on these estimates in the direction of emotionally disturbed children. I want to tell the hon. Minister opposite, and I say it to him vigorously but in good faith, that in this field as in no other he has abdicated responsibility as a Minister of the Crown and uneasy lies the lead.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that he is losing the confidence—if he has not already lost it—of the Opposition in its entirety, in this particular field. You cannot forever be the monarch over a mental health pattern which is confused and unco-ordinated, inadequate in the extreme and, in its final and most tragic extremity, damaging thousands of young children simply because The Department of Health will not

move. If the hon. Minister wants to pursue that topic any further, and to analyze it in greater detail, let him know that there are many of us here who would be happy to do so.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, I have read the hon. Minister's opening address in these estimates and I notice he says there is a blueprint for future action. Recently, during the winter months, the *Sudbury Star* in one of its news stories criticized the northern members for losing their aggressiveness in pressing for a hospital school for retarded children in northern Ontario. As the hon. Minister very well knows, all the retarded children now in our institutions are long distances away from their homes.

I remember that each year I have asked about a hospital school for retarded children in northern Ontario. It was said we were going to have one at North Bay. There is no mention of it in the hon. Minister's speech at all. I know there is a hospital being built in Timmins. I believe it is for mentally ill, probably a 300-bed hospital. There was some intimation by the hon. Minister during the meetings in committee that there would likely be a hospital school built in North Bay, when these other smaller hospitals are built.

I believe there is one being built now in Timmins, and another one probably in another section of northeastern Ontario, probably in Sault Ste. Marie. Why they would build any institution for the mentally ill in Sault Ste. Marie—with all respect to the hon. Minister who represents that riding (Mr. Wishart), because it is away off on a tangent—is beyond me. If it is going to be built at all, it should be in a more central area.

I would like to ask, what is the position now in regard to a hospital school for retarded children in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, what I said last year still stands. The hospital at South Porcupine is under construction and when it is opened and can take its quota of mentally ill patients from the existing hospital at North Bay, a unit for retarded children will be opened at North Bay.

In addition, we are already in discussion with interested groups in Sudbury, under the Acts of the Legislature which already have been passed, who are interested in establishing a centre for retarded children there. I think, according to their beliefs, the plan will first be on the basis of establishing a small residential unit. I might advise the hon. member for Scarborough West that the

changes in the various programmes with the exception of that one—The Department of Reform Institutions—all came out of the deliberations and the opinions and recommendations of the interdepartmental committee and they are all part of the co-ordinated programme, which will be operated under the direction of this department.

Because of the greatly increased government support to The Retarded Children's Homes Act and The Children's Institutions Act, it will be possible for local groups to establish and operate their own facilities. This is the plan at the present time in the minds of the people interested at Sudbury, and I think when this comes about, the northern part of Ontario will be very well served.

Mr. Troy: I would like to raise a couple of other points. I notice in looking at the presentation of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) to the House that he is still requesting the clinical services building in the Ontario hospital at North Bay. I believe that ever since I have come here this has been requested. Is it still intended to put up that clinical services building?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, it is still going under this name. Have you something else to ask?

Mr. Troy: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Is that the end of your question?

Mr. Troy: No. About that thing, it still goes on the books—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will explain it to you in a moment.

Mr. Troy: Thank you.

Finally, if the hon. Minister will recall, I wrote him some time ago, at the request of a federal member, about a young man who is 35 years old. He is a mental defective, I believe, at Aurora. The mother lives at Sturgeon Falls, which is 25 miles or so from the Ontario hospital in North Bay, and she asks if the young man can be moved to North Bay. I understand that in other hospitals mental defectives are permitted to be admitted. It seems to me that, in all humanity, you could move this man. I believe that he has been at Aurora for 18 years; he is now 35 years old and I think it would be an act of humanity toward the mother if she could have an opportunity to see him once in a while. As you say, there must be

some communication between the parents and the children, regardless of the age.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. member brought this up in the House. He wrote me about it and I wrote him in return and I gave him, not my reasons, but the reasons of the doctors who are in charge of the young man, as to why he could not be transferred to North Bay. There is no inhumanity to the mother; I think the doctors based their decision on what was best for the patient. I will have to look it up because I only have a very sketchy recollection of it, but I did outline it to the hon. member in my reply to his letter.

As to the matter of the clinical services building being carried on The Department of Public Works record, it is still carried under that name. But it will not be a clinical services building per se, it will be a smaller clinical services building; but the rest of the facility will be school facilities for the retarded children.

When the clinical services building was first conceived, it was to complete the hospital. Then it was decided that the hospital would change its character, and the hon. member understands now that this has Treasury board approval and is in the planning stage.

Mr. Troy: I must confess that I did not mean to embarrass the hon. Minister with the question about this young man—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You did not embarrass me, but I cannot understand—

Mr. Troy: —but I understood from others that some mental defectives were in other mental hospitals. It did seem to me that it would be okay to move this lad; that is the only reason I mention it now.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I have waited some time to get to this vote and I am hoping that I do not, in any way, make this a personal issue. I have a couple of items I want to take up with the hon. Minister and I would like to preface my remarks with a question. I understood quite some time ago that Cedar Springs was not completely filled with patients because you lack administration, or nurses, to take care of the patients. If the hon. Minister would answer that, Mr. Chairman, I could go on.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right. When the hospital was built no administration building was provided, but we still believe that, even as it is now being used, it is big

enough and certainly bigger than we would build now.

Mr. Bukator: The decision of the department, then, is that the unit is much too cumbersome to handle?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I would not say that.

Mr. Bukator: In any event, I shall go on with one of the items previously referred to. There is a lady in my riding from whom I received a letter dated April 16, 1965, and I shall read extracts from it. She wrote:

I have a daughter soon to be 16 years of age, who is totally handicapped physically. She must be dressed, fed and carried about. She is unable to walk, talk or sit up. She is a darling child and I love her dearly.

Brooke has been on the waiting list at Cedar Springs since July, 1963.

When I received this letter, I took it upon myself to send it on to the hon. Minister of Health, who was good enough to reply to me. Perhaps I should read a portion of the hon. Minister's letter to keep things in sequence. He said:

I am advised by my mental health officials that this girl's name is on the waiting list for admission to the Ontario hospital at Cedar Springs. However, we have been in touch with the Welland county health unit and the public health nurse there will keep in touch with this family and is trying to arrange for a home help or VON nurse to see the mother over the period of hospitalization. You can be assured we will endeavour to assist the family in every way possible in the care of this girl.

The mother has had to contend with this unfortunate child for 16 years, unaided. She cannot go out to work, because she must take care of her. She says in her letter:

I cannot find anyone that can lift

Brooke or will assume the responsibility of feeding her.

The mother is in the position where she can do absolutely nothing but look after her daughter. I replied to this lady's letter and forwarded a copy to the hon. Minister.

The only solution to this particular problem, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that this youngster should be admitted immediately. The mother has carried this burden for many years and has been put in the position where she can do absolutely nothing to help herself. So much for that.

I would like to go on with another item, and I do want to get these things into the record because, for many years, I have felt that the mental institutions of our province are not only overcrowded, but do not have enough staff to take proper care of the patients. This only confirms what I have to say on the next item.

This is a letter written to me by another lady from Niagara Falls, and I think I should read the whole letter to you:

I am enclosing a copy of the letter that my husband and I have sent to the Minister of Health, Dr. Dymond.

Naturally we are concerned about the welfare of our daughter, but we are also concerned about the overcrowding of our hospital schools which, we feel, is the direct cause of incidents such as we are experiencing now. Certainly smaller residential centres in each community, which would permit more frequent visits of parents and child, with local volunteers participating in the hospital programme, is, I feel, the final answer to this problem.

We would greatly appreciate any assistance you can give us to find a solution to this present situation.

In reading the letter alone—I have never talked to these people—I find, as I analyze it, that the parents are exceptionally fair people. They have made a suggestion that the government look at the possibility of smaller residential units. I think the government has been thinking in that direction, from what I have gathered from the committee meetings I have attended.

But let me show you what these poor people have to contend with in Gravenhurst—their daughter is in Orillia. Let me read from a letter they sent to the hon. Minister of Health:

We are writing to you in regard to our daughter, who is a patient at the Muskoka unit of the Orillia hospital school at Gravenhurst.

Susan, who is 17 years old, has been a patient at the Orillia hospital since January 1960, and is a severely retarded child.

During the past year we have been concerned about the type of medical care she is receiving at Gravenhurst.

Early in July 1963, when we visited Susan, her right wrist was swollen and she was having difficulty moving her arm. We reported this to the floor nurse and to the acting supervisor, asking that they have the staff doctor examine it.

We visited again on August 10 or 11, to

find her wrist very swollen. On checking with the supervisor we found that it had never been reported to the doctor. Again we requested medical treatment.

We telephoned the hospital on Tuesday, August 13, and were advised that her wrist was broken, and that the doctor planned to set it the next Friday.

We telephoned again on Saturday, August 17, to be advised that the doctor had decided not to set her arm and that a letter was on its way explaining the reasons—a copy of this letter is attached.

To date Susan has very little function in her wrist or hand and to us it is quite deformed. We do not believe that she has had any follow-up treatment on this injury.

On April 5, 1964, when we visited Susan, she was having difficulty walking. We reported this to the floor nurse and were advised that she had not been walking for from four to six weeks. On inquiring as to whether the doctor had checked her, the answer was negative.

We wrote to Dr. Houze on April 6, and requested medical attention—Attached is a copy of the letter we received in reply.

We feel that slow degeneration of the muscles of her legs, which is probably due to lack of use, further points up the lack of care and attention Susan is receiving at Gravelhurst.

While we feel that an incident of neglected treatment could be due to the incompetence of one attendant, we also feel that continued lack of care could be due to the overwork of a too limited staff.

We would specifically like to bring to your attention that it was only at our insistence in both incidents that Susan received medical attention.

We are charter members of our local association for retarded children and also of the Ontario association for retarded children. During the past ten years we have become very interested in the welfare of the retarded, both at home and in our hospital schools.

We do not feel that we can sit back at this time and allow our daughter to become a bed patient without making every possible effort to prevent it.

We would request that Susan be transferred to the children's psychiatric clinic at London for assessment, and then to the hospital school that would provide the best possible care for a child of her type.

Now, this could be a crank letter from a parent if it was not accompanied by two letters from the Ontario hospital school.

Your daughter Susan was examined today and there is no clinical—

and this was written to the lady who received the letter, naturally, and who had the daughter in the institution:

—evidence of any abnormal disability. She spends the bulk of her time sitting quietly and although she is still able to walk and her balance seems normal, there appears to be some slow degeneration of the muscles of her legs, which is probably due to lack of use.

Assessing the physical capabilities of these patients is very difficult, but I find no gross evidence of any inability to walk, or evidence of any injury. If there is any further change it will be investigated.

And this is signed by the doctor.

But the letter I was very much impressed with, after the mother had said that the daughter's wrist was swollen. As the days went on she finally got a reply to that letter. It said:

An x-ray taken on Tuesday last has revealed a fracture of Susan's wrist, which would appear to be of several weeks' duration, and is now largely healed.

Left as is, she will have a slight bump on her wrist but otherwise should have normal function. I do not think we are justified in breaking down the healing process to adjust for the amount of residual deformity that will be present.

She apparently is suffering no discomfort from this, and the end result will be good.

Can you imagine a person who has all his faculties about him, Mr. Chairman, having an arm set without any assistance whatever? Then consider a retarded youngster with the same condition who knows absolutely nothing about taking care of herself, having to contend with this pain, even after it was brought to the attention of the authorities. I attribute this to one thing and one thing alone, and that is the overcrowding of the hon. Minister's institutions and the lack of staff which the hon. Minister admits, I believe—that is, a lack of the proper type of staff.

If this condition exists in one case where the young lady has had this particular problem to contend with and the parents have had the anxiety to contend with, I am wondering if there are other instances similar to that one. Is there a possibility that the

day will come, Mr. Chairman, when the government will decide on community residential hospitals for the patients who can be taken care of, perhaps, better by the local people and their parents than they could in large institutions such as Cedar Springs where they are just another number and do not get adequate care. Apparently, from what I gather here, one youngster has waited two years to get into an institution and has not made it yet. Another has been admitted and has been getting the type of care that these people are concerned about.

I find no malice in my heart towards the hon. Minister or his department, but I think this is a problem which should be looked into and immediately remedied. I think it is possible through smaller units in the municipalities. I mentioned this in committee and I mention it here again.

The Hydro project in our area in the peninsula left a hospital abandoned—I do not know whether it was a 40- or 50-bed hospital—which seemed to do the job. It is not old, and it could take up some of the slack. I made reference to a dormitory with 130 rooms, which could also take care of some of the problems with which we have to contend.

I would like to say to the hon. Minister that they tell me, Mr. Chairman, that there are times when the parents go to see these mentally disturbed youngsters and that they really set the children back rather than help them. If that is the case, too, I would like an answer to that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to appear to defend what happened in respect to this child. I cannot remember the details of this after the hon. member drew it to my attention, but I do recall asking for a complete investigation.

I can say to you, Mr. Chairman, and I can say this very frankly and without equivocation, that overcrowding did not cause this. Overcrowding is not the cause of neglect of treatment, if there is neglect. The central office does not lay down any professional policy. The doctors in charge of the cases are completely free to treat cases as they will. They had the right to pick up the phone and ask to have this child admitted, for instance, to the general hospital at Orillia if they were short of staff and could not give the child the attention that she ought to have had.

If this child fell at a time when she was not noticed and if the accident was not reported, it was not because of overcrowding. I can only come to the conclusion that there must have been some oversight or some neglect in treatment. That child should have

gone to the general hospital and had her wrist examined.

We certainly have a neurologist visiting the Orillia hospital periodically; I think it is once a week, but at least he is on call—a highly skilled specialist in neurology who ought to have been asked to examine the child if her leg muscles were wasting. I am not defending anything of that kind, sir, and I will not defend sloppy medical practice by anyone.

The matter of the small residential units: We have made provision for that now by legislation that is almost completely passed by this House. This is the kind of thing that we are encouraging, this is the kind of thing that has been talked about among the parents' groups and the associations and ourselves for quite a long time. As I have just stated a few moments ago, this is one of the decisions arising out of a recommendation made to us by our own interdepartmental committee. But we do not expect nor do we agree that these should be small community hospital schools. We believe they should be residential, and I do not think we should encourage the establishment of a great many hospital schools. After all, with the increased number of community schools for the retarded, the existing residences will fill about the last remaining gap. Those who still have to go to an institution will probably be so severely retarded and so sorely handicapped physically as well, that little more than care and nursing will be needed for them. But the popularity of small residences should be very great indeed and the grants now being provided, both for capital construction and for the acquisition of existing buildings and their renovation, and then for the maintenance of those buildings, should stimulate that expansion very greatly.

Mr. Bukator: I was pleased to hear—and I knew the hon. Minister felt this way—that he would not tolerate sloppily operated institutions, and that this youngster should have been sent to the hospital. The fact remains that attention was drawn to the proper authority immediately the parents noticed this, and nothing was done. This thing had to heal on its own and finally the doctor said that it was healing and that there was no sense in breaking it.

The point that I tried to make was that I had asked another question of the hon. Minister. I am sure that he just cannot grasp all of the questions that have been fired at him over the last week or so; he has been quite a target for us. But I asked if the parents, on occasion, when they visit the children in these institutions, set them back in their

progress so far as education is concerned. I understood someone here to say that this happens on occasion.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It does, Mr. Chairman, but I do not really believe that it is a serious matter. Sometimes we have difficulty with parents who find, on visiting the children, that the child rejects the parent. The child has built up a child-parent relationship with the staff at the hospital, and often we have as much difficulty with the parents—because they feel rejected—as we have with children who, after a trip home, or after a long visit from their parents, have difficulty readjusting to the hospital. But I do not really think these are serious matters. They are only transitory.

Mr. Bukator: Another point I would like to make here. It was brought up in the House a few weeks ago by one of the government members, who said something about it—I could look it up in *Hansard*, but I do not think it that important, except that the meat of the question was that we, as politicians, have a tendency to call the hon. Minister to have someone admitted because we are pulling strings, so to speak. I must admit that I am guilty of that offence, if it is an offence, but I have done it only through this process: I have first contacted the parents, and have found that the two medical men, who have to have the youngster admitted, have written the necessary letters or have filled out the necessary forms; then we find that the youngster does not get admitted, because the doctors felt that that patient, a youngster, should go to an institution. We find that nothing has happened, so they come to us and we contact the only authority of which we know—and I was told here last week again, by some hon. member of the government, that this is our duty to our constituents. On some other occasion, in talking about some other department, it was said that if we had this ombudsman they speak of, then we would have no chores to do for our constituents. That would be putting us on very solid ground, with big pay, and doing nothing for our people.

So I understood, from what was said to us at that time, that we have a job to do. I have never asked any department head to do anything contrary to the rules and regulations but I say this, to you Mr. Chairman, and to the assembly: I have asked the hon. Minister on occasion. I think that young lady has been waiting for two years, for the proper authority, for the doctor filling the forms, and for the man from the Health department or the Public Welfare department, Mr. Stock, to say that this lady has no means to main-

tain them. She claims in her letters that she can hardly feed them, or keep her home together, because of the limit of her income.

Now then, I say to you publicly: Please take this young lady in. That is the answer to that particular problem.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that is the answer to the particular problem. I did not examine this child, but the doctors who knew where she should stand, or what her real need for institutionalization was. What the parent needs, in the meantime, is support. Has this community got any arrangement, through The Department of Public Welfare, for homemakers services or home nursing services? The government supports these services if the municipality is involved, they are available to anyone who needs them, and this may very well, Mr. Chairman, be the support the parent needs.

It would seem to me that if she had been an urgent, or an emergent admission, her record would have been noted as such by the doctors who examined her in the first instance, by our staff who examined her. I know that the family doctor, or the doctor who sees the patient outside, believes they should be admitted immediately. They believe that, oftentimes, a simple mongoloid should be admitted the day it is born. We know these things and this is why we are putting all these cases through an assessment and diagnostic clinic. But there is support available for the parent if the community is involved in the homemaker and home nursing services, supported through The Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. Bukator: We have come, now, Mr. Chairman, to the parting of the ways. The hon. Minister stood up and said he did not know really whether this youngster was to be admitted to an institution. Her doctor would know better.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I did not say, "her doctor," but that "our doctor" who examined the child should know the degree of priority that should be attached to this case.

Mr. Bukator: I hope you can get your doctor on the job. I hate to bore the House with the contents of the letter here, but I would like you all to read it. It is more than urgent as I see it, Mr. Chairman and it is about time. If they have a doctor who does this sort of thing, I will send that letter back to the hon. Minister and I would expect results immediately.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, the salaries paid to the staff of the Ontario mental retarded children's hospital at Cedar Springs. We do appreciate, Mr. Minister, that so many of our citizens in southwestern Ontario get a position on the staff at this mental retarded hospital. But I have been approached, time and again, Mr. Minister, and told that the salaries are not sufficient for them. They are low.

I would like to know if the salaries in every mental institution, or Ontario mental retarded children's institution, in the province are on the same schedule. I know these men and women are sincere when they tell me this. I would like to see you, Mr. Minister, bring those salaries in line with the other segments of our economy, so that these men and women can earn a decent livelihood. Is it true that the salaries are very low? There seems to be quite a bitterness among those who have been on the staff, Mr. Minister, and I would like to see you bring them in line with other segments of our economy.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the salaries paid to the hospital staffs, as in all public salaries, are the same all across the province. I have to repeat, sir, that The Department of Health, in keeping with all other departments, does not set salaries. The Department of Civil Service does that. They have all the machinery for investigating, studying, researching and so on. We, in the department, have made our submissions to them, given them our opinions, reclassifications, specifications, and salary levels, and we have to abide by their decision.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister asked for a higher rate of pay for his staff? I take it, if you have asked for more, that it has been obviously turned down; but what do you ask for?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We do not ask for anything, Mr. Chairman. We put our views before the civil service commission researchers and we do not ask for anything.

Mr. Trotter: Well, what are your views on the subject?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this matter a little further.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this matter of salaries was all dealt with when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) was dealing with the estimates of The Department of Civil Service. It is quite outside my juris-

diction as a departmental Minister, and I am afraid I cannot give any satisfactory answers to the matter because I am not knowledgeable about it—again, I repeat, because it is not within the scope of my responsibility.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is entirely true to say that this matter was fully canvassed under the estimates of The Department of the Civil Service. At that time, we were concerned primarily with salary policy and personnel policies generally, with regard to the whole of the public service. We now come to a specific section of the public service—specifically the numerous hospitals covered by vote 713. There has been considerable discussion until now of broad policies in the treatment of mental illness, the availability of professional and sub-professional staff, and that sort of matter.

Equally important, I would suggest to the House, is the question of the adequacy of the salaries paid to the non-professional staff. They perform a less skilled service, but a service which we can all recognize is equally essential. If they are not paid adequate salaries, then obviously the whole programme for the treatment of mental illness in our hospitals is going to suffer.

I want to put a question directly to the hon. Minister, a question of fact. I am not going to ask him about what submissions he has made internally to the civil service commission, but I would like to find out certain facts about this particular area of his administration. I would like to ask, first of all—taking all of the hospitals covered by vote 713 as a group—what percentage of the employees in that group of hospitals receive less than \$3,000 per year. Second, what percentage receive less than \$3,600 per year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the hon. member's question; I would have to get that information. I did not come with any material vis-à-vis salaries because, as I stated, I have nothing to do with this. I will get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: Certainly I would like to have the information, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the hon. Minister will be able to get it for us while these estimates are still before this House. We were amazed to discover, with respect to the civil service generally, that 17 per cent receive less than \$3,000 a year, and 35 per cent less than \$3,600 per year. What I am concerned about is that these large percentages may be even larger in respect to the mental hospitals. As far as I can determine, people who are classified as attendants

in those hospitals are at an extremely low rate of wages, at a rate where one can hardly expect them to give their best efforts in their work because they are bound to be pre-occupied with personal, financial worries.

For example, some time ago, a number of us witnessed a group of attendants, from the Oak Ridge hospital at Penetanguishene, demonstrating in front of this building with regard to their salaries. We were told at the time, when we inquired about it, that they had been given an increase in pay effective at the end of last year, and that a further reclassification, or shall we say a premium, was being paid to these people because they were considered to be in a somewhat different position to attendants in other hospitals.

I have since discovered, if information given to me is correct, that the increase they got in the reclassification effective November 1, 1964, amounted to \$20 a year. They had been on a rate—I am now talking of starting rate—they had been on a starting rate of \$3,000 per year, but a bonus of \$100 a year was being paid to them, making a total of \$3,100. They were then given an adjustment, bringing their starting rate up to \$3,120, but the bonus was dropped, so the net increase was \$20. Now, this is just playing with men.

Mr. Chairman: I wish to inform the member that the salary scale schedule should be discussed under the civil service commission. Any discussion, I would suggest, should be on a general plane, and dealt with in that way. You are dealing with the percentages and therefore I would say it is out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that the question of salaries, an item in this vote of \$250,000, affects the efficient operation of the hospitals referred to in the vote. I recognize your point, that the technical determination of these salaries comes under the civil service commission, but I think it is in order to comment on the salaries being paid as part of the total problem of efficient operation.

I just wanted to make one further comment with regard to the Oak Ridge attendants, whom I was taking as an example only. They are a group. I understand, who are paid a somewhat higher wage than attendants generally, but the wage is obviously ridiculously low. A point that really concerns me is that we were advised earlier in this session that these people, whose basic starting rate was set at \$3,120 on November 1, 1964, are now supposed to be getting an additional premium of \$300 per year. I am told by the people concerned that they are not getting it, or, as of two or three weeks ago, they

were not getting it. Now, can I get to the bottom of this? Are they getting it or are they not? What is the score on the matter?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I regret that I cannot give the hon. member the answer, but I will undertake to get it. I understood that they were getting it, but I will certainly find out and let the hon. member know.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, the Minister, a moment ago, stated that he did not know what his staffs should be paid. I would say, with the greatest respect—because I do have a lot of respect for the Minister, and the job he is doing, and the immensity of his job; it is the most important job we have in our whole House—I say, with respect, that no other business in the world could operate this way. If the head of a business concern saw that his operation was not ticking properly, he would have to change his salary schedule to employ the people to do the job. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that it is not working properly for many reasons.

My hon. colleague, the hon. member for Parkdale, threw some very pointed questions to you. What are you doing about recruiting, about working conditions, about salaries of these key people? In my own contact with people in the mental field, I know, Mr. Minister, that we have, in the New Toronto hospital, graduate nurses with a degree in psychiatry, who take home less than \$60 a week. This is a shocking situation, that you, as head of this department, can say that you do not know what they should be paid. I would suggest to you that your job would be made a lot easier if you were aware of these very pointed facts. This has been flogged across the House for many hours now, but I think that, in essence, this is the key factor in this whole business, paying them wages competitive to other layers of our society.

I would ask the Minister before I sit down, what is he doing about the answer to my colleague from Parkdale, what is he doing about recruiting, about paying these people? Are you going to take the decision of the civil service for all these things? I say again, no other business in the world could operate this way. Why do we let health and mental health operate this way? I would like an answer, please.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, by and large, we do not have a great deal of trouble recruiting. We advertise in the newspapers like anybody else. But, again I have to say that salary scales are the responsibility of

The Department of Civil Service. The hon. members opposite know this perfectly well, sir. It was all cleared during the estimates of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who is responsible for that department. I cannot check salaries in flagrant disagreement with The Department of Civil Service because this is their responsibility. As far as the registered nurse who has a degree in psychiatry is concerned, I find it very difficult to understand what the hon. member means. The only person who can have a degree in psychiatry, to my knowledge, is a physician.

However, if a nurse studied medicine and then took her degree in psychiatry, this is quite possible, but I am quite certain that she is taking home a lot more than \$50 a week. The starting salary for a registered nurse is \$4,000 a year. What she takes home, I don't know, but I have looked into quite a number of these complaints about take-home pay, and I have found in many instances that there was a large debt being paid off, or something of that kind, or deductions were being made at the source on the request of the employee. We cannot help that any more than the hon. member can. If one of your employees asks you to deduct certain things, he cannot hold you responsible for his net take-home pay. I say to you unequivocally, sir, that there is no graduate nurse in our hospitals that is earning a wage of \$50 a week.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I will give you the names. I said under \$60 a week, and I will give you their names, but I get back to the point that I do not think it is right and proper that civil servants should tie your hands in what you should pay your people to get the right personnel to do the job. I think that you should explain to this House why you let the civil service run your department in that way.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, just following up on the hon. member for Grey North, I would like to put a proposition to the hon. Minister.

As he says, the responsibility for determining pay and other working conditions in all classes of employment in the public service rests with The Department of the Civil Service and the civil service commission. The difficulty, however, arises—and it is a difficulty of which I would think the hon. Minister of Health would be acutely aware—in the fact that the normal procedure of the civil service commission is to give great weight to comparative wage rates in the community for similar classes of employment,

in arriving at what it considers to be fair and reasonable wages in the public service.

When we come to the custodial, attendant, and other similar type of employee in mental hospitals, we face a sort of vicious circle. Anywhere in the community, that type of employee, in my opinion, is grossly underpaid. If one makes a comparison between hospitals operated by the government and other hospitals, it may be that the comparison is not unfavourable as far as the government is concerned. The point is that the whole class of employment is underpaid. How are we ever going to get out of the vicious circle that this entire group of employees is underpaid throughout the community? They are a group of employees that perform a vital service. It seems to me that it is in our interests as citizens who may, at some stage or other in our lives find ourselves in hospitals of one class or another, or may find our friends there, that the people who will attend the patients in hospitals in a non-professional status are sufficiently well paid that they can regard themselves as free and honourable citizens, not overwhelmed with debt. This is not the case.

I do not for the life of me see how we can expect a person with a family to support to live in any sort of decency and in any sort of freedom from worry when he is paid \$3,120 a year, or \$3,500 a year, or something like that. I think the hon. Minister has to take up the cudgels with the civil service commission on behalf of these people and try to get it across to the commission that, in this case at any rate, the approach of comparative wage rates is totally useless. The wage rates for the entire category throughout the community has to be lifted.

This is in the interests of the hon. Minister of Health and the administration of his hospitals. It is in the interests of the people of Ontario who pay for the upkeep of these hospitals and who use their services when they are required. Let the government be a leader for a change. Let it set the pace with regard to this class of employment, one of the most important types of employment in the province.

It is tragic to think that people who attend to patients in mental hospitals in this province receive substantially less than common labourers in any of the major plants in the major employment centres in the province. I do not think that the common labourers in any of the plants are paid too much. In fact, I think the wages they get are probably just about enough to give them a decent living, but I certainly think that the wages

we are paying to attendants, custodial staff, and so on, in our hospitals is a public disgrace. Really, the government ought to take the bull by the horns.

This is the time to do it. Their wage review is under consideration right now. This is their turn in the cyclical review policy. Let us get it straightened out. I do not think the government can think in terms of an increase of \$100 or \$200 a year. They have got to think in terms of an increase of \$1,000 a year for these people. That is the only way they can possibly be brought up to what any of us could consider as even approaching an adequate level.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to re-emphasize, from our side, our party's view on this.

I have listened to the replies of the hon. Minister. It has been a long and a detailed debate. I felt at times that he perhaps tried to slur over some criticisms which were made.

We talked about the morale of staff. The hon. Minister suggested that we were at fault in this; if there was low morale it was because of the Opposition and the criticisms they made about conditions. I would like to get it completely clear in his mind: I met with the delegation of people who came here from Ontario hospitals and I talked to them. They told me about the working conditions and emphasized very clearly that one of the reasons for the sense of frustration and futility and low morale was the fact of their salaries. They asked: Would you stand up for us and raise in the House the fact that the utterly inadequate salaries give an indication that the government does not place importance on the matter of dealing with human beings who have got mental disabilities?

I would suggest, sir, that in our society the measure of the importance that we place on people, on the whole, is through their salary bracket. It would seem to me that it is an indication of the worst kind of misgovernment that compared to these human beings who have these difficulties, talking of mental illness, I suggest you probably pay the men who clean and look after the cars that you drive around in more than the human beings who look after those who, because of mental afflictions, are confined in mental institutions.

I realize that the hon. Minister is saying this is the civil service commission. I think it is a Cabinet decision. I suspect, frankly, that the hon. Minister himself has probably fought hard. It has been a solitary fight and I suspect that people have said we want to give more

importance to some of the material things we are doing.

We have got to give more emphasis in this area and I think the reallocation of money is the form it should take. Frankly, this government stands condemned because of the inadequacy of staff, and one of the real reasons for not getting staff is because of the inadequacy of salaries.

Let me go further than that. I am not just thinking of the custodial staff or the attendants. I suggest that the lack of trained personnel is again because of a lack of foresight on the part of the government. I am not going to go through a lot of statistics on this. I think the debate from the Opposition has been thoroughly documented, but we could look at such yardsticks as the number of doctors that graduate in this province, 303 doctors in 1962-63, and so on.

The hon. Minister says it is a costly expense to have doctors graduate and you cannot do it overnight. That is the very point we have been making steadily to you, but instead you now face another crisis and you are announcing that because of the Hall commission and the sudden realization that you have not got enough people you are now opening up new medical schools. It is an indictment of the government not to have foreseen the need for more doctors; and if you do not have doctors, you do not get psychiatrists, because as I understand it, the first platform of medical education, before moving into psychiatry, is to have a medical degree.

You have not had the facilities to train doctors and you have been turning hundreds of young people, who wanted to move into this area, away because you have not provided the facilities. We are going to wait for about another seven years in this area.

I am talking of staff, Mr. Chairman, connected with these mental institutions. Dentists—I almost dread to ask the question—what kind of dental care is given to patients within these mental institutions? Because, if it is anything like the other areas, and knowing the lack of dentists that we have in this province, I suggest there is an area of great neglect in the mental institutions. We just do not have the dentists.

I raise that to the hon. Minister, if he would be good enough to make notes on the points I am making. How many routine checks are made of the teeth of patients within mental institutions? I suggest, sir, that in this whole area of staff the government has been lacking and has neither shown foresight in developing the institutions for training people

in medicine and dentistry and psychiatry and nursing, nor encouraged them by offering adequate salaries.

It would seem to me that this could probably be the most exciting challenge for this wealthy government—the mental institutions. I would think, when we hear of a peace corps attracting young people to move into a drama and a challenge to it, that this could have been the area that we were going to clean out—our mental institutions.

My colleague, the hon. member for Parkdale, has outlined a series of points which he felt the hon. Minister should be emphasizing. I would like to stress again that to me when one day this hon. Minister stands up and tells us that he has torn down institutions which have more than 400 beds and has smaller accommodation, segregated accommodation, and so on, for various types of patients, then I think he will deserve a medal. I think this will be a high occasion in the life of this province, because it will be showing a new approach in this.

I would like to feel, sir, that in this whole community approach—and I know some of the work that the government has been doing in the outpatient clinics and hospitals and the other areas, but it has been slow; I do not know why it has been slow. The hon. Minister has suggested to us in reply to the hon. member for Scarborough West, that when you get older you have more wisdom and you have a broader view on this. I can remember when I first stood in this House and was challenging the hon. Minister in several areas, in which he had made the same approach. I imagine that when he was defending his position on fluoridation he made the same kind of approach. I say that this does not become the hon. Minister.

The hon. member for Scarborough West came through with facts, figures and statistics. And similarly with the hon. member for Parkdale. They both showed knowledge and idealism. If there is one thing that this department needs in the mental health area it is a new vigour, a new imagination, some daring, some idealism. For the hon. Minister to have deplored this and say that he is getting older and finds therefore that some of these things really do not work—I would hope that he would get back again and rejuvenate himself with some kind of vitamin pills or something—

An hon. member: Take Geritol.

Mr. Thompson: Geritol, yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Scotch whisky.

Mr. Thompson: If Scotch whisky is the approach that the hon. Minister needs to give him that new vitality and vigour and dynamism, I will give him a case of it.

All I am saying is this: This, sir, is what is lacking as far as I am concerned. The hon. Minister has stood up before us again in an indefensible position, defending an indefensible cause. They have talked of Fort Logan, they have talked of a variety of ways of taking the locks away from the doors. I think that, as you go around to these mental institutions, the questions that you should be asking is, how many locks were taken off the doors in the past year, and you should give a medallion to the institutions where these locks have been taken off. A whole variety of approaches has been suggested to the hon. Minister, and it disappoints me, sir, that this Minister of Health, instead of seizing on these suggestions and rallying to his cause—a cause of being a crusader to open new frontiers and opportunities for people who have the affliction of mental health—instead of that, he is standing back with his feet dug in, standing behind a ditch of reaction and suggesting to us, “Look, these things really do not work” or “wait until you get more seasoned.”

This, sir, is really why I deplore the hon. Minister's whole approach towards this. There have been tremendous challenges and we realize them and realize the complexities of such problems as emotionally disturbed children and realize the problems of the retarded children; we realize that the institutions are crowded but what we are doing is trying to suggest approaches in order that Ontario can be known as a province of humanity, a province that does not still lock people up as though they were family skeletons and must be hidden away in the closet. Let us get a breath of fresh air into this whole approach. I think that dynamic ideas have been presented to the hon. Minister; and they have been documented as having been shown to work in other municipalities and I ask the hon. Minister—knowing that underneath the position of Minister of Health in a reactionary government, he still has a small spark now and again of a crusader—I ask him, in view of this discussion, to get that spark lit into a flame and tackle this as a first priority as it should be in this province of affluence.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, there are one or two questions I would like to put to the hon. Minister.

The hon. Minister will remember that a few weeks ago the employees from the

Ontario hospitals made a protest demonstration in front of the Parliament buildings. I spoke to several of them. One of them complained about the inadequate wages he was receiving; I asked him what kind of a job he had, his occupation, and he told me he was a ward attendant No. 2. I asked him what this entailed and he said that he was on shifts and was in charge of his ward, ward attendant on his shift, in charge of the administration of medication. I asked him if this included drugs and he said, yes. I would ask the hon. Minister if this is correct. I knew this particular individual; he has not been in the employ of the government very long. Prior to his employment with the Ontario hospital he was a service station operator and a factory worker.

I would also ask the hon. Minister, following the demonstration—and, of course, the criticism of the Opposition in regard to the salaries paid to the hospital workers, when we dealt with the estimates of the civil service commission—if there has been any discussion between the hon. Minister's department and the civil service commission or the government in regard to this problem that was raised so strongly by the employees.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is quite aware that the hon. Provincial Treasurer, who heads the civil service commission, met the group and I met them with him. Further discussions were not necessary. The question the hon. member poses concerning the attendant administering drugs. Yes, I can understand an attendant administering drugs, simply carrying a pill or capsule or what-have-you to the patient, in the same manner as you would carry it to your child and see that your child takes it. This is administering drugs, but this is not the matter of prescribing or concocting or dispensing the drugs, this is simply handing it to the patient when it is handed to the attendant to do this. Now, sir, this is not to be confused in any way with dispensing drugs.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think it quite a responsibility for one making something like \$60 a week. I forgot to add that his responsibilities also entailed compiling a report for the doctor in charge and I would suggest that this kind of responsibility to an inexperienced and unqualified person, is beyond what one would expect. One, the administration of medication for—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I might make it plain that an attendant is not an unqualified person. An attendant two has

passed his examinations, a fully qualified attendant.

Mr. Gisborn: I wish the hon. Minister would elaborate on his qualifications, as the reason I raised this question is because I know this particular chap has not had any more than a high school education, if he has had that. As I say, I knew he was a service station attendant and a factory worker prior to going into the employ of the Ontario hospital. What kind of qualification would he need to be in charge of the administration of medication and drugs, and compiling a report for the doctor in an institution of that kind?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying to make a great deal out of whole cloth. The preliminary education required for an attendant is grade 10. Anyone with grade 10 is qualified to undertake training as a ward attendant; he undergoes a course of in-service training and writes two examinations and on successfully passing those, he qualifies for confirmation as first, an attendant grade one, and then attendant grade two.

Again, I want to emphasize that this matter of administering drugs is simply taking a pill or a medication that is given to him by somebody qualified to do so and handing it to the patient, or seeing that the patient takes it, in exactly the same way as a parent or a member of the family would give a dose of medicine to another member of the family. Let us not make a great deal out of this administration of medicine, because you leave the impression in the minds of those who do not understand, that we are calling upon those attendants to dispense medications. This is an entirely different matter.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this debate has not been entirely subdued at all times, and perhaps it will end on that note. I wish to ask the hon. Minister a series of questions about this branch, not all of them related, but some of which, I think, deserve a reply.

First, Mr. Chairman, it is generally considered that the rationale for developing psychiatric wings in general hospitals is to allow to emerge in the public mind, and in the practice of medicine, an equation of physical illness and mental illness—the one is not to be given priority over the other. If that is true, then surely the corollary is also true where the mental hospitals are concerned.

Why would it not be possible, or is it not advisable, to build general hospital wing units of 100 or 150 beds, in the Ontario hospital structure, so that the community again would

be treated for physical illness as well as mental illness, within the same structure. Unhappy comparisons would not then be made. I gather that, at London Ontario hospital, the superintendent was very much in favour of this procedure. It was supported, as I said before, by the London academy of medicine, by the editorial board of the local newspaper, by the mental health branch; but, for a variety of reasons connected with a teaching hospital at the university, the general hospital wing was not included in the new plans for the Ontario hospital. I think that is rather unfortunate. I think that some kind of regional planning could have been instituted where the university hospital would not have dominated all the available bed space.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, to make it even more specific, I gather that plans are underway for a revamping of Toronto Ontario hospital. Is it the intention of this government to enact what the superintendent wishes, namely, a general hospital wing facility as a part of that? And what is the hon. Minister's general feeling about the overall position of general wings within Ontario hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We agree with the thinking in this, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, at Whitby, Ontario, the community is building a general hospital on land being made available to them as part of the Ontario hospital complex; some will have to begin with a 100-bed general hospital, in association with the psychiatric hospital.

On 999 Queen West, this is one of the reasons why there has been some delay in our planning; we were trying to iron this out. We accepted the belief that it would be a good idea to include a general hospital with this; but because of the fact that there are so many general hospital beds in this area of the city of Toronto, we cannot get approval. I do believe that we should force the issue, because I suppose hon. members may well think: "Well, the government is doing this; they can put the hospital where they please." It would be rather foolish for the government to go in complete opposition to what they themselves believe; that general hospitals should be planned. We are quite prepared to accept the authority of the Ontario hospital services commission in this regard; that there are already too many general hospital beds collected together in too small a space.

We are looking at the possibility of placing a general hospital in connection with our New Toronto hospital, a place where we believe it can be accepted. We have not yet

posed this to the Ontario hospital services commission, whose approval, of course, we must have. It is quite true that a general hospital was advocated for association with the London psychiatric hospital at London, and it is quite true also that this plan was left in abeyance so that the university hospital would be given priority over it.

In keeping with modern concepts, the health sciences centre, a hospital physically in contact with the university health sciences schools, in an essential part of the complex. This does not mean to say that the matter is abandoned. We believe that, when the time comes that further hospital beds are essential in London, the proper and acceptable place for it will be in association with the psychiatric hospital that is now under reconstruction.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering: Is there any expectation that the old part of 999 Queen Street, which is the main part, will be torn down; surely, as a building built in 1846 it has obviously outworn any proper use?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Chairman, is "Yes." It is to be torn down and the planning is going forward.

Mr. Trotter: When?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is a budgetary item in the 1966 estimates which will be in the next fiscal year estimates for this.

Mr. Trotter: But sometimes these items—pardon me for being rather suspicious—just allow for the plans, and then the plans go on for a number of years. Can we have any idea from the hon. Minister when this building will actually be demolished? Second, what will be in its place?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did have the timing on this. I cannot lay my hands on it just now.

I believe 1968 is the target date for its completion, and there is a budgetary item projected for each of the years till that time.

Mr. Trotter: By 1968 the present old wing should be torn down?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that the new hospital will be built around the old wing, and then the old building will be torn out.

Mr. Trotter: Will the new wing remain, like the front? You have a new front wing now which covers up the old wing, at the present time. The new one will stay, is that the case?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is right, Mr. Chairman. This is why the new one was put in the position it is now.

Mr. Trotter: When you build the new hospital that is planned, the new wing that is going to go up at 999 Queen Street, what type of hospital is it going to be? A community centre, or just a mental hospital? And how many beds?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. member that at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, first I remind the hon. Minister that on February 8 in this House, that is several months ago, the hon. Minister first announced that this building would get underway in the year 1966. It is my understanding that all the architectural drawings have been made and, indeed, approved by Public Works. All we have to do is start turning the sod; so surely the hon. Minister would be able to inform this House as to what those architectural drawings include? How many beds do they include? What kind of treatment is envisaged?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, general psychiatric treatment, active treatment, outpatient, day care, night care centre, and a long-term unit as well. There will be no custodial care envisioned in the new hospital.

Mr. S. Lewis: I take it that the bed objective listed in this mental hospital's report, the bed objective of—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Total bed complement envisioned is 600 beds.

Mr. S. Lewis: Six hundred?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Four units of 150 beds each.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I say, Mr. Chairman, just by way of a smiling aside to myself—I probably share this little joke with myself and no one else—but, in your mental care for Metropolitan Toronto reports, your projected number of beds is 676, so we can deduct another 76 from that mythical total which was projected.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is losing sight of the fact that we have 100 in the new building, the most recently built addition.

Mr. S. Lewis: We have what?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are 100 beds in the new front of the hospital.

Mr. S. Lewis: I appreciate that, but we are talking about continuing treatment and acute-treatment beds. I still think, again, that there are peculiar discrepancies between bed projections and bed realities. Another fact, just to ask him while we are on this branch and while the hon. member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis) is here—if the hon. member for Humber can lower the eminent newspaper which he is reading—I believe in this Legislature he said, not so long ago, that there would be, in the Scarborough Centenary hospital, an addition of 100 beds for a psychiatric unit. I want to tell the House that that is also considerably in excess of the number of beds which the OHSC says will be constructed as a psychiatric unit. Now again, somewhere there is a breakdown in figures in the report, and what the hon. Minister said, what the hon. member for Humber said—some of us studied his figures fairly carefully—and what is available from OHSC. That too, we will probe further as this debate goes on, but I am concerned about all these bed estimates.

My second question was going to be, Mr. Chairman, when will Toronto Ontario hospital be constructed? I take it that the hon. Minister has answered that aspect of it to his own satisfaction, if not to mine.

Well, then, Mr. Chairman, let me ask another question. What happens to the staff situation at St. Thomas Ontario hospital, Hamilton Ontario hospital, and London Ontario hospital, in view of the very marked decrease in numbers to be expected on July 1, 1965? Unless I am not interpreting them accurately, the superintendent in Hamilton said that on July 1, 1965, he would have nine psychiatrists in a hospital that should require 19 or 20. London would have seven full time in a hospital that would require a minimum of 15 to 17, and St. Thomas is in a similar state of attrition. Now, particularly in the case of St. Thomas and Hamilton, the ruling of the Royal college will rather adversely affect these hospitals, because they will not be able to be used for training facilities. What are the hon. Minister's immediate plans to overcome this gap? Obviously, psychiatrists are human beings, not supernatural objects, and they cannot possibly take the case load that this implies.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the last question specifically. It is the first I have heard that the superintendent anticipated this drop in staff. The ruling of the Royal college will have no effect on St. Thomas whatsoever because this is not part of the teaching programme. I am advised

that the ruling of the Royal college will have no effect upon it at all. There are occasions during the changeover at the end of the academic year, or the training year, when we have a drop in the number of our psychiatrists, and we anticipate it sometimes. But we also take the opportunity to recruit and we are constantly seeking to recruit new staff members. Whether we will get them or not, I am not in a position to say yet because I do not know, but every effort will be made to recruit the staff when we need it, if and when staff signify their intention to withdraw from our service.

Mr. S. Lewis: I may say that the figures I put are not new. They are—alas, I admit to repeating myself—a repeat of the figures I gave to this House last week. They were not challenged then, they have not been challenged subsequently, they come directly from the superintendents of the hospitals involved. I just do not know how a hospital that needs 20 psychiatrists and two administrative officers can possibly function with nine. I do not know how it is humanly possible, and I suggest to you that unfortunate things are imminent at Hamilton Ontario hospital unless the hon. Minister does something pretty vigorous about the personnel situation.

That leads me to my next point, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps these answers will not be forthcoming but I would like to hear at least what the hon. Minister says. We are at present, in the province of Ontario, graduating a maximum of three child psychiatrists a year. Three for the entire provincial needs. Is the hon. Minister aware of any effort in that direction, that specialty within the psychiatric profession?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that the course is open, bursaries are available, and if men and women do not wish to enter child psychiatry, I have still not devised any formula whereby they can be either enticed or induced or forced into this area.

Mr. Bryden: Do you ever think of salaries?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is apparently not an attractive area because these men are not going even into private practice. The salaries do not stop them, to answer my hon. friend who interjected, because they are at liberty to go into general practice.

I have to repeat, sir, that psychiatry is a post-graduate specialty supported better out of the public purse than any other branch of medicine, and if we cannot entice more

people to go into it there must be some reason that is quite beyond a financial or a material one. The Queen's University in Kingston is now in co-operation with the department working on a programme of training for child psychiatrists, or specialists in child psychiatry. We hope that with the addition of this course to the one now in operation in Toronto, more may be attracted, but I have no reason to base that opinion on anything more solid than a hope.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to answer the member for Scarborough West, and may I ask him a question? Which hospital in Scarborough was he referring to?

Mr. S. Lewis: I believe it is the Centenary hospital.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: The Centenary? The original approval for this new hospital was 200 beds; present plans now show an approved capacity of 480 after-treatment beds, plus 44 psychiatric beds. It is planned to provide space for 152 active and fill 44 additional psychiatric beds in a shell as part of new construction. This hospital is in an advanced planning stage, tenders should be called early in 1965 with completion of the hospital for mid-1967.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine. I shall have to go back and check the *Hansard* and we will be debating this area after dinner tonight. I recall the difference between the 44 and the 100 and I will corroborate it in the House. At the moment my material is not with me.

Mr. Chairman, to pursue this for a moment, I would like now to ask the Minister about research in the field of mental health. He has spoken with great vigour about the need and relevance of research. He has made a submission on behalf of his department to the Hall commission which stressed in graphic terms the relationship of research to mental illness and mental deficiency. Yet, according to the recent submission by the Canadian psychiatric association, their report on research, it was noted that in the province of Ontario only 1.2 per cent of federal moneys granted for mental health were being used for research purposes—1.2 per cent.

Let me hasten to say, Mr. Chairman, that that exceeds the amount paid by many other provinces in Canada, whose efforts are even more deplorable. It is exceeded in its percentage only by the province of Saskatchewan, and in the past two or three years, the province of Quebec has been upping its amounts considerably. But I strongly suggest,

Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's words are necessarily a little suspect when the animated urgency about research is reflected in a 1.2 per cent contribution. I think we all agree on the importance of this. I was never more impressed myself than when I read some of the material. Can he reveal to this House any of his plans in regard to the field of mental health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the figures the hon. member quoted are wrong. I do not know where he got them, but I state unequivocally that they are wrong. We have been using 10 per cent of grants for mental health research and this has dropped of late, my advisers tell me, to 7 per cent. But the 1.2 figure is completely wrong and I do not know whence it came.

Mr. S. Lewis: The figure is contained in the *Canadian Psychiatric Journal* in 1964, the report of the Canadian psychiatric association on the amount of money spent on research as part of the federal grant. Their words are very strong for a group of psychiatrists—exceedingly strong. I will get the report and send it to the hon. Minister or table it in the House. I probably have it in the mass of material with me. It says 1.2 per cent; I shall find the precise figure.

Mr. Chairman, another factor that I want to raise as we come to the end of this vote, is the question of economic and social class in relationship to mental health facilities. The hon. Minister has been wont to say on occasion that psychiatric illness can strike in a rather—how shall I say—in a rather egalitarian fashion; it can strike people of all economic and social structures; it does not discriminate between wealth and poverty.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, mental illness does so discriminate. A variety of surveys show that mental illness is far more prevalent in the lower income levels and that these are precisely the levels which are not served by the community facilities, sadly enough. I want to remind the hon. Minister of the book by Hollingshead and Redlich called *Social Class in Mental Illness*. I want to read a short précis of that book to the House because I think it might be of some interest to the House.

Social Class in Mental Illness is often quoted but not for its main point, a point so startling and so revealing of the character of much of our current mental health effort that one suspects its neglect can only be due to professional embarrassment and consequent repression of the disturbing facts.

Hollingshead and Redlich studied all persons receiving psychiatric treatment in New Haven, Connecticut, during a specific period, to find out what determined the kind of treatment they received.

One would normally make the simple-minded assumption that diagnosis would determine treatment; that what was done for a patient would be based on what was the matter with them. The investigators found no relationship between diagnosis and treatment. They studied other variables, such as age and sex, and found these unrelated to treatment.

The one variable related to type of treatment received was the socio-economic status of the patient. If he were from the lower socio-economic group, he received some kind of mechanical, inexpensive, and quick therapy, such as electric shock. If he were from a high socio-economic group, he received extended, expensive, talking-type psychotherapy. If the patient were not only affluent, but also a member of an old prestigious family, so situated in life that he bestowed honour on his helper, he received extended, talking-type psychotherapy, but at a discount.

The relationship between socio-economic status and type of treatment received was not manifested in private practice alone, but also evident in the treatment provided by clinics and other public supported agencies. Thus all the mental health professions are involved.

This is a rather interesting fact, Mr. Chairman. I do not pretend that it will galvanize the Legislature; but the fact is that the relationship between diagnosis and treatment related more to the socio-economic status of the patients involved, rather than to the psychiatric need, or to age, or to sex, or to any of the other obvious factors.

In the very recent past, Dr. Ryan, a noted eminence of the Massachusetts psychiatric centre—the institute for youth and children—came to Toronto and delivered a lecture discussing the relationship of social and economic class to mental health facilities. He came to the interesting conclusion, based on two studies in the state of Massachusetts, that the medical model such as prevails there and prevails here, does not lend itself to service of the lower income group. In fact, the lower income groups most in need of psychiatric assistance are discriminated against by the nature of the medical model. So there are a variety of studies available, I suggest, which imply that, again, the kind of model we are evolving is not of itself sufficient. It cannot

demonstrate the community emphasis which is so important. It cannot weld those channels which are of particular consequence in relationship to socio-economic status.

I simply say, Mr. Chairman, that this should raise rather important and startling facts. I raise it now at this point in the Legislature, because I think it is worthy of analysis, some research and experimentation.

What, in fact, or how in fact, are mental health facilities now effectively coping with lower economic and social groupings, and are they effectively coping with such groupings? If they are not, how do you redefine the mental health model? I have seen no Ontario evidence of such studies and such efforts, and since it is becoming more and more marked that there is a breakdown between diagnosis and treatment, a breakdown which relates to economic status—I commend the thought and the analysis to the hon. Minister.

Will the hon. Minister reply?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we are familiar with this work and we believe, and we have some evidence to believe, that the opinions of the authors have been questioned and quite widely questioned. However, this does not mean to say that they are wrong or invalid, or that they have any basis for it; but we have no such work that will either support or deny their opinions as far as Canada or Ontario are concerned, and I do not know of any work under way, or planned to be put under way, to support or deny their opinions. However, it is a very interesting thing and it offends one's professional sense that the treatment given to the patient is geared to the patient's material possessions. This might well be, but all I can say is that we are aware of the work and would be interested to know if it is going on here; and we will watch very carefully when any research is undertaken to try to prove, or otherwise, the validity of the statements here.

May I take this opportunity to reply to a question from the hon. member for Woodbine—two questions, rather—one started with the hon. member for Scarborough West. We believe now, from our calculations, that the 1.2 per cent quoted is not 1.2 per cent of the mental health grants, but 1.2 per cent of the total national health grants. This includes moneys for all health matters. The hon. member for Woodbine asked about the increase that was promised those at Oak Ridges; this was in their May 24 pay cheque.

Mr. Bryden: The information I had was prior to that date. You are still getting information on the other thing?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are still trying to get that.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on this problem of doing some mental research—and I want to mention the research done by the national institute of labour education. This was done in the United States, it was not done in Canada; but many of the same problems still apply in Canada and one of them is the problem of the fact that the people in the lower economic groups in our society are not being reached in the matter of mental care.

It was found in the United States that those people who were in the upper income groups got much better treatment than those in the lower income groups; also the people who were earning more money were reached much sooner than those in the lower income groups. There is a greater fear—according to this survey made—among people who are in the so-called “poorer” groups, in the blue collar groups—of going to a mental health clinic.

There is less understanding of people who are harder-up financially in seeking treatment. In this survey that was made—and again I repeat, it is by the national institute of labour education—they say that up to the present time nine out of every ten psychotic individuals in lower income groups have been institutionalized and given protective or custodial care instead of active treatment. I do not intend to go into detail on their survey but it has been found that it is simply because of a lack of understanding among those who have a poor education. And it goes hand in hand that those who make less money also have poor education.

I would draw two things from this to the hon. Minister's attention, Mr. Chairman: Once again the need for outpatient services; and, even if we do have the outpatient services, there is a greater problem—the people in the lower income groups have a tendency not to use the outpatient facilities even if they are there, unless they are educated.

The people you need to assist in this programme are organized labour. They point this out on page 22—incidentally, this was not written by organized labour but by medical people who were financed, to some extent, by the labour movement. They say this:

Labour organizations have the machinery for reaching their membership on many questions and they have, in addition, thousands of union counsellors and others who have been trained over the years to function as liaison representatives between

the shop and various kinds of union and community services. They are thus a key untapped resource for mental health education.

I would like to emphasize this point to the House, and to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, because organized labour is a facility that we have not used. I have often complained before that I felt that our campaigns to raise funds, especially our boards that run our hospitals, are far too conservative. We have not used the facilities of organized labour as much as we should have, and I often feel that is so because—now this may come up in the next vote—our Ontario hospital services commission is as conservative as it is because we do not have any representatives of organized labour on it.

Here again in the question of mental research and the improvement of the lot of those people who are in the lower income groups, you are going to need organized labour, because the researchers point out that nine out of ten people who are in the lower income groups and suffer from some psychotic disorder end up in our institutions, which means a heavy burden on our taxpayers. The research—this particular one—also points out that people end up being institutionalized because they fear to go to any type of clinic that would give help. A lot of education is needed in this respect.

I would also respectfully submit to the hon. Minister that the facilities of organized labour be used more than they have in the past. The fact they would go to this expense, as they have in the United States, and show this interest is evidence that the labour movement knows there is a great problem here and they are willing to do something. Certainly here in the province of Ontario they are well organized and I would suggest that the labour movement in Ontario is open to provide any assistance that the hon. Minister asks of them.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have one short final question which the hon. Minister can answer quickly, probably before we go to public bills.

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, there is a committee presently involved in examining and rewriting all the legislation relating to mental health, rewriting much of The Mental Hospitals Act, rewriting much of the parallel and similar legislation. I have noted the name of a Mr. Barry Swadron from time to time in the newspapers. I know that much of their work relates to this matter of reviewing cases presently under some question in mental hospitals; I am wondering when might this

Legislature expect some specific draft legislation on the basis of the work that is being done?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is correct. This was set up as a research project expected to last for two years. I expect the final report will be submitted to us about a year hence, about June, 1966. The study has been under way for a year now and it is believed that it will take two years of study. So I would expect the report one year hence.

Mr. S. Lewis: Will the hon. Minister be waiting until the final report before he introduces any legislation relevant to it or might we expect legislation next session?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is a question that I find difficult to answer, Mr. Chairman. We gave very serious consideration to bringing in one or two amendments, important amendments, this session, but we decided, in balance and on the recommendation of Mr. Swadron, we decided against it. I could only say to the hon. members that the same thinking will guide our actions for the next session. If his studies have progressed far enough that worthwhile amendments can be made or if he would advise us to wait until his study is completed—I think we will have to be guided by that rather than continue a patchwork of legislation. It might well be better in balance to wait for a completely new Act. I believe the Act will be completely rewritten.

Mr. Thompson: I want to ask the hon. Minister if he has a blueprint for a large industry as far as the kind of mental health prevention measures they might undertake? Does he give encouragement to a large industry, say, for example the Ford plant, on what approach they should take regarding mental health and alcoholism and this type of treatment?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Chairman, we have no specific programme in this area, but this is undertaken in a very extensive way by the medical department of many large industries. If and when they seek consultative services from us these are made available to them, but we have no programme of this kind originating with the department.

Mr. Thompson: I ask the hon. Minister then: We know of situations such as at the Bell Telephone, where they have had very advanced classes in understanding of alcoholics and perhaps mentally disturbed

people, trying to help them to overcome this, to rehabilitate themselves and come back again into the industry. Does the hon. Minister approve of this kind of thing being done by a particular industry and does he encourage it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, we do indeed, Mr. Chairman. Our own foundation, as far as the programme the hon. leader of the Opposition has mentioned is concerned, has been very much involved. But strictly, again, on invitation; when they invite us to participate as consultants then we are quite readily available to them. I think every industry knows that we are willing and prepared to encourage this sort of thing and to assist them in whatever consultative area possible.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask: In view of the hon. Minister wanting industry to do this, what kind of an example does the department itself give, from the point of view of the treatment of alcoholics within the civil service, as well as mentally ill people?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the vote has already been passed; we maintain a very extensive health service for the civil service and we are just about to engage in discussions which I hope will lead to the establishment of a programme particularly aimed at dealing with alcoholism within the service. I do not know how widespread it is, but I have been told enough to cause me some concern about it. The foundation is being invited to review this matter and consider the advisability of setting up a model service within the public service. This actually was the aegis of the establishment of the public service health service that we operate through this department. Through it we try to practise preventive medicine, not only in respect of mental health but in respect of general health.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this is not under the vote, but I think the hon. Minister would agree with me that an underlying cause of alcoholism is often mental illness or insecurity. I think it would be of great interest to know the plans you have in this area. Are you going to wait to publicize this, because I had not known of it. I certainly would be very interested and I am sure many others would be.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The programme on alcoholism?

Mr. Thompson: Within the civil service itself; you may want to publicize it—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I stated, Mr. Chairman, that we have just been advised of the matter. One of my colleagues tells me that this department, for instance, has on occasion referred cases from his own department directly to the foundation. We have accepted this, but we believe now that the matter is of great enough importance that we have asked the foundation to consider the setting up of a model service within the public service, to see if the numbers involved are such that this is justified. If there are only scattered cases, such a programme may not be of any real value and the present pattern of each department referring them to the foundation may serve the purpose quite adequately.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the hon. Minister could tell us if the day-care centre, which was formerly open in Cobourg until Dr. Cormack left, is going to be opened. I understand some of the people in Cobourg have been in contact with your department and have not had very much satisfaction.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the people who had contacted our department have been told what I must tell you, sir: As soon as a psychiatrist is available who can do this job, the centre will be reopened.

Vote 713 agreed to.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, are we going to proceed now to the other public bills and orders?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): We were just waiting until we found an opportune time to move, and I now move that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, we would like to call order number 66—and I might just say it was my understanding that orders numbers 66 and 67 were being debated together, if I could put it that way, and I believe the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) had completed some remarks.

Clerk of the House: The 66th order: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT (continued)

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, there are several aspects relative to Bill No. 33 which I would like to bring to the attention of the Legislature.

Bill No. 33, of course, is An Act to amend The Municipal Act. I might say, sir, that I awaited with interest to hear the reasons that might be submitted by the hon. member for Riverdale when he introduced this bill, and when he discussed it the other day when we adjourned the debate. As I suspected, sir, the reasons were in connection with a certain incident that took place in Metropolitan Toronto, surrounding a certain parade; and it had to do, of course, with the propriety, or otherwise, of certain signs or banners and also with the matter of a permit to hold such a parade.

The purpose of the bill would appear to be to transfer the powers of regulating such parades from boards of police commissioners to the councils of cities and towns. I would be the last one, sir, to argue against any move that would strengthen our municipal councils. In fact, I think that the process of what we refer to as fragmentation has taken place to a large degree, and we should do something to strengthen our municipal councils.

However, I do not believe this bill is a transfer back to council of any powers that they did have. In fact, section 403, which is mentioned in this bill, section 403 of The Municipal Act, empowers boards of police commissioners of cities to do certain things—and those things, of course, are to regulate parades, and so on. I think that section 403 of The Municipal Act was extended to boards of police commissioners of cities for a special reason. Municipal councils of towns are not included. And, as the bylaw itself has to do in section three with the regulation of parades, processions, and so on, to determine and prescribe the routes of travel within a city, and also to give direction to police constables for so regulating such parades, I think that the reason this section was passed must have been because there was a problem existing in large cities which did not exist in smaller towns to the same extent.

Apparently the thought in mind, in the words of the hon. member for Riverdale, is

that they want to transfer the power from police commissions of cities to the councils of cities and towns. The reason is given that there is an infringement, according to *Hansard*, on the right of people to associate and parade in carrying out and putting before people views which they believed in and which they thought deeply about.

I question very strongly, sir, whether or not the transfer of the authority from a board of police commissioners to municipal council would in any way change the situation. Section 403, of course, as I said, extends the powers to boards of police commissioners rather than councils, simply because they are cities and there is a definite traffic problem there that does not exist in smaller towns. So, in the first instance, I do not believe this power at all should be transferred to small municipalities, such as towns, particularly to the councils, because it does not in any way become a problem in these towns.

In section 403, sir, section three says that bylaws may be passed for regulating parades or processions from time to time, as the occasion may require, for prescribing the routes of travel to be observed by vehicles during public processions or public demonstrations, and for giving directions to constables for keeping order.

The purpose of the bill would be, as it says in section two:

That paragraph three of section 403 of The Municipal Act is to be repealed and that it would be transferred to section 386 of The Municipal Act.

Section 386, of course, empowers councils of cities and towns to pass bylaws for certain purposes—which would be to regulate parades, to prescribe the time and the route, and to give direction to constables for keeping order.

I hesitate to think, sir, what would happen if the power was given to the councils of all of our towns and cities to direct the police departments as to how to regulate by bylaw of the municipal council. I think this is something that is thoroughly within the purview of traffic control matters, which are preferably handled by the police departments. Rather than having councils endeavouring to regulate the parades, perhaps the regulation would include the matter of determining which signs would be desirable and whether or not a permit should be given for one particular parade or another.

I do not know if this is proper or not. But there is an implication in giving this power to council that there might be some political aspect to the thing. Surely we do not want

council to be influencing which permits should be granted, or what sort of banners should be carried by a parade? It is purely a matter of regulating traffic. I do not feel, sir, that this is a problem which should be handled by municipal councils in either towns or cities, to prescribe the routes of travel, to regulate the parades in any way, shape or form, or particularly, to give direction to police constables how to so regulate them.

The same comment, sir, as was mentioned previously, would apply to Bill No. 34, which is a bill to amend the metropolitan Act pertaining to the same thing; and my comments apply in a similar manner to Bill No. 34.

Further, in connection with the penalties that could be imposed by the boards of police commissions, section 482 of The Municipal Act provides a means for the board of commissioners to impose fines for contravention of any regulations they might make in connection with parades. Section 486 goes further to provide powers to restrain any such contravention. In my view there is no real reason why this power should be so transferred; in fact I feel that it will not accomplish the purpose which is proposed in this bill. I would have to oppose this bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, despite the great respect I have for the hon. member for Waterloo South I just could not follow his reasoning. He is taking the usual line so often taken in these matters, that because it is on the statute books, it is a good thing. I am sure that the hon. member for Waterloo South will recall the question I directed at the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), a series of questions, relating to bylaws passed by boards of commissioners of police. We had quite an incident here in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto when a columnist of one of the large metropolitan dailies wanted to find out what bylaws were in existence which affected the public. He had a very difficult job and all the press joined in and agreed that there was no reason for any secrets being kept. The tenor of the hon. Attorney General's reply to my question, sir, was that in his opinion, in the opinion of the chief law officer of the Crown, there should be no bylaws affecting public conduct passed by boards of commissioners of police or any other body, that should be kept secret.

I fail completely to understand the reasoning behind delegating authority of this type to a body whose attentions are supposed to be directed to the administration of law and order. This is not a legislating body. The

only reason, the only possible excuse that they should have power to legislate is insofar as it affects the discipline and the conduct of the police forces. But they are not elected officials, sir, they cannot be called to account and when they are going to stray into a field that affects public conduct, surely there is no more important part of our tradition of responsibility of Parliament that the people who pass laws should be responsible to the voters who put them there and empowered them to pass laws.

Under police commissions, you have one elected person who is ex officio a member of the commission, but the others are appointed. Very often it is a judge or a magistrate or other people approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Those people have no responsibility to any voters, to any electorate. They can do all sorts of things, as happened, as I say, Mr. Speaker, in Metropolitan Toronto where for the longest time they said, "It is none of your business what is in our bylaws."

I think this is wrong, I think this is a direct negation of our democratic principles. We hear so often from our hon. friends on the government benches—they cry "let us preserve local autonomy." If that means anything, surely it must mean "let the local elected officials determine what is going on in the municipality." And surely it should be the responsibility of the local councils to determine the rules and permission in regard to parades. If the voters do not like it, at the next election they can get rid of it. It is as simple as that. There is nothing complicated about it.

I fail to understand the tortuous process that the hon. member for Waterloo South goes through to justify this. He mentions the traffic regulation and that maybe it should not be allowed in towns. Surely the job of police forces in cities or towns or villages or counties or wherever we have police forces, is to maintain law and order. As the hon. member for Riverdale said, when he introduced both these bills for first reading, surely the police can be expected to maintain law and order in the municipalities for which they are responsible. That is their role. Their role is not to make a type of legislative decision that is referred to in these bills. For those reasons, sir, I find myself in support, in great support of these bills introduced by the hon. member for Riverdale. The arguments put forward contrary to these bills to my mind have no grounds at all, they make no impression at all; I do not think it is logical, and for those reasons, sir, I urge the House to support both of these bills.

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

THE REMEMBRANCE DAY ACT, 1965

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North) moves second reading of Bill No. 55, The Remembrance Day Act, 1965.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, this bill, I think, gives proper honour to a day of which we are all very proud, and to the men who died in World War I and also World War II. It is merely an Act which I am asking the House to pass, and I think there are four other provinces which have passed it. This bill is drafted after a bill that has been passed in the Houses of four other provinces.

About five years ago, the federal Parliament passed an Act authorizing the provinces, if they wished, to take advantage of the fact that they could make this day a special day. That is about all there really is to the Act. I would urge upon hon. members the importance of voting for it; there is nothing obnoxious about it at all. It gives proper recognition, I think, to a day to which all of us ought to pay honour and homage as well as prayer. It closes certain types of business, of course, on that day.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the sponsor of this bill has the very best of intentions. He wants to be certain that Remembrance Day and all its meaning is perpetuated and in this I am with him 100 per cent.

He feels, I am sure, that the very least we can do is to set aside one day a year in which to pay tribute to those fine men and women who gave all they had, their lives, in the defence of our way of life. He feels, perhaps, as many do, that there is a great danger of losing altogether this fine institution known as Remembrance Day. As evidence of this fear there has been a strong movement to cease to recognize it as a school holiday on the excuse that it will be better to keep the children in school on November 11 and use that day to implant in these young minds the true meaning and history of remembrance. Now, I cannot go along with that because in passing I might say that it has been my experience that excellent Remembrance Day programmes are held in the schools now. It does appear that we adults are being very remiss in our duties on Remembrance Day. But if it were a general holiday would we do any better? A great

many of those who realize their responsibilities seem to manage to be present now at functions which mark this solemn occasion. There is a great doubt in my mind that any further appreciable number would present themselves merely because the day was declared a general holiday.

You cannot legislate to create an emotion or a feeling of responsibility. This is a matter of education. In the past several years in spite of great efforts by veterans' organizations, news media and schools, a large portion of the public has displayed an apathy toward Remembrance Day. In my opinion, this is indeed a sad commentary on our way of life.

Further, if we were to enact this bill, take a look at those who would be excluded from its effects. This bill, this holiday, would not apply to farmers, hospital staffs, pharmacists, hotel and restaurant staff, policemen, firemen, furnace tenders, watchmen, janitors, domestic servants, emergency repair people, shift workers in a continuously operating plant—such as almost all industries are in our area—railway workers, or those engaged in transportation in either goods or travellers, those caring for perishable products and live animals, those who sell bread and milk, those operating a plant as defined in The Milk Industry Act, or the distribution of its products, those who operate bakeries, process workers in meat plants, those whose job it is to see that electricity, gas, light or water are continuously supplied, those whose work is the conducting of commemorative or religious services, a broker when he is acting for clients with business outside the province, and actors or performers after one o'clock in the afternoon.

This certainly excludes a large segment of the population, yet it does not exclude them entirely, for section 4 states that:

Every employer carrying on or engaged in an industry to which section 2 does not apply—

and these are the ones that I have just listed:

—shall, subject to section 5, relieve the employee in the industry from duty and suspend the operation of the industry for a period of three minutes at one minute before 11 o'clock—

notice the time, it is precisely stated:

—at one minute before 11 o'clock in the forenoon of Remembrance Day.

Now section 5 merely says in effect that in circumstances beyond human control the Minister of Labour may grant a permit to carry on through this period of the day. So you see if you cannot stop at one minute to

11 you go to the Minister of Labour and get a permit which authorizes you to carry on at that time.

Besides this, there are penalties attached which allow for fines, upon conviction of anyone who contravenes any provisions of this Act, of up to \$100 for an employee or \$300 for an employer. So the employer must indeed allow the three minutes off duty, though the bill does not say to what purpose the three minutes are to be put by the employee. So at one minute to 11 o'clock: Does the engineer stop the train? Does the baker disregard his oven? Does the policeman stop his chase, or does the chased stop also? Does the process worker turn away from his dials, or the provider of produce interrupt his long-distance calls? No, indeed!

No one can say: "You will cease work, all work, at one minute to 11 o'clock upon pain of serious penalty," and then expect people to use the three minutes in reverent contemplation of those who sacrificed themselves for our country. The will to do this must be present in the individual. If it is, he will, at some time during the day, likely as near 11 o'clock as possible, spend a minute or two or three, or much more indeed, thanking God for the sacrifices that have been made for him; but only if his heart is right, not because it says so in section 4 of this bill.

Then I find that there is a penalty attached in any case to those exempted employers because section 3, subsection 5, states that unless you are a watchman, furnace tender or a janitor—and I do not see why these should be discriminated against—if you have to work on Remembrance Day and receive only the regular rates of pay for that day you have to be given equivalent compensatory time off, with pay, within 30 days. As you can see, of course, this does penalize this employer and it lays the ground for double pay for the holiday. I cannot see, for the life of me, the connection between double pay and the proper payment of respect to our heroes.

One other phase of this bill is important. Reference has been made to the fact that there is a federal bill which says that the provinces can pass a bill of this nature, but if we were to pass this bill, we would create a provincial holiday for something that is nation-wide in its implication. I believe that this bill is introduced in the wrong jurisdiction and properly belongs to the House of Commons, and indeed I think it belongs only in the House of Commons.

To sum up, I believe this bill is out of order here, and in any case it will not do

what the sponsor wishes. I stress that it is right and proper and even the duty of each one of us, in whatever way we can, to pay tribute to our fallen heroes on Remembrance Day at least. Indeed, for whatever help it might be, I appeal to the people of Ontario to make a special effort in this respect on November 11 to attend functions, to stand up and be counted among those gathered to give heartfelt thanks that Canadians are capable of dying for our way of life.

A bill of this nature passed by the federal government might help to recognize officially such an important day as Remembrance Day, but as a bill it will do nothing to the hearts of our people. With the penalties involved and the large segment of people excluded from observing this day by legislation it seems to me to make almost a farce out of the solemn and deep and poignant meaning and spirit of Remembrance Day.

Something much better, much less confused than this bill is needed to accomplish the objectives of the sponsors. Whatever it is, when it is discovered I will be 100 per cent for it, but I cannot support this bill.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering why this bill is out of order. I do not see anything out of order about it at all. Notice was given and—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I do not think that the hon. member meant it in that way. I do not think the bill is out of order in the order of this House. I do not think that is what he really meant.

Mr. Reaume: I want to say on this bill, first of all—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): You have spoken once.

Mr. Reaume: My hon. friend asked a question and I want to follow through on that. When my hon. friend started out I really thought he was for it and then he turned everything upside down. He apparently spent a week on that speech, finding out what is wrong with the bill. I want to inform him, and the House, too, that this bill was instituted and brought here to the House because I was asked to by members and officials of the legion and other branches of the veterans, and if they do not know the importance of this day as well as my hon. friend does, then I would like to know what the whole thing is all about.

I do not think we ought to make a farce

of the bill. After all, five other provinces have passed this bill. Is this not the day on which we should at least pay some respect? I know as it is now many of the legion branches have banquets and services, and many of our folks attend services at the church of their own choice. This is all very well, but I think that the very passage of a bill such as Bill No. 55 will tend to bring some importance to this day and impress on the minds, not only of adults but the boys and girls of the province, too, just exactly what this day means. It will have, I hope, some effect on making people talk about it and go out and observe it.

I do not see anything wrong with the bill at all. I do not know whether my hon. friend is talking for the people over there or not, but I would urge upon you, if you can, to vote for the bill because there really is not—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member's further remarks are completely out of order.

Mr. Reaume: I thought that Mr. Speaker was the man who handled all that.

Mr. Speaker: I might say I thought perhaps I would allow the member for Essex North, as the sponsor of the bill, to say a few words the second time. I thought it was only going to last one or two minutes, though, and we have perhaps extended the time. If there are any further speakers on this bill, would they please proceed.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. I believe, kindly, that the hon. member for Lambton West, if this had been a government measure, would have voted for it. But I do say, in a constructive way, Mr. Speaker, that in municipalities across the province, every first week in November, the mayor has to make a proclamation to enable the banks to close for Remembrance Day, and it is always a big hassle across the province in the municipalities in this regard.

I think that we have statutory holidays —in effect if this bill were passed by this House, this would make Remembrance Day a statutory holiday.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): It is already.

Mr. Sargent: We have such days as Labour Day. Why is that one, more than Remembrance Day, or why is May 24? Americans across the country think we are crazy, having May 24 as a statutory holiday, for some fine old fellow lived over half a century ago.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): I am sure most people call her Queen Victoria.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is known as Commonwealth Day.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: We are talking about ways to shorten our work week. This is always a controversial subject across the province, and every hon. member of the government knows this is good legislation—especially like the hon. Prime Minister, who is a veteran and knows this is good business. The Legions want it, but because it was not sponsored by the government it is not a good idea. I think you should support good legislation.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. When the hon. member who sponsored the bill showed it to me some time ago, I took it down to the Ontario command of the Canadian Legion and had the officers there look over the bill. They were very much impressed with it. It seems to me that possibly, outside of Christmas Day and Good Friday, November 11 is probably the most important day in the history of this country. I think it should be observed as a holiday. It is on the statute books as a statutory holiday. First of all, it was known as Armistice Day and then, later on, as Remembrance Day; but it is just a statutory holiday, with no penalty at all if it is not observed. I do not know which provinces have Remembrance Day as a real holiday. I believe the province of Manitoba has. I do not know of any others.

Mr. Reaume: Nova Scotia.

Mr. Troy: Nova Scotia? Well, that is very fine, because the Maritime provinces have always been cradles of liberty; it is good that at least one of them observes this day as a real holiday.

I know, in my own area, we have certainly —almost thousands turn out for the Remembrance Day services. The school in which I was a teacher for many years, on the day before Remembrance Day, probably has the most impressive service you could find anywhere in this country.

As I say again, I certainly strongly support this bill of the hon. member for Essex North.

I can recall the days when the Ontario Northland railway had a band—and this was a statutory holiday in the country—and we could not get the bandmen off. They were not allowed to be free for that time and they lost their wages; so we had to pay for the

band to play for us. The chairman of the commission was a distinguished soldier, the government supported the idea of Remembrance Day, but still they would not decree that their people could be free on that day, without somebody else having to pay the shot. I think it is certainly very definitely necessary that, in some way, this great day of November 11, which recalls that great day of November 11, 1918, should be made a real holiday—and not what it is now, just a farce across the country.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, we, in the New Democratic Party, support the principle enunciated in this bill. We feel that because it is the first of this type of legislation introduced into the Legislature, providing for a statutory holiday in a sense, it would need a lot more draftsmanship to make it workable. But certainly, if we are going to remember the devastations and tragedies of wars, we have used the day, November 11, to remember. I feel that the Legions are right in putting forward this kind of a request, because they are the ones who perpetuate the fullest remembering of the days gone by.

I do not know myself whether legislation providing for a holiday will add to the solemn ceremonies that take place. I think it would, in the case referred to by the hon. member for Nipissing, remove some of the chaos in making arrangements for the ceremonies. I was a little bit confused by the hon. member for Lambton West, who opposed the principle of the bill and then ended up saying it should be a matter for the House of Commons, that they should bring in legislation. It does not make sense to oppose something and then say that some other jurisdiction should look after it.

Nevertheless, several of the local unions in the province of Ontario have been able to negotiate Remembrance Day as an added statutory holiday. The problem we are finding is that management—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, they get a premium if they have to work, and this is the problem. I do not know just how much the Remembrance Day statutory holiday is used as one to remember the tragedies of wars, when management does not take it very seriously and insists the wheels must turn in industry. If they are willing to pay the premium the men take the money instead of the time off. I think we have to take a real look at the drafting to make it really work and make it applicable to the times. Nevertheless, we do

support the principle of a day off for Remembrance Day.

Mr. White moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

THE MINORS' PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Reaume moves second reading of Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Minors' Protection Act.

Mr. Reaume: Mr. Speaker, this bill as it is now does not allow children or young folks under the age of 18 to go into billiard halls; and, of course, the billiard hall of today is much different to the old-time pool halls, as we used to call them. If you notice, in practically every area of the province, the billiard hall now is really a fancy place; it is an academy. I have had the opportunity—I am not a pool player actually myself, or of billiards—but I have visited, in Windsor, in London, in Guelph, Brantford and here in Toronto, many of these billiard halls and they are a far cry from what they were in the old days. Certainly I can see nothing wrong with a young man or woman aged 16 or over, going in with their friends. If you have visited these halls you will have noticed that there are many of these young people going in there now. Actually there is nothing obnoxious about the bill; it only reduces the age from 18 to 16. Again I would ask hon. members to kindly pass this bill—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Reaume: Well, I guess that is the idea behind it, yes.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I must say that until now I have led such a sheltered existence that I do not even know what a bagatelle room is. I do have some limited knowledge of the games of billiards and pool, however. I will readily confess that my skill in those games is exactly zero, but at the same time I do regard them genuinely as games of skill. I think they are good games. I am not skilful at them myself but I think they are good games for people to play, young or old.

Unfortunately, the nature of pool halls in the past has been such as to create certain rather unpleasant associations, and the legislators of the past in their wisdom decided that it was desirable to exclude young people from such places. That did not relate to the nature of the games being

played in them, and I think the answer to the problem is not to exclude people under a certain age from these establishments but to ensure that the establishments are properly conducted so that the games played in them can become genuine recreation for people who are interested in that type of recreation. This can be done through municipal licensing policy. Municipal authorities are moving in that direction.

This, I believe, is the answer to whatever problem or residue of problem there may be with regard to billiard rooms and pool rooms. Nobody suggests that young people should be excluded from bowling alleys. I see no reason why they should be excluded from properly run billiard rooms and pool rooms. We will certainly go along with the rather modest legislative proposal that is now before the House; in fact we would be prepared to go further and say that if a proper licensing policy was adopted in municipalities with regard to these establishments, the minimum age should be eliminated altogether.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, not very often in the last month have you had three speakers from three different parties getting up and agreeing fairly well on any particular bill. I would like to say that I also have visited billiard rooms around the country. There are some of them to which I would say there would be no objection whatsoever for boys and girls even down as far as 12, 13 or 14 years of age to go and play billiards or pool or snooker or whatever game they want to play. There is no question about it, it is a game of skill, and I do not think proficiency at playing billiards is a sign of a misspent youth the way it used to be.

Many of the billiard rooms that you visit now are clean, they are well supervised, have excellent facilities, they are operated in very fine surroundings and there is no rowdiness. There is nothing at all wrong with boys and girls at the age of 16 going in to play in these billiard rooms. I understand that they are licensed by the municipality and, on inquiring if they are supervised to any extent by the municipalities, I find that some are and some are not.

Unfortunately, there are other billiard rooms that are not quite up to the standards of the ones which have recently been built and I do not think that they are the kind of place that you would like a boy or girl 16 years of age to enter.

It would seem to me that before such a bill as this is passed, there are three or four things that should be done. First of all, I

think these billiard academies or rooms should have standards established. If they live up to these standards or comply with these standards, then young people should be allowed to play there when they are 16. I think in some of them, much better supervision should be maintained by the licence authorities. I think there should be some consideration given to a time limit for a 16-year-old, or if you want to lower it, a 15-year-old. He or she should leave at 11 p.m., because I think there are occasions when these billiard academies can be open much longer than that.

I feel there is not too much wrong with this legislation, but I do feel that probably a good thing would be to have the association, if there is an association, get together with government officials to try to iron out some standards which a billiard academy would have to maintain, along with time limits and anything else that would help to put all billiard rooms in the same category as some of these newer ones which are being opened at the present time. I feel that billiards is a fine game, I think it can provide a very valuable form of recreation for our young people, but I would suggest that before such a bill is passed, there should be a little more thought given to make sure that the standards and any of the regulations that can be put into the bill are such that would help to see that all billiard rooms have the same standard as some of the better ones have at the present time.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing for one in the Opposition to sit and hear a government member almost support a bill that comes from the Opposition.

I would say this: Being the sportsman that he is, the hon. member for Kingston, also working on the select committee on youth, understands the problem that youngsters 16 years of age and even younger will go to pool rooms regardless of the deplorable condition of some of them. They just have a way of getting in and I realize that they should not. I liked the comment of the hon. member for Kingston when he said that some of them should be cleaned up. We should not penalize the ones who are keeping their places well maintained by not allowing youngsters to go in there. I have no boys, but my eldest daughter has a pool table in her basement—can you imagine such a thing?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): I can. The proper place for children to learn the game.

Mr. Bukator: And the wealthy people—such as the last man who interjected there, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management can afford to put a pool table in their cellars. He has the means, from what I gather, but these youngsters who are 16 have not got the recreation centres that you speak of, and this would be a good place to know at least where they are.

Management should be made to brush up. I know that the former Minister of Labour has often said that he spent some time in a pool room, and I tell you that the only fault that I could find with that man is that he always beat me in the game of Russian billiards. He was an expert and he said that that was one of the few games in which, when your opponent makes a good shot, you pay him. You do not see that in many games of sport that we take part in. If some of you members of the government who find yourselves at your wits' end, let us say, and almost a nervous wreck after a long session like this, just go down to the park commissioners' quarters and go up into that penthouse, you will find one of the finest pool tables that you ever played on! You see, the commissioners work so hard and they have to relax. If the weather is bad and they cannot get out on the golf course, they go up to the pool room.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: The hon. Prime Minister asked me a question and I want to answer it. The only fault I found with it is that of all the commissioners that were there, I beat them all but the Minister himself, and the chairman of the parks commission. That is, I guess, because he has been chairman since 1943; he had a lot of time to practise—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: —and I was only on the commission for six consecutive years.

I might say this to you, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the rowdiness that you do see around a pool room, if management of those particular institutions would bring them up to standard and take the green curtains off and put a little more light into the place it would improve.

This is not a bad bill. I do believe, in supporting the bill today, that if it does not come into effect when we prorogue here and have Royal assent to all these bills, I am sure that the government will bring in a bill another year that will bring this into exist-

ence. We will know where the youngsters are.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Troy: Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this bill. I am very glad to see that the hon. member for Kingston, who is chairman of the youth committee, also supports it.

Knowing something of what these academies are nowadays, I see nothing wrong in reducing the age to 16. I am certainly—

Mr. Apps: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to point out, sir, to the hon. member for Nipissing, that I said I thought this was a good bill provided there should be time given so that the proper investigation should be undertaken in order to help bring the ones that are not so good up to the standards of the ones that are good. I think that if that is done—and I would suggest that that should be done during the coming year—there would be no objections next year to bringing in a bill that would do that job, so that one would not be discriminated against when someone else has not such a good billiard room.

That was my statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Troy: Thank you for correcting me.

I think if you pass the bill, then, all these other things can come through the regulations or be established afterwards. It seems to me that parents would rather see their youngsters in the billiard academies that they have now than in the theatres where some of the adult pictures are shown. I think it would be much better for them playing this game of chance rather than a game of mischance.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to give the hon. member for Woodbine lessons, providing he brought his wallet along with him.

But to be serious for a moment, there have been billiard tables in the YMCAs in Metropolitan Toronto for the last 15 or 20 years. I believe there is a place for billiard rooms, as we know them now, the new ones. I agree with the hon. member for Kingston, but again I would say we must tread very slowly because there are many billiard rooms across this province that you would not want your children in at present.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 15, 1965
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 15, 1965

Estimates, Department of Health, Mr. Dymond, concluded	4207
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	4235
Appendix "A"	4236

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 56th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH (continued)

On vote 714:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, this vote, which relates to the hospital services commission of Ontario, naturally covers a very broad field. One of the subjects which falls within the scope of the vote is that of hospital accommodation and hospital construction. This is a subject that is of particular interest to me, as I imagine it is to all residents of the Metropolitan Toronto area, because of the particular problems which have arisen in this field in this area, over the past decade. I want to take a little time now, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the problem as I see it at the present time.

Part 5 of the study by the committee for survey of hospital needs in Metropolitan Toronto, published in May, 1963, revealed a serious shortage of hospital accommodation in the Metro area. One would have thought that this urgent warning would have galvanized the government into action to remedy the situation before it became desperate. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

Instead of acting to increase the hospital construction planned in 1963, the government has resorted to its old trick of creating an illusion of activity by announcing the same projects over and over again, and by announcing projects for which there are no definite plans at all.

The term "housing by headlines" has often been applied to government housing policies. "Hospitals by headlines" can be applied with equal validity to its hospital construction policies. A programme of "hospitals by headlines" unfortunately does not produce the hospital accommodation that is urgently needed in the Metro Toronto area. It does, however, allay public alarm. Politically, no doubt, this is all the government requires. The full impact of the hospital crisis in the

Metro area will not be felt until after the next provincial general election, whenever that may be. Presumably the government hopes to get over the election by its "hospitals by headlines" policy. When the public finds out the real truth, it will be too late to do anything electorally, or so the government hopes.

Indeed, the government seems to have mesmerized even the survey committee. In part 13 of its study, issued in May of this year, as compared with its original study of hospital needs in Metro Toronto of May, 1963, the committee, said, and I am quoting:

With the large amount of hospital accommodation now being planned for Metropolitan Toronto, it will soon be possible to provide enough public hospital beds to meet the legitimate needs of this area. This is in sharp contrast to the situation when part 5 of this study relating to active treatment hospitals was prepared in the early spring of 1963.

Mr. Chairman, I for one would like to see some solid evidence of this joyful conclusion. Unfortunately, the survey committee presented none. It merely made a bald statement without any supporting evidence at all. It did not undertake any sort of comparison of the disturbing facts revealed in its 1963 study with current facts. Such a comparison would, I believe, have revealed little, if anything, now being done or forecast, which was not forecast in 1963, and which the committee at that time found to be completely inadequate.

To demonstrate that this is true, I will now do what the committee failed to do; that is, I will compare the facts presented in the 1963 report with current facts. I will confine my attention to active treatment beds in general hospitals, including beds for both children and adults, but not bassinets for the newborn babies. I will not include beds for psychiatric treatment or for the treatment of alcoholics—not because I consider such beds to be unimportant, but because their inclusion complicates the analysis without changing the essential picture.

Before I get into the specific figures as they were reported in 1963, and as we now

have them in the latest available published information, I might indicate, Mr. Chairman, that any sort of meaningful statistical analysis, with regard to figures published about the hospital situation in Metro Toronto, is difficult. As far as I can make out, those who announce figures from time to time are engaged in the old-fashioned game, "Button, button, who's got the button?" It is almost impossible to harmonize one set of official or quasi-official figures with any other set. They just cannot be made to fit entirely. So one has to do the best one can, with the figures available. In approaching this matter, I have worked on the principle that, wherever possible, I would give the benefit of the doubt to the government and the hospital services commission.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Oh, I am sure you will do that.

Mr. Bryden: But I would emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that considerable doubt arises. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) smiles at that comment. He is well aware that I always give the government the benefit of the doubt.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Smile when you say it.

Mr. Bryden: As a general rule, there is not much doubt that what it is doing is wrong. Here there is doubt only with regard to the specific interpretation of the statistics; and on that I have given the government the benefit of the doubt.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Kindness we can do without.

Mr. Bryden: In its 1963 report, the committee found that there was an existing deficit of 2,300 beds at that time, and that the need would increase by 1,570 beds by 1970. Thus a total of 3,930 beds would have to be constructed between 1963 and 1970 if the full need was to be met in the latter year. That was essentially the finding of the survey committee in 1963.

The committee then reviewed all the plans that were then being considered for the construction of hospital accommodation in this area. It took the most optimistic view possible—that is where I picked up the habit—of these plans and included a total of some 200 to 300 beds which have, in fact, not matured. Even on this highly optimistic view, it found that the total number of beds to be constructed between 1963 and 1970 would be only 2,759, leaving a deficit of 1,171.

The committee viewed this projected

deficit with concern. It noted that the need will continue to grow during the 1970s and that if we enter this period—that is the period between 1970 and 1980—with a deficit, it will be virtually impossible to keep abreast of the increasing need.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) made no specific reference to hospital accommodation in the Metro Toronto area when he introduced his estimates. He made some general sort of statement about the province as a whole, but nothing specific that I can recall, or that I noted in rereading his speech, with regard to this area where we all know the problem has been most difficult.

The most recent public analysis of the situation, therefore, was that provided by the hon. member for Humber (Mr. W. B. Lewis), who is a member of the hospital services commission, in his speech in the Throne Speech debate on February 3, 1965, which appears in *Hansard* for this year, at pages 246 to 247.

At first sight, the hon. member's statement is most encouraging. If one adds up all the projects listed by him as completed since 1963, under way or planned, one arrives at a total of 4,441 beds—substantially more than the 3,930 the survey committee said would be needed between 1963 and 1970. That is what it sounded like as we listened to it when he presented his statement in the House, and it was not until we had a chance to analyze it that we found that the true situation was a little different.

A little analysis reveals the hollowness of the hon. member's brave statement. In actual fact, the situation is little, if any, better than it was when the survey committee studied it, and I will give my reasons for that assertion:

First, the hon. member included 221 psychiatric beds, and 50 beds for the treatment of alcoholics. These are unquestionably desperately needed, but they will not in any way help to relieve the shortage of general active treatment beds. They will be needed for psychiatric purposes and for the treatment of alcoholics; they will not relieve the shortage of general treatment beds—active treatment beds—which the survey committee said in 1963 would amount to 1,171 by 1970.

Second, the hon. member included 550 active treatment beds in Sunnybrook hospital which are being made available for public hospital purposes. I do not know if that arrangement has yet been completed; but, whether or not, it is on the way—there is no doubt about that. And that, according to the hon. member for Humber will make 550 active treatment beds in Sunnybrook

available for general public purposes in Toronto. That is fine, Mr. Chairman, except that the survey committee, in its gloomy review of 1963, included in its calculations 887 beds in Sunnybrook that were in actual use, and an additional 100 beds that it thought could be put into use; thus the 550 that are to be made available to the general public are not an addition to the stock that the survey committee was already taking into account. In fact, it is a smaller number than the survey committee was taking into account. If anything, the figure indicates that the situation is worse than the survey committee contemplated, rather than better.

Mr. White: Oh, you are not giving us the benefit of the doubt now.

Mr. Bryden: I am indeed. I said "if anything, the figure indicates that the situation is worse." I did not positively assert that it is worse, I just said that it would appear that way—I was really straining to give you the benefit of the doubt at that point.

Third, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Humber included four projects totalling 1,000 beds which are hardly more than gleams in their sponsor's eye. For example, the hon. member himself said of the proposed 120-bed extension of Grace hospital that "there is no planning for this expansion at the present time." Now that 120 is part of his 4,441 total. Of the proposed Etobicoke hospital, all he could say definitely was that "a provisional board has been set up," and of the proposed Fenway hospital he said that "discussions have been held regarding development of a public hospital of up to 500 beds."

Mr. Chairman, I am tired of discussions. Until we have something more than discussions, I am not prepared to include those 500 beds in the total. I have prepared a table showing a breakdown of the survey committee's figures—that is, the figures which they introduced in the 1963 report—set beside those presented by the hon. member for Humber. I am not going to read that table now because as everyone knows it is almost impossible to follow a table when it is read, but I will table it as an appendix to *Hansard* (see Appendix A). Anyone who studies it will find, I think, that it shows that the true net increase in general active treatment beds, as disclosed by the hon. member for Humber, is not 4,441, but 2,841. I am now talking about the net increase in beds, going back to 1963 and carrying it forward to 1970. This figure of 2,841 compares with 2,759 new beds that the survey was counting on in 1963, when it concluded that the situa-

tion was close to desperate. You see, the hon. member for Humber was not announcing necessarily new projects; he was announcing, in revised form, the same project as the survey committee had been taking into account with some very vague additions. I admit that there are one or two true additions to compensate for some very optimistic figures that the survey committee had included, but the only real additions were based on faith and hope, rather than on anything concrete.

If you take it right down to what is actually disclosed as either having taken place or likely to take place between now and 1970, one could say that the figure of the hon. member for Humber was 2,841 as compared to 2,759 that the survey committee figured on. Thus, the anticipated 1970 deficit is to be reduced from 1,171 to 1,089. That is by about 82.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if that is what leads the survey committee to conclude in the sycophancy of its more recent report, that "it will soon be possible to provide enough public hospital beds to meet the legitimate needs of this area." I would also like to ask if that reduction of approximately 80 in the anticipated deficit is what the government regards as a realistic attack on the problem.

Last year, the government increased the provincial grants for hospital construction and also provided provincial loans. Yet, when grants from all levels of government and the provincial loans are taken into account, 20 per cent of the cost of hospital construction, or about \$4,000 per bed in this area, still has to be raised from private charity. This is an outmoded concept. Experience to date indicates that it will not work.

If we are to avoid a serious shortage of hospital accommodation in Metro Toronto by 1970 and an even worse shortage by 1980, the federal, provincial and municipal governments together are going to have to cover the whole cost of constructing and equipping new hospitals and hospital extensions. Moreover, the basic initiative, at this stage, will have to come from the provincial level. The OHSC should immediately set up an agency to take overall responsibility for hospital accommodation in the Toronto area. It would be the responsibility of this agency to ensure both that the accommodation available in the area as a whole is adequate and what is equally important—although I have not had time to go into it at this stage—to ensure that that accommodation is properly distributed among the various regions in the area.

The survey committee, in part 20 of its report, recommended the establishment of a "co-ordinating council" in Metro Toronto. This is essentially what I am proposing here, but my proposal differs from the survey committee's in two respects:

1. The council should be financed by the OHSC, so that it will have a secure financial base and will not have to dissipate its energies going around with a tin cup—which is what the survey committee suggested;

2. It should not be a purely advisory body as the survey committee apparently envisaged. We have already had enough talk about the hospital problem in Metro Toronto; it is now time for action. The council should naturally consult with hospital boards, municipal authorities and other interested parties, but in the last analysis, it should, in my opinion, have clear-cut authority to act.

I have one further note on this point, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest that if, as a result of the forthcoming Goldenberg report, overlapping of municipal authority in Metro Toronto should be significantly reduced, I would propose that the council I am talking about should become an agency of the Metropolitan Toronto council. In the meantime, however, the OHSC should get the ball rolling by setting it up for the present as a provincial agency. I do not think we can wait for Goldenberg's report and then for the implementation of whatever proposals may be contained in that report. I believe that we have to move in and do a lot more than has been done up to now in meeting this crisis that the survey committee envisaged back in 1963.

It is, I suggest to the hon. Minister and to the House, a crisis that continues to exist. There has been a certain amount of progress made but such progress has, shall I say, merely compensated for the padding in the survey committee's estimates of 1963. When one takes the net figures, one finds that the reasonable anticipation of the deficit of hospital beds in 1970 is not significantly different from that which the survey committee indicated in 1963. I would, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, remind the House that the survey committee regarded that anticipated deficit as having the character of an emergency.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make on vote 714. I am just pursuing the remarks made by my hon. friend about the hospital situation, but at this time I would like to talk about the hospital situation in the Ottawa area.

I would like the hon. Minister to inform

this House about the plans he has, or the OHSC has, for the construction of additional facilities for hospital beds in the Ottawa area. Mr. Chairman, the Ontario hospital services commission published a report dated December 16, 1964, which made very specific recommendations in this respect. If my information is accurate nothing has been done to implement these recommendations six months after the report has been published.

I know it will take some years before these recommendations are fully implemented. I believe, however, the plan of action should be told to all interested parties. The hon. Minister is well aware of the fact that one of the big problems is the need to provide teaching facilities in connection with Ottawa University medical school.

I would like to read into the record a paragraph which specifies the roles of the hospital in Ottawa and I quote:

In addition to the national defence medical centre, two other hospitals, the Ottawa civic hospital and the Ottawa general, are university-teaching hospitals. These hospitals have special need to subserve their teaching functions and these will be assessed in the light of the recent provincial announcement regarding assistance to medical schools and teaching hospitals. The assessment is not dealt with in detail in the study.

Mr. Chairman, as several hospitals are involved, together with the Ottawa University medical school, would it be too much to expect the Ontario hospital services commission to set up a committee to study the needs of the area? I would also suggest that in view of the urgency of the problem that this be done without delay.

To prove my point about this matter, I would like to quote a news item appearing in the *Ottawa Journal* on March 11, 1965. This was in connection with a speech given to the Ottawa Richelieu club by Dr. J. J. Laurier and was headed in the *Ottawa Journal* of that date: "Needed—Hospital Help." I will not read the entire report, but I think there are parts of this report which should be read into the record. They begin this way:

Before even thinking of building new hospitals in Ottawa, the city should think of subsidizing all existing hospitals, not only the civic. Municipal grants could help in getting better utilization of existing hospital beds in this city.

This goes along with the remarks made by the previous speaker about having to obtain funds through charity to build hospitals or to increase their facilities.

So said Dr. J. J. Laurier, medical director of the Ottawa general hospital, Wednesday, before the Richelieu club.

Dr. Laurier said the cost of a children's hospital was much higher than the \$20,000 to \$30,000 per bed cost of construction of a general hospital. He said the public should seriously consider advantages of aiding financially all hospitals before going ahead with the advance of millions of dollars spent on new hospitals.

There are two or three paragraphs that I would like to read here:

Dr. Laurier suggested a campaign aimed at a better utilization of existing hospital beds which could drastically reduce the burden of taxes. There is no reason, he said, why the bed occupancy in Ottawa should drop on weekends from 100 per cent to 80 per cent. What we need is a seven-day-a-week hospital occupancy 365 days a year.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I have said enough about this matter. I am sure that the hon. Minister would like to give me some explanation, and give this House some explanation, about what is going on in the Ottawa area regarding construction of new hospital beds and construction of new facilities in existing hospitals.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, in attempting to answer the hon. member I shall try to deal first of all with the state of hospital construction in Metro Toronto.

I am not even going to attempt to sort out the difference between the figures given by the hon. member for Humber and the hon. member for Woodbine. I will simply outline the actual figures, which will be the net increase in the number of beds which will come about from building that is now under way, planning that is either out for contract or is approved by the commission and the dates on which these additional beds are likely to be made available for actual use within Metro Toronto.

Wellesley hospital 327 beds in 1966, this will increase the capacity of Wellesley to 586. In 1967 Toronto Western will add 80 beds to bring it to 862. Women's College hospital will add 152 beds to bring it to 411. North York General will build 518 beds, completely new. York General will build 200 beds, completely new. Scarborough General will add 240 beds to bring it to 580 beds. Scarborough Centenary will build 480 beds, new. Baycrest will build 93 beds, new.

In 1968 Sunnybrook will add 550 beds to

bring the total to 1,437. Now it is understood there that on a certain number of those beds veterans will be given prior claim to their use, but that does not mean to say that the beds will be left standing vacant. I am quite sure that my hon. friend knows the procedure that is followed in the case of workmen's compensation.

Mr. Bryden: It was taken into account by the survey committee.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But the 550 beds are completely new, they are not there now. The 887 are.

Mount Sinai will add 181 beds to bring it to 554. Northwestern General will add 100 beds to bring it to 348. Grace hospital will add 110 beds to bring it to 229. The Central hospital will add 102 beds to bring it to 175.

Fenway General hospital has just been given approval to build 300 beds, completely new. In 1969 Etobicoke will build 425 beds, completely new. Humber Memorial will add 100 beds to bring it to 413.

This, according to my rather questionable mathematics, Mr. Chairman, amounts to 3,958 additional beds. According to our—

Mr. Bryden: How many again?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That was 3,958, you had better check my addition because I added it rather hurriedly and I did not have a computer.

According to our relation of the total beds then available in Metro Toronto to the projected population, there should be a statistical surplus of 530 at least. I think that the confusion in the Sunnybrook figure was that the survey considered there were 887 available now, the additional 550 will be completely new beds.

The co-ordinating council, which the hon. member mentioned, is already in process of being established. It will be financed in the first instance by OHSC as I announced in this House on March 17. What its future will be may very well be dependent, in some measure, upon the report that comes before government relative to affairs in Metro Toronto. But we believe that this is a sound principle and we accepted this recommendation. Indeed, I believe we discussed this recommendation when we were questioned by the survey committee, as the staff of the OHSC had been advocating this regionalization for some time—and actually have regionalizing projects underway throughout the province of Ontario, in certain areas of hospital administration and service.

Mr. Chairman, relative to the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa East, I would say to him—and I am quite sure he knows the hospital situation in Ottawa has been under study: They asked the commission to make a study of the existing hospital facilities and the needs, and the report of that study, it is expected, will be submitted to the city council who asked for the report, in the very near future.

At the present time, we believe there should be, and we will be recommending that there should be, a university hospital of 400 beds as a part of the health sciences centre. I think my hon. friend will have knowledge of, and appreciate, some of the difficulties inherent in this until very recently. All of these have, of course, disappeared now.

Riverside is being built, as I am quite sure he knows. It is on schedule, within a matter of a month or so, and will provide 300 new beds. Ottawa Civic, I think he also knows, has been given the approval for 75 additional children's beds. The Ottawa General is in discussion with us, I believe, at the present time, relative to a very large programme of renovation and updating of services. There are very extensive gaps in the service areas and these are to receive a good deal of attention. I have it now on good authority that the Salvation Army's Grace hospital is likely to begin building this fall, will increase its capacity from 75 beds to 200, and will become a general hospital.

As far as the seven-day week is concerned, this is a matter that concerns a great many people in the hospital business. I have often said that people do not get sick on schedule; they cannot. But, nevertheless, we encourage the utilization of the hospital over seven days.

Now, this is the responsibility of the board; we cannot order them to do it, and they do not seem to find it possible to put in a seven-day schedule, other than for emergencies on Saturdays and Sundays. But this is the privilege and responsibility of the board and the only response it would get from us would be hearty encouragement.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: How can he expect the hospital boards to operate seven days a week when, in actual fact, the OHSC does not allow them to use the wage shift differential for nurses? I know that the OHSC says, "We let the board decide what they want to do." But the truth of the matter is that, in its budget, the OHSC allows only so much money for the nurses' wages. If they spend it on the wage

differential for an evening shift, or for a weekend shift, it means the hospital board has that much less money to spend on the nurses during the regular shift.

The wage shift differential, I believe, is used in Saskatchewan, in British Columbia, and in Quebec—and I think it is used in about 94 per cent of the public hospitals where nurses are working in the United States, and yet here we insist that the wage differential cannot be used. This is in the actual operation of the OHSC; the use is stopped. Technically, you say they can do it, but in fact they cannot, and I would like to know why the OHSC turns such a blind eye.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is most interesting to listen to the hon. member, but I do not believe that the refusal to use a shift differential is stopping the seven-day week. But I will say this: If my hon. friend can bring proof to me that this is so, I will guarantee to him that we will take another long look at this and probably change our ways; but he has got to be able to prove to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the reason why the hospitals are not on a seven-day week. And I am quite certain he will find I am right and he is wrong.

Mr. Trotter: There are some hospitals in this area which want to expand. True, they cannot start anything new and do it in a mass form, but at least they should try a pilot project; and some hospitals wanted to try it. It is simply common sense. You run a hospital just like a plant. It is there seven days in the week, and the main reason they cannot operate it is the need for the nurses, and also other staff, to work on weekends. Obviously you have to do something to encourage people to work on Sundays and Saturdays, or in the evenings, when they normally do not want to do it. Certainly, there are hospital boards in this province which have been turned down flat; and one of them is right in the Toronto area.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is not so. I say this unequivocally. We are quite prepared—I will say this to you, sir, publicly and in front of the hon. members of this assembly—if any hospital board comes to us and says they want to try this on an experimental basis, to go along with it. This is the opportunity for them to rise to the offer.

Mr. Trotter: I am glad to hear you say this, because I have raised this either in committee or in the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We sat across the table from that board.

Mr. Trotter: This is the first time I have heard you say that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My people sat across the table from that board and did not—

Mr. Trotter: I am glad to see you move that much, but it just shows that, in the course of time, if you keep pushing something, you might get—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We have already offered it to them.

Mr. Trotter: While I am on my feet with regard to the shortage of hospital beds, I would like to clarify this situation of the centennial grants for the building of any public project. The hon. Minister did make an announcement that he was going to encourage the use of centennial grants for the building of hospitals. As you recall, there is a type of grant where the federal government will put up a third, the province will put up a third, and the municipality a third; and the hon. Minister of Health said he would encourage hospitals owned by municipalities to build hospitals, extend hospitals, or add a wing, in celebration of Confederation.

I would like to know if, when the hon. Minister said the hospitals that were owned by the municipality, he meant any general hospital here in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I would have to ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) to lay down the ground rules. I do not make the rules relative to Centennial grants, but it is my understanding that the property must be vested in the name of the municipality. It would therefore have to be a municipally owned hospital, not one in the municipality.

However, I would again ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs for a ruling on this matter; but I would like to point out to the hon. member that he may not be completely wrong, but he is not exactly right either, in that the municipalities will pay one-third, and the two levels of government will each pay one-third. That is up to \$1 per capita—remember that. In certain municipalities that might be a very small amount of money. For instance, in my municipality they would not get enough money to build one bed.

In the city of Toronto, for instance, if the city were disposed to give all of its available money for this centenary project to a hospital, it would amount to quite a large

sum; but would they be willing to give that all to one hospital? And there are no civic hospitals in Toronto, I do not believe—

Mr. Trotter: There are only 24 in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Whether they would give it to a board of a public general hospital or not, I do not know, but we have no objection. Wherever they get their share of the financing, we will support it with the statutory grant.

Mr. Trotter: I would expect, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister of Health would try to encourage this, because the rules, as laid down by the federal government, really depend on what the province does. In other words, if the province said that any hospital in Ontario, and the provincial government approved of a particular hospital proceeding with the project, then it is fine with the federal government. So, really, it is up to the department of the hon. Minister. And if you look to the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), who is supposed to be laying the ground rules, certainly you, as Minister of Health, interested in the expansion of hospitals, have every reason to encourage this type of building. It is certainly better to put up a good hospital than some monument that is not of any use. A hospital is one of the most important things we can build and I am sorry that the hon. Minister and the government as a whole have not taken more of an interest in it, because last April when I asked this question before the orders of the day, there was so much confusion as to whom to ask that I got the general impression that the government had not even heard of federal grants. The next thing I knew—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I explained last April to the hon. member that the centennial grants were the responsibility of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I discussed this matter with him. It is rather strange that he did not have an application for one hospital project. He had applications for a great variety and number of other projects, but not for one hospital project throughout the whole province.

Mr. Trotter: Well, after all, you are the Minister and I think it comes from the energy and drive of the Minister of Health to see to it that things are done, because I do not think that most of the hospitals or hospital boards if they heard of this matter, that it would even be done—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course, they have heard about it!

Mr. Trotter: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, you say, is the one who gives the answers. In the press you and the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information were quoted as the ones who were saying things, because I know that when I made my inquiries there was great confusion on the government bench. I was of the opinion then, as I am now, that at that time, you had not heard it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back to the figures that the hon. Minister rhymed off a few minutes ago with regard to hospital construction in this area. As I mentioned earlier, one of the difficulties we are always up against is that every official or quasi-official statement made on this subject does not harmonize with the previous one, and it is a little hard to sort some of the things out. I jotted the hon. Minister's figures down as best I could when he was reading them out. I would like to take one for an example: the Salvation Army Grace hospital. As I have it, he stated that it is now definite that a 110-bed extension will be constructed on that hospital. Was I right in that?

When did this come into the category of the definite, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The report I have is dated May 6, 1965; the report from which I quoted my figures is dated May 6, 1965.

Mr. Bryden: What happened between the time of the speech of the hon. member for Humber, when he said in regard to the Grace hospital extension, there was no planning for this expansion at the present time? What brought it from simply a good idea into the realm of a practical project that is to be completed in the reasonably near future?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot begin to say what happened. A possibility is that the final approval had not been passed by the commission. I do not recall when the hon. member made this speech, but actually, Mr. Chairman, what does it matter? The fact is that this is the official record extracted from the official records of the Ontario hospital services commission and it is dated May 6, 1965.

I can tell you that since that time, Etobicoke general hospital, for instance, has agreed upon—

Mr. Bryden: You have it in your figures already—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And Fenway general hospital—

Mr. Bryden: You have them both in right now, so apparently they were anticipated when the figures you just gave were drawn up. Yours are larger than those read by the hon. member for Humber with respect to Etobicoke. The reason I am asking these questions, Mr. Chairman, relates to the problem that I have been talking about all along. We keep getting announcements, announcements, announcements. And projects that would appear quite definite, we find later are not definite at all, and sometimes we are told in advance that they are not definite. But there are so many conflicting stories that I would like to get a clear-cut answer on what the hon. Minister bases his announcements—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. January 19 was the statement of the Salvation Army hospital, which I gave to this House and which the hon. member is quoting. The later figures which the hon. Minister of Health gave you tonight are from the report of May 6. Certainly, in three months there has been progress made. What I said was that a possibility has now become an actual reality.

Mr. Bryden: When did you say that?

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I am saying it now!

Mr. Bryden: Well, you see I do not think it is sufficient, Mr. Chairman, to have these vague statements. I am not quite sure when it was that the hon. member made his statement—

Mr. W. B. Lewis: January 19.

Mr. Bryden: January 19. Well, I want to know just what steps have been taken since, because on January 19, according to the hon. member for Humber, there was hardly even a possibility—there was a project that had been hanging fire for a long time.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: It was in the planning stage, and I said so.

Mr. Bryden: No, you did not.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I will read it to you, if you like.

Mr. Bryden: I have already said that you said that there was no planning for this at the present time. You see, that is the problem. That is what the hon. gentlemen opposite call "being in the planning stage." There is no planning so that is what is called "the planning stage."

However, Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no point at this stage of trying to sort out the figures. It took quite a while while to sort out the figures presented by the hon. member for Humber. Now an entirely new, substantially inconsistent set of figures has suddenly been presented to us by the hon. Minister. It is going to take a little time to sort them out and analyze them. This is probably not the place to try to do it. I can assure the hon. Minister that I will do it, nevertheless. I hope that his announcement creates the rosy situation that he claims. I will postpone judgment until I can get the opportunity to go through the thing and find out how much padding there is in it.

I do not quite understand why he thinks that 3,958 will create a statistical surplus, when essentially the same number a few years ago was going to "just meet the need." However, that is another matter I will investigate when I have an opportunity.

It is unfortunate, though, that we could not have these figures presented to us in a consistent, coherent way that is comparable with previous—

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): You have said that four times.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): He said you have said that four times.

Mr. Bryden: Well, if the hon. member has anything to say, I suggest that he say it.

Mr. Letherby: We realize now what you are hammering at, so let go.

Mr. Bryden: Well, if you realize it, I agree that the point must now be very clear.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that in future, statistics on this matter should be presented in a consistent way from period to period. Also we should have full documentation and not merely have the hon. Minister rhyme off a lot of figures.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 714.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of OHSC policy and its effect on the operation of our general hospitals, that I would like to raise. To my mind, it is the most distressing aspect of our whole hospital system in the province of Ontario.

I have raised quite a number of cases, which I am sure the hon. Minister will recall, of people who suddenly are discharged from our active treatment hospitals on the argument that they no longer require the advanced kind of treatment that an active treat-

ment type of hospital can provide, that their needs can be met in a chronic hospital or even in a nursing home. The hon. Minister will recall one case. Quite frankly I am almost tempted to go back and spend a day or two to dig through my files, because it really represents a hair-raising tale.

A gentleman, 78 years of age, whose wife, 81, had had one or two heart attacks. She was completely incapable of looking after herself, would never be able to walk again or to feed herself again. Suddenly it was decided in a certain hospital in the Metropolitan area that she no longer required the treatment—this was a chronic hospital—and she was going to be sent home. Now, there was a great deal of negotiation between OHSC and the hospital because of a sharp disagreement between the doctors in the hospital and the family doctor. I will be fair and say the family doctor of years ago before she went in, because a family doctor ceases to become a family doctor, apparently, when a person goes into one of these hospitals; and one of the doctors in the hospital, in effect, becomes the attending physician for that person.

But what happened in this instance was that finally she was pushed out, the old gentleman had to run around this city to try to find an alternative. There was no effort at all on the part of the hospital to seek an alternative to place this person. There was a long and confused administrative tangle between OHSC and the hospital, even after OHSC had said they would meet the bill for the extended period while they were reviewing the case.

To add insult to injury, the hospital continued to bill this old gentleman, who was living on nothing but pension, for something like a year or a year and a half afterwards, up to and including lawyers' letters, when we had been told and assured each time we called that the hospital services commission had said they would cover the bill. The fact of the matter is the money had not come through to the hospital. The hospital was protecting itself. Until it got the money from the OHSC it was going to continue to fire out bills, which it did.

The amount of distress to this old gentleman, the amount of fear, unnecessary fear, when he was faced with a seven or eight hundred dollar bill which he had no means to cope with, was tragic within his little world. Trying to cope with it was nothing short of tragic.

This is only one of many cases. When I first raised some of these cases with the

hon. Minister he was disturbed about them and was going to examine the policy and see if there was not some more humane way of meeting this kind of situation.

As I understand it, the government gives grants to hospitals for nurses whose job it is in part—not only nurses but social work nurses if I may use the term, I do not know what the exact term is—the responsibility of these people is to find alternative accommodation at whatever level it is deemed to be adequate when a person is going to be discharged, either from a general hospital or a chronic hospital. I want to ask the hon. Minister what the situation is. If you are giving grants, then presumably these grants place an obligation on the hospitals to do something more than suddenly announce to patients that as of such-and-such a date they are out and what they do is their own business. They cannot do anything, perhaps the only friends they have are almost as incapacitated as themselves, but they have to look after themselves.

On the second point I know the hon. Minister will reply to me that the decision rests with the medical board or doctors or whatever group it is within the hospital that makes the decision in the first instance or whatever group can review it. But I cannot chase out of my mind the feeling that the decisions that are made are completely inconsistent one with another.

I visited the particular hospital from which this 81-year-old lady was discharged. I grant you I am only a layman. I walked up and down and saw people there and listened to their stories of what their problems were, how long they had been there and so on. It struck me that some of them who were continuing to remain in the hospital were certainly no longer in need of hospital treatment; yet they were staying and this person was being put out.

I have a case, the details of which I will not go into, of a person who was in Humber Memorial hospital. This patient went out, but was going to go into a chronic hospital. In the chronic hospital they will be covered by OHSC. However, in other instances, patients will not be taken by the chronic hospital and they have to go into a nursing home. Some cases in the nursing homes can be covered, other cases cannot be covered by OHSC. They may have paid for all the time that the Ontario hospital services commission is in operation, yet in these elder years there is no place for them to go except out into a nursing home where they have to meet the full charge on the limited means that these people may have.

Now, my questions to the hon. Minister

are: Some clarification as to, what is the obligation on a hospital if it is in receipt of grants for nurses, part of whose function it is to find alternatives? Further, if they are not in receipt of grants for nurses who have these responsibilities, is there any obligation on the hospital at all, or can they in a sort of a callous, strictly business fashion say: "Out you go and what happens to you is of no concern to ourselves"?

Putting it more broadly than these specific cases—has the government or has the hon. Minister, given any consideration to expanding the number of institutions, whether it be chronic hospitals or nursing homes or some new kind of institution, where you can get, not active treatment hospital care but the necessary care for people who are at advanced years, or who are recuperating from an illness and do not now require all the facilities of an active treatment hospital? Has the hon. Minister considered any alternative policy and the economic advisability of building a range of alternative facilities so that you can perhaps move out, even more quickly if you had these alternative facilities, from our overcrowded active treatment hospitals at the present time?

There are many other aspects of which the hon. Minister is as aware as I am. I will not go into any more detail, but I would certainly request his comment on the whole situation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that the hon. member has discussed with me privately. I am not the least bit backward in saying it is an area in which we hold common concerns and some common views. This is unusual, and I hope my hon. friend will not consider it a precedent. Nonetheless, I am proud to hold common views with him on this matter.

I would say, first of all, that we do not pay grants to the hospitals for this service, but there are allowable costs. If the hospital wants to have on its staff social service nurses this is accepted as an allowable cost of the operation of the hospital. It is not by way of a grant, it is by way of a recognized cost of doing business.

All of the hospitals do not have them but it is encouraged, and again, I suppose, they are faced with the problem that all who need social service people may not be able to get them. But here is an area where I do not altogether agree that a highly skilled social service person is necessary. Finding a suitable place for the patient to go need not demand university or equivalent training.

I would feel that a hospital that does have on its staff social service nurses should feel

an obligation to make certain that patients who cannot go home are well placed. I would think that this is one of the duties, this should be one of the duties, of the social service department, to make certain that adequate and suitable accommodation has been found for those people who cannot go to their own homes.

Where the hospital has not got staff of this kind I suppose one would be right in saying there is no obligation upon them. I think that the attending physician should feel some obligation to be sure that everything possible has been done to enhance his patient's chances of successful recovery, or recovery as successful as is possible.

This is, as I have explained to the hon. member, a difficult and grave area. It must be puzzling, it is puzzling to me sometimes, to see patients who are kept in the hospital vis-à-vis those who are sent out. Even I would have great difficulty in understanding the reasons, and I can understand how a lay person would have even greater difficulty. There may be clinical reasons which are not evident to the naked eye which the attending physician notes; and of course I have to repeat that the decision to discharge or admit a patient is the responsibility, and must remain the responsibility, of the physician. Yet again, I do repeat and agree with my hon. friend that it is difficult to understand.

Have we given thought of some alternative? Yes, we have, and our home care programme is in part geared to meet this need. We recognize also that there are other needs and we have submitted proposals to the federal government to discuss with us the extension of the programme to see if we can put any definition on this gray area.

For instance, we know that certain doctors discharge patients from long-stay institutions because they believe that nothing further can be done for them. I do not believe that was ever the thinking behind the plan. I believe the thinking was that when there was no longer any medical necessity for the patient to be in hospital, it was time for them to be discharged. There are many patients who should be in hospital, for whom nothing can be done, but whose medical necessity demands that they should be in a hospital. We have had very friendly, very open, and frank discussions with the staff of The Department of National Health and Welfare on this matter, and I believe it is one of the matters that is expected to be discussed at the upcoming conference. We have met them twice, I think, since the last session of

our Legislature, on this matter, and have been in correspondence with them on it. I expect that this is a matter to be discussed more fully.

I can only say, at this time, that this is all I have to go on. I hope that we can find an area of agreement where this can be broadened and some more generous definition of the—

Mr. MacDonald: Just use the word "humane" and that will cover it all.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —humane method of dealing with the people who fall in this very broad gray area.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to return to one other phase of the question of the latest revised figures on hospital construction in the Toronto area. The one I want to inquire about, I think, is worth trying to get cleared up, because it is the largest figure of any which have been presented at any time; that is the so-called additional 550 beds at Sunnybrook. I think we will be on common ground if I say that those 550 beds do not represent actual new construction. They are there on the ground at the moment. Sunnybrook hospital has always been a hospital of 1,453 beds, and I do not believe it is going to become a hospital of 2,000 beds. I hope not anyway.

The situation, as I have understood it, is this: There are 1,453 beds at Sunnybrook, and the survey committee in 1963 was of the opinion that 887 of those could be released fairly readily for the general public, and that another 100 might be released, leaving about 550 for the use of veterans from this area and from outside the area.

What I want to know is: When the hon. Minister said 550 beds additional at Sunnybrook, is he talking about the 550 that the survey committee considered would have to be reserved for veterans? If so what happens to the veterans?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The federal government, in the transfer of this property, if you will recall, undertook to build a domiciliary care unit for domiciliary care veterans who are now resident in Sunnybrook hospital. This will take care of 300. This will provide 300 completely new places, so it would be akin to having 300 beds; 250 beds are to be gained by moving out additional cases and renovating the area of the hospital now occupied by them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago I had occasion to

bring to the attention of the hon. member for Humber a problem concerning a hospital services commission employee. She had separated from the service because of what was termed voluntary retirement—she had become pregnant and she had to leave her job. She felt this was unfair and, on inquiry, I was able to ascertain that the civil service which works for the government is treated in quite a different way; but the employees of the hospital services commission apparently work under a separate set of rules.

It seems a little foolish to me to have two sets of employees working for government, or for government agencies, who work under different rules and regulations. I wonder what, if anything, the hon. Minister proposes to have done about this.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The only thing I can say to the hon. member is that this is the policy followed by the commission, and has been one of their employment practices since they began to operate. Since their staff is not under The Public Service Act, I presume it was considered the right of the commission to decide what personnel matters should be. This is one of them, and I have not discussed it with the commission. This is the first I have heard of it, I believe, although I believe something was mentioned to me just in passing. But I have not discussed it with them, therefore I cannot say any more about it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I spoke to the hon. member for Humber about it. He made available to me a copy of the letter he presented to the commission. He shared the view I have just presented, and his letter made that abundantly clear, but the commission apparently did not. I would think that the government looks very foolish in helping to establish two sets of rules, one for a group which happens to work in a particular building and gets its cheques from one source, and another for a group which happens to work in another building. If it is good enough for the people who work in this building, why is it not good enough for the people who work for the hospital services commission?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a further question relative to this matter? Does the situation that I believe used to exist continue to exist, where the confusion was even worse than that suggested by the hon. member for Downsview, namely, that some employees of the hospital services commission came under The Civil Service Act and some of them did not? It

was not only that the hospital services commission was differentiated from the government as a whole, but there were some within the commission who were one way and some who were the other. Is that still the situation?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The ones who joined the staff from The Department of Health continued the privileges and benefits they had under The Public Service Act. The rest of the staff, a very large number of them, as you know, were taken over—former employees of the then existing Blue Cross. This apparently was the practice in their organization, and the practice was continued as part of the personnel policies of the commission.

I can only undertake, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this at greater length and in more detail. It is impossible to discuss it with my staff and come to any decision as to what shall form the basis of future policy, but I will undertake to discuss it with the commission and probably have something more definite to report to the House.

Mr. Singer: Can we perhaps get the hon. Minister to the point where he might agree that it is logical that people working for government, no matter which particular label they happen to wear, should have the same sort of working conditions and fringe benefits?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think my personal views are very well known in this matter. I do not believe that anybody working for any emanation of government should be anything but under The Public Service Act.

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly glad to hear that from the hon. Minister. I think that is a hopeful statement. I was a little surprised when he indicated—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is no surprise. I have made this clear for a long, long time.

Mr. Bryden: No, no, I am not surprised about that statement. I am glad to hear that. But I was a little surprised when the hon. Minister indicated that this was a matter he had not considered before. I have recollections of it being discussed in this House at least once in the past two or three years. I tried to raise it, I may say, with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) under the estimates of the civil service commission, but the government insisted I was out of order at that time.

This is one agency, and I would suggest the hon. Minister take this up with the gov-

ernment as a whole. There are a number of agencies whose employees are out from under The Civil Service Act, and the Ontario hospital services commission is one of them. I agree with the statement of principle made by the hon. Minister—that they are all public servants and that they all should be treated equally. I hope that policy will be made effective, because I think that right now the differences involved are not for the benefit of the employees.

One of the factors involved is that they do not get the normal representation of the civil service association and such benefits, such as they may be, of collective bargaining, and so on—in the sort of half-baked way it is carried on here. They do not get any of that benefit. This is true not only of the Ontario hospital services commission; it is true of several other rather large agencies.

If there are problems relating to the conditions of employment in the civil service which create difficulties for the Ontario hospital services commission, then I would suggest that the matter be straightened out by removing rigidities in the civil service. We have often heard complaints that employment conditions in the civil service are too rigid; well, they should not be rigid. On the other hand, there should be consistent personnel policies. I do not believe there are consistent personnel policies actually in the Ontario hospital services commission, and certainly the policies are not consistent with those in the rest of the public service and it is time something was done about it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, if I may intervene by saying a word on another subject which has to do with hospitals—and I approach this subject from the point of view of the efficiency of our hospitals and the maximizing of the optimum care that hospitals give our people.

The hon. Minister of Health, the hon. gentleman in charge of this department, should not get the feeling after these many protracted days of debate in which he has been so intimately concerned, that all of us over here think he is all that bad because we do not. I can tell him that the *Sudbury Star*, for example, which is even more arch-Tory than the *Globe and Mail*—if that is possible—would not have printed that editorial of this morning. The *Sudbury Star*, on the contrary, if they printed an editorial about the hon. Minister of Health would have congratulated him on the changing of the Sudbury-Algoma sanatorium into a mental hospital unit. A portion of it has been turned into a hospital for the care of the mentally ill and that was

just about the most progressive step that has taken place in the treatment of mental illness in northern Ontario in the last two decades. I just wish the hon. Minister was listening to these fulsome praises I am heaping on him, but he is so busy he cannot hear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sopha: I was speaking, sir, about the alteration of the Sudbury-Algoma sanatorium unit for the treatment of the mentally ill. One of the results has been—and I look at the hon. Minister from Cochrane South (Mr. Spooner) when I say this—one of the significant results is that we now have three psychiatrists in northeastern Ontario. For many years there was only one who served all the area, right from the French River through to the Hudson Bay watershed where salt water laps at the shores of Ontario. Now we have three all in the city of Sudbury, and there has been a great change in the care of people suffering from mental illness. One bears in mind that there was a report of this government as long ago as 1951, I believe. I have that report, a very compendious volume, which recommended treatment of mental illness on a clinical basis, an outpatient basis. I am sorry I cannot use the jargon of exactitudes that my friend, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) can, but I hope to get my point across. Now, 14 years later, that has come about. This clinic or hospital outpatient services in the Sudbury-Algoma sanatorium is functioning very smoothly and is a very welcome increment to the standards of medical care for our people.

But that was not what I rose to speak about. I wanted to speak about this business of collective bargaining for nurses. I had the privilege, I think it was back in January or February, of speaking to about 200 young ladies of very comely attributes, all of them nurses, who invited me to come and address them on the subject of collective bargaining. They were very charming young ladies, I must say, clean-cut and handsome of mien.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Stick to the subject.

Mr. Sopha: One felt that they were babes in the woods in this maelstrom of collective bargaining. One got the impression that they did not really know much about the ins and outs of it and how it might affect future employment in the hospitals of our province.

However, a bill was presented to the hon. gentleman some months ago—

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Is this still on this vote?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, this has to do with hospitals, collective bargaining in hospitals, where most of these young ladies are employed. The bill has gone astray; the hon. Minister told us this morning that it had been put up to the government, and there he ended his sentence without any hint whatsoever of what has befallen it in the hands of the government.

I would beg leave to say that I think the nurses made two mistakes. The first was, I think, that they were utterly wrong in presenting their bill to the hon. Minister of Health. And I will say this as a categorical statement, that I do not really think that the subject of collective bargaining in hospitals is really basically any of the hon. Minister of Health's business, it is the business of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). The hon. Minister of Labour is the person in charge of the labour relations in this province and I need only cite that it would be a ridiculous assertion to make that teachers in their collective bargaining with school boards would have to go through the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), which, of course—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They do.

Mr. Sopha: They do not, they do not get the right to bargain collectively from the hon. Minister of Education and the point I am making—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is under their own Act.

Mr. Sopha: The point I am making is this, that I do not see any difference between any groups in our society in having the right to bargain collectively. I say that it is a fundamental right of any person in employment to bargain through representatives of his own choosing in regard to his wages, working conditions, terms of his employment and all the ancillary matters connected with his working for any specific employer. I feel that, in order to present their case to the government properly, the person to whom they should have presented their demands for collective bargaining, was the hon. Minister of Labour. It is the hon. Minister of Labour in charge of that statute, The Labour Relations Act, who has excluded nurses from the rights to bargain collectively.

I think the second mistake they made—and I say this in all respect to their executive and leaders—the second mistake was that they mentioned in their draft statute the

function of the Ontario hospital services commission to revise the rates in regard to hospitals, to take care of any increases in wages that nurses might win at the collective bargaining table. I think that was wrong, because I do not think it is really the responsibility of the nurses to tell the government how the money will be raised, to tell them of any increased benefits that they might win through the process of collective bargaining.

And I suspect—and that is all we may go on, suspicion—that it was this reference to the Ontario hospital services commission that got the back of the government up or perhaps alerted the commission itself in such a way that the commission made its views known to the government, that "we will have to think about this for a period of time, we will have to think of the effect of a province-wide increase in wages or salaries, if you wish, to nurses, and what that will mean in terms of the per diem rate of people using our hospitals and the responsibility of the OHSC for its share." That is my suspicion. But then again, these are mere matters of detail. If you believe that the person in his employment has the right to bargain through the representatives of his own choosing in regard to his work, then really all the rest becomes a mere matter of detail.

I have said before in the House, and it bears repeating, that our statute, The Labour Relations Act, the governing statute for the conduct of relations between worker and employer in the province, does not, like the Wagner Act in the United States, carry a ringing declaration by way of preamble, about the fundamental right of the worker to bargain collectively. The Wagner Act begins by—I was spending some time trying to find that reference in an earlier *Hansard*, so I could read that declaration, but the hon. Minister of Labour is familiar with it. It begins, I believe, by saying it is the policy of the United States of America that workers shall have the inalienable right to bargain collectively concerning their hours of work, pay, safety, terms of employment, and all ancillary matters through representatives of their own choosing.

Now, I ask rhetorically, can you discriminate against nurses? They have come to the point where they are dissatisfied with the manner of carrying out their responsibilities to the public. They are dissatisfied with the treatment apparently given to them by their employers. And really, the hon. Minister is offended, many are offended, when we say from this side as we have said before, that the real employer of nurses in the province is the Ontario hospital services commission.

The Ontario hospital services commission, it is plain for all to see, runs all the public hospitals in the province.

I would like to hear an answer. I hoped that the first citizen himself would be here tonight to tell us, because he speaks for the government. How then can you discriminate against these women in our society who wish now to forward their just and equitable claims, to be paid appropriately for the sacrifices and the work they do in the employment of the hospitals of our province?

Just one additional thing I would like to say. I was rather interested that our friends of the democratic left raised this earlier in the day. I expected, when this vote was called, that one of them was going to get up and say something about it right off. After all, they proclaim themselves to be the spokesmen of the working people of this province, of this country, if not the world. But they were strangely silent. I suspect, and I pass this on to them, that they have become a little disillusioned with forwarding the claims of the nurses; because shortly after the nurses made these moves toward the securing of the rights to bargain collectively, the Canadian labour congress—the socialist-oriented, New Democratic Party dominated Canadian labour congress—immediately set out to woo them, and that is a very apt word to use in respect of nurses. They set out to woo them. They wanted them immediately, before they had won the right to bargain collectively, they wanted them to undertake to come into the CLC.

Whether they do or not, I suppose, is none of our business. It may account, as I say, for the lack of enthusiasm among our hon. friends of the democratic left in regard to them. I just happen to have the opinion that one of the chief things wrong with the labour movement in this country—maybe it is a private opinion, however it is validly held and I do not mind stating it—is the emphasis of some of its leaders on political action.

An hon. member: It is a big mistake.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it is a big mistake. They should be devoting their energy, time, and talents to winning gains at the collective bargaining table, rather than running for Parliament. I venture to predict that now the salary is \$18,000 at Ottawa, every second union vice-president is going to run in the next election for the NDP. We shall wait and see.

Mr. MacDonald: You do not object to their political action—merely its direction.

Mr. Sopha: You should have been here during my earlier assertions. I am glad you are back.

Mr. MacDonald: I have been listening to you.

Mr. Sopha: I am glad you are back, because we want to hear from you; but then again, to redirect—

Mr. MacDonald: I am listening for the same reason I go to the circus.

Mr. Sopha: You know, you are a firm believer in the maxim that practical politics consist in ignoring the facts. Well, I have made my point.

Mr. MacDonald: You made it and you buried it.

Mr. Sopha: I would hope that, in the absence of the first citizen, perhaps the hon. Minister of Labour would enlighten us on what has befallen The Nurses' Collective Bargaining Act, 1965.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 714.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I will only speak very briefly in reply to what the hon. member has brought up at this time. It is quite true that the nurses brought their brief, and their proposed Act, which would give them the right to bargain collectively for their profession—and I would like to point out that it was their decision, their election, to submit it to the Minister of Health.

They submitted it to me for submission to the government. Since it was a matter to be submitted to the government, I submitted it to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts); and he, of course, naturally, since it was a labour matter, called in the hon. Minister of Labour for consultation, and the three of us met the executive of the registered nurses association of Ontario and discussed the matter fully.

I think the hon. Prime Minister put before them, as did also the hon. Minister of Labour, the considerations which were of greatest moment to the government in the proposals they made.

I would like, sir, to disabuse the mind of the hon. member that the reason, for what appears in his mind to be delay, had nothing to do with the clause in the Act that had reference to the Ontario hospital services commission changing the rates. As soon as this was drawn to the attention of their solicitor, just in passing, he recognized of course that no person writing a bill, other

than the government, had any right to make reference to any spending of public moneys. This had nothing to do with it at all.

But The Department of Labour is very much concerned, naturally, and the hon. Minister of Labour will doubtless speak for his own department. It is very plain to see, and to understand the view, that a matter of this importance had an impact on other areas of government responsibility and is not something that could be gone into lightly. The hon. member said something about the teachers. I think I am quite right in pointing out that the teachers do have their Act under the direction of the hon. Minister of Education.

I would just say also, sir, in passing, that I hope some day the hon. members will see how wrong they are in this belief that the Ontario hospital services commission run the nurses, or hire the nurses. We hire them in exactly the same way as The Department of Education hires the teachers. We provide the money that is used to pay them, but we have nothing to say with the terms of reference, or the work they do, or the duties they perform in the hospital. This is the responsibility of the board, and the administration of the hospital in question.

But I can assure the hon. member that his sinister fears, or his fears of sinister action, or his suspicions—and I am dreadfully exercised to see how suspicious my hon. friend tells me he is becoming, I think it is a very dangerous sign and I hope he will be able, in the calm of a summer vacation, to rid himself of those fears—are all quite groundless, in respect of this matter. It is a matter of great importance, having impact on other professions, just as it would have on nursing itself. And the hon. Minister of Labour, naturally, is bound to be much concerned about it, and I think he is in a much better position to discuss it than I am.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I just—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, what my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health, has just said, is the fact. The matter was referred to me, the bill which the nurses had submitted. Since it provides for—and actually it has been advanced by the registered nurses themselves; their draft bill, of course, takes care of their own organization and their own group of registered nurses.

The minute that this matter came up, there was opened up a whole new avenue of consideration as to the entire position of all other professional groups, leading, of course,

to a fairly major reconsideration of the Act itself. Then the question arose as to where you start and where you finish with professional organizations; and as recently as this afternoon, another group, an organized group, a degree-bearing group, approached me to make an appointment in the next couple of weeks or so to come and present their views insofar as they are concerned. I might say that the group which approached me this afternoon, while I have been aware of the nature of their employment and the qualifications required for that employment, quite frankly it never occurred to me that that particular group would seek to be treated as a separate group for this particular purpose.

However, that is the fact, and I think the fact that this group has taken that position corroborates the government's position in this matter—that the matter is one which requires pretty major and calm and careful consideration in order that, at an appropriate time, a full and complete report may be given to this House with respect to the matter. I do not think that the matter can be rushed; I think the matter merits, as do the individuals who belong to these various professional groups, the closest attention.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I have one or two incidental reflections before more specific matters. I do not wish to tangle with the hon. member for Sudbury. He is, of course, a recognized delight in this House. He occasionally gives revelations to this body, and certainly one of the most notable is that the New Democratic Party dominates the labour movement. From a man who derives from Sudbury that is a strange and interesting twist on the ancient adage.

Mr. Chairman, the incidental thoughts I had were these: I owe a clarification, if not an apology, to the hon. member for Humber for references in relation to hospital beds which I raised this afternoon. I think I would like to clarify the point. He was quite right in his statement, as he gave it to the House, that 44 psychiatric beds would be added to the Centenary hospital in Scarborough. What I was confused with was the mental care report in Metropolitan Toronto which says that 100 beds will be added for psychiatric purposes. Because of that confusion, I called the OHSC no more than 10 days or so ago and on their records the proposed addition still shows 44 beds. Again, I think the figures in this report may be inflated and though I bow to the hon. member opposite from one vantage point, I suggest to the hon. Minister

that we are again a further 56 beds short for psychiatric care. My original figure of 1,000, therefore, is smaller than it need have been.

The second thing I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, in relation to facts raised by my hon. colleague from Woodbine, was that this emphasis on private subscription as one of the major factors still available to underwrite hospitals is obviously an incorrect emphasis. I can be corrected in this, but I believe I am right in saying that the deadline for the sick children's hospital fund raising has passed and they have raised barely half the required money. For us to finance major parts of hospital expansion on this basis is patently unrealistic. None of the projected hospital bed programmes will come to recognizable fruition, unless the hon. Minister expands the methods of financing.

Mr. Chairman, the major point I want to raise at this stage, relates in particular to one of the things which my leader raised earlier this evening, namely, the matter of hospitals advising patients that they are to be discharged, in most instances quite validly—and having no onus on them to make alternative accommodation available. I want to raise certain questions, and I hold no brief for them. I think they are rather interesting and I think the House will be rather interested. I want to raise certain questions in relation to the case of Kirkor Horhoruni of St. Joseph's hospital—the visiting Turk in St. Joseph's hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to become embroiled in the usual sub judice rulings from the government, the way in which, alas, I suggest, we manage to circumvent important areas of discussion. Let me say right at the outset that I have discussed this with some legal friends because I am a layman and do not pretend to knowledge in these areas, I wanted to make sure that I was within the bounds of legislative propriety. As I understand it, there was an appeal from a court order directing Mr. Horhoruni to leave hospital and that is all that is presently before the courts. As a matter of fact, I think it is tomorrow morning, and I just want to raise some questions in relation to what happens to this man, or to people in a similar position when they leave hospital, regardless of how his departure was effected—whether it is a hospital discharge or a court order, or whether it is of his own avail. I simply want to lay some of the facts on the table and to ask the hon. Minister to answer certain questions about it, and I think that the hon. members may find it interesting.

It highlights, Mr. Chairman, certain dilemmas which the province of Ontario faces

in exercising judgment over discharged hospital patients. I have the following seven or eight points to lay before the House, and hon. members who are skilled in the languages of the far east or middle east will forgive me if I am not correctly pronouncing names.

Mr. Horhoruni came to Canada about two years ago on a medical visa lasting two years and expiring on July 23, 1965. The instance which brought him to Canada is contained in a letter under the letterhead, St. Joseph's hospital, entitled: "To Whom It May Concern" and containing the following material:

February 27, 1963

This is to certify that I have examined the x-rays of the above noted and have discussed this case with Dr. Paul Ackman and I have agreed that he requires—

"he" being Mr. Horhoruni:

—a bilateral arthroplasty of both hips and both knees, and for this reason I have agreed to his admission to St. Joseph's hospital in Toronto, Canada, to have these operative procedures carried out. His disability without operation, of course, is very serious indeed. The result of the planned operation should be satisfactory.

G. F. Pennal
Chief of Surgery
St. Joseph's Hospital.

So Mr. Horhoruni came here on perfectly valid medical grounds on a medical visa for a two-year period, expiring on July 23, 1965. That is the first point, Mr. Chairman.

The second point is that the very nature of such visas—and I find this rather interesting because I think there is no other parallel consideration—denies Mr. Horhoruni the right to any social security whatsoever, to any general welfare assistance, let us say, or to any social assistance of any kind, so that that particular avenue of recourse is totally removed from him. That is the second point.

The third point is that, despite some of the newspaper accounts and despite some of the things we have read, Mr. Horhoruni is, in fact, totally destitute. He has spent \$10,500 in the province of Ontario up to this point, for the purpose of two operations on his hip, and he has no further money whatsoever.

The fourth point is that the Turkish embassy in Canada is on record as saying that this is a Canadian problem to be looked after by the government of Canada or the province of Ontario.

The fifth point is that the Turkish government will not convert Turkish currency into

Canadian dollars to rescue Mr. Horhoruni for whatever financial reasons the Turkish government may have.

Sixth, Mr. Chairman, and I think very important, is that Mr. Horhoruni is a genuinely disabled person, unlike what one might have derived from a cartoon by MacPherson in the Toronto *Daily Star*. He is not waiting to be enticed from his bed by thinly veiled Turkish madames of the night. He is, in fact, a genuinely disabled person. I want to quote from the transcript of the original verbatim the following sections. I think they are rather interesting. The person who gives the answers is Dr. Pennal.

Q. Now would you agree that in the condition he is in now, in his physical condition, that he is unable to walk; when I say walk, walk normally?

A. Well, he will never walk normally.

Q. Never walk normally?

A. No, no matter what is done.

Q. For instance, he could never walk without crutches?

A. No.

Q. He could not now and probably never will be able to, in your opinion, is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. He would find it very difficult to walk with crutches?

A. Pardon?

Q. Find it very difficult to walk with crutches, I mean walk any distance?

A. Yes.

Q. You agree then, it is possible that he finds it very difficult and painful to move at present; there is a possibility, a strong possibility?

A. Yes. It is difficult for him to walk.

Q. He could not walk very lengthy distances?

A. No.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I would like to know from you, sir, just what this has to do with the estimates of my department. I can find no relationship between matters that appear to me to be the business of The Department of External Affairs of Canada and The Department of Health of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I shall come directly to it. This man is at present, for whatever duration of time, in St. Joseph's hospital in Toronto and that hospital falls within the Ontario hospital services commission and within this estimate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, not at all.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, let me go to one point further, Mr. Chairman, which I think will give basis to show that this is foursquare within these estimates.

In the intervening period of time, a very real effort was made on the part of the legal firm involved to find alternative accommodation for Mr. Horhoruni. And that, I think, brings it right back to the point my hon. leader was making earlier this evening. Very real efforts were made, and this can go far beyond the man in question. A series of letters, I shall not read the form letter into the record, was sent to a variety of homes requesting that some accommodation be provided for this man. Now let me read you the replies, and I have them photostated in front of me.

Hillcrest convalescent hospital reply sent to Day, Wilson, Campbell and Martin, in every instance the barristers and solicitors involved.

Without prejudice.

Re Mr. Kirkor Horhoruni.

Gentlemen:

We have your letter of May 25 and from the patient's history it would appear that you should make application to a hospital for the chronically ill. This hospital is equipped to look after convalescent patients or those needing short-term rehabilitation. All requests must come from a doctor. Accordingly it would appear that your application has come to the wrong hospital.

Yours very truly.

St. John's convalescent hospital:

Dear Sirs:

In reply to your letter of May 25 making inquiry regarding the possibility of the admission of Mr. Kirkor Horhoruni to this hospital, the matter has been referred to our admissions committee. The committee is of the opinion that Mr. Horhoruni is not eligible for convalescent care.

Yours very truly.

St. Bernard's convalescent hospital to one of the lawyers in the firm:

Dear Mr. Hogan:

In reply to your letter of May 25, I inform you that we regret not to be able to admit Mr. Kirkor Horhoruni as a patient here. Our hospital is for women only, and besides we have no vacancy.

I do not know what that "besides we have no vacancy" means. It may be an exotic hospital in the context of Mr. Horhoruni.

Sincerely yours, etc.

Providence hospital:

Gentlemen:

Thank you for your letter requesting if a bed would be available for Mr. Horhoruni by the 31 of May. We are sorry but we do not have any vacancies.

Yours truly.

Our Lady of Mercy hospital.

Re Mr. Kirkor Horhoruni.

Replying to your inquiry regarding the above patient we beg to inform you that our hospital is for the chronically ill not for convalescent, therefore, Mr. Horhoruni would not be eligible for this hospital.

Yours sincerely.

This is a very interesting pattern of response. Everybody says no. The chronically ill hospitals say: take him to the convalescent hospital. The convalescent hospitals say: take him to the chronically ill hospital. But no one, Mr. Chairman, is willing to provide accommodation or make provision for this destitute and seriously handicapped human being, who, under perfectly legitimate circumstances is presently resident at St. Joseph's hospital.

The important factor about this, Mr. Chairman, is that it can relate to persons far beyond Kirkor Horhoruni and his peculiar dilemma; it leads us to a re-analysis of the terms of The Public Hospitals Act and whether or not, as the hon. Minister himself thought earlier, it should be obligatory for hospitals to make some alternative accommodation available.

As it now stands it may be—and I do not pretend to be clairvoyant, I do not know what will happen—it would not surprise me if Mr. Horhoruni ended up for his day in the Don jail.

He is then placed literally on the sidelines. There is nowhere for the man to go. He is in this country legitimately until July 23. There is litigation pending which he has a right to be involved in. I suggest to the hon. Minister opposite that some kind of compassion or some kind of alternative should be found. The government should use this as a demonstration, albeit an extreme one, that very odd occurrences can happen when an attempt is made to find alternative accommodation for discharged hospital patients.

At the moment, let me say, that the man is under some harassment in one of the

hospitals in our city. He received—I will show it to the hon. members—a very few days ago in the hospital something called: "Extra! Extra! Le Petit Paris Montreal. See Horhoruni the Sitting Turk Only \$1." That is the kind of material that is being sent to the man in hospital. I think he has been unhappily subjected to some adverse publicity.

I believe that a Minister of the Crown, governing the hospitals in the province of Ontario, should indicate nothing that relates to The Department of External Affairs, nothing which relates to the court factors, but simply explain to us what happens to people in this situation, when this set of circumstances contrives to place them in this particular dilemma. He should do so recognizing that the case is not merely restricted to Kirkor, if I can become familiar for a moment, but also to others in a similarly difficult position on the question of alternative accommodation.

Has the hon. Minister any comment as to what will happen between say July 15 and July 23?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the man has remained in hospital this long. I can state that I am perfectly correct in believing that this is a matter to be determined by The Department of External Affairs. This man is not a Canadian citizen. He is here on a medical visa. Frankly, I cannot understand why the doctor ever invited him to come here. Surely to goodness we have plenty of arthritics in Canada who might have benefited from the treatment and I am quite certain there are good surgeons in Europe who could have provided the same type of treatment as this gentleman was to receive here in Canada.

However, that is not my concern. I only make these statements because they do puzzle me and have puzzled me from the first time I heard about the physician. Surely to goodness we have enough arthritics in Canada that our doctors do not have to invite arthritics from all over the world to come here for treatment unless we can be sure that we have some type of treatment that is not available to them other places.

However, I find it very strange, very hard to understand, why the man's own national embassy has not taken some interest in his case. The man is a Turkish national and why the Turkish embassy has ignored him is quite beyond me. I would hate to think that if a Canadian were placed in similar circumstances in Turkey the Canadian embassy would adopt the same attitude. Perhaps this is getting into a realm where I have no right to be and

perhaps I am breaching protocol, I do not know, but these are commonsense opinions that occur to me. It is quite beyond my comprehension to know why the man's own people have not taken some interest in and concern for him.

I cannot see whose responsibility it is, if it is not the responsibility of his own people, to find other placement for him. I can understand the hon. member being confused and puzzled by both types of hospitals saying that he belongs to the other. The convalescent thinks he belongs to the chronic, the chronic to the convalescent, and so on.

But I do not understand why these things came about. If he only has to stay until July 23, it looks to me as if the debt will become a bad debt and will fall back on the province of Ontario to pay anyway. I do not expect that The Department of External Affairs will look after it, although I think we have some method of charging these debts back to them, for non-landed immigrants.

We have not got a precedent, they tell me. This is the first time. I thought we had an arrangement whereby we could charge the hospital care of immigrants back to The Department of External Affairs. However, it does not matter. It will apparently become a responsibility of the government to meet his bill and I suppose if we have to pay it for a further 23 days, it will not be so impossible that we cannot do it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I thoroughly agree with the hon. Minister. I have no hesitation about discussing this aspect of external affairs. We are not making treaties, we are just hypothesizing. I do not know whether it will be a charge on the province of Ontario for 23 days, because it is possible that the man will not be in St. Joseph's hospital. He may indeed become a rather sad charge, in a sense, on the public. Someone is going to have to take responsibility and I just feel that it is important that the hon. Minister be alerted to it and to the complications which arise when reputable convalescent and chronic homes send letters such as those that I read into the record. I hope that this forewarning is premature and unnecessary, but I suspect that Friday will show that it has not been.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to deal briefly with the increasing costs of trying to run a hospital. We all know that the costs are going up all the time and it is increasingly hard to get personnel. I have had an opportunity to do some reading on different ways in which to control the costs of hospitals.

Various administrators have various ideas, but there is one unique experiment going on in Akron, Ohio. Probably the hon. Minister has heard about it, as have some of the men in his department, but I would just like to briefly highlight a few of the things that are done in the children's hospital in Akron, Ohio.

It is a 260-bed hospital and in this modern day and age they have gone in for automation. Everything in industry, it would seem, is automation and now in hospitals they are going the same way. The hospital at Akron spent \$100,000 in putting in equipment, or I should say they put in the equipment and it costs them \$100,000 per year to run this computer system. Literally, what happens is that this computer system, which they call the hospital information system, assigns work to staff members as to what jobs they do each day—orders drugs, x-rays, lab tests, and special diets for patients. And, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to believe that today this can actually happen; instead of individuals having to do all the ordering, with a properly set up automatic system this can be done, and this hospital has found that it works. From what I read, it said it smoothly schedules appointments in the operating rooms and other departments to avoid needless waiting. It immediately provides the doctors with an up-to-the-minute record of progress of their patients.

A four-year study made in Akron, Ohio, checking into the old system which we use in our hospitals here, said that the traditional hospital work methods were scandalously inefficient and archaic. And the ablest bedside women—that is, the head nurses and the registered nurses, and the student registered nurses—expended 41 per cent of their time in doing paper work; so the idea was to try to keep these different individuals, instead of spending so much time doing paper work, at the bedside taking care of the patients. The licensed practical nurse and student practical nurse provided 14 per cent more nursing care than the RN group. You can understand why, Mr. Chairman, they would call our present system of doing things inefficient, when the practical nurse does actually more nursing than the graduate registered nurse.

Volumes have been written on the subject. I am not going into all the volumes, I am sure the Chairman will be glad to know, but in one two-week period at the Akron hospital, 375 doctors admitted 585 patients and issued 10,000 orders on their behalf, indicating that, in the course of a year, the nursing staff was required to turn out millions of indivi-

dual pieces of paper work. The job of staffing, which formerly occupied two nursing supervisors for 16 hours a day, is now performed by the machine in seven minutes, which is an amazing thing. In other words, the task done by two people working 16 hours a day can be done in seven minutes by a machine—and this has been proved to work.

Information about the patient's condition is relayed to the switchboards so that the telephone operators can intelligently reply to queries from friends and relatives. This system is particularly valuable in dispensing drugs, because of the built-in safety factors. It is impossible to administer the same drug twice through error, and the danger of overdosing has been largely done away with. It also eliminates the handwriting problems of doctors, and anybody who has seen the handwriting of a doctor knows that this can be a serious problem.

In a world-famous, eastern American hospital, within a seven-month period, there were 179 difficulties involving patients and the administration of drugs, most of them due to careless writing. So this type of thing can be wiped out under such a system.

Many might say, "Well, it kind of dehumanizes the whole hospital system if we bring in machines," but the truth of it is that the personnel have more time to spend with the patients, so there is more of what the nurses call "TLC"—tender loving care. In addition, the machine can supply, in a matter of seconds, complete patient profiles for new doctors including even the names of newborn children. Fascinating possibilities, I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, will grow out of this. I think it would help medical research. It will be able, I think, in the long run, to use thousands of clinical tests automatically, and they can be stored in a computer for future use.

The future possibilities are dazzling. Supposing, in 20 years, 5,000 hospitals throughout the world keep automated records. You will quickly be able to analyze as many as 500,000 clinical cases of any given disease. And also, no matter where the patient moved, reference to a single card would give the physician a complete rundown on his medical history.

Mr. Chairman, this may seem a bit far-fetched, but in this day and age it is not far-fetched at all. We know it is working successfully on this continent in Akron, Ohio. I think it is a matter that could be seriously considered, even on a pilot basis, in one of our large urban areas, preferably here in Toronto. I was wondering if the hon. Min-

ister has heard of this, and if any consideration has been given to following in the footsteps of the experiment carried out in Akron, Ohio.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member must have forgotten that the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), when he spoke on the Throne debate, I believe it was, mentioned the Akron, Ohio experiment. He also mentioned that the hospital in his own riding, Scarborough general, is at present involved with a commission and IBM in setting up a prototype to study the feasibility of this—and the possibilities of it as well. It is very much in the experimental stage and I think we should be a little careful in saying that the Akron experiment is completely successful. There are many things to work out in it yet, but I agree with the hon. member, as we did with the hon. member for Scarborough North, that this does present some exciting possibilities. The commission is working with IBM, as I stated, to see how it can be applied in regional areas within our province.

Mr. Trotter: This experiment with the hospital in Scarborough—is there a reasonable chance of that coming to pass, or is it more or less just in the talking stage? I understood it was more at a rumour-and-talk stage than actual practice.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, there is a possibility that it will come to fruition. It is being very carefully studied and explored at the present time. If it proves itself workable and feasible, there is no doubt that it will be accepted.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I have been rather puzzled for the last half hour. The hon. Minister made the statement that there were other organizations involved in connection with the nurses, and the hon. Minister of Labour also got up and reiterated what the hon. Minister of Health has said, so we have two Ministers. Is the government telling us that there are other organizations involved who are looking for bargaining rights also? If that is the case, how does it affect the nurses? Just exactly where does this fit in with them? Do the engineers have a right? Do the policemen have a right? Do the firemen have a right? Have the nurses not a right to be able to sit down and bargain for their rights as far as wages are concerned? You tell us of some secret groups, some meeting you had with the hon. Prime Minister himself, the hon. Minister of Labour, the hon. Minister

of Health—you have met with other groups and therefore you have set this thing aside. To me it does not make sense, and I would like an explanation.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member for Niagara Falls was better informed about current labour trends and developments than he presently indicates. The—

Mr. Bukator: That was quite a statement.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes, I put it to you directly. As is common knowledge, it has been in every newspaper in this province, the first group would be professional engineers—and it goes down the line to any group which has an association of its own or bears a degree or, indeed, has any item which might be identified as a common bond. What it leads to, the big question, is: How far do we fragment, on the basis of professional grouping, the work force of this province?

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, I am awfully sorry; that does not answer my question. I can read the newspapers. I hear of two Ministers, and the hon. Prime Minister himself, who have had secret meetings—well, not secret meetings, but—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Nothing secret at all.

Mr. Bukator: They certainly were not public as far as I am concerned; and I would like the hon. Minister to get up in his place and tell us who these people are who would prevent the nurses from having an opportunity to bargain for their wages.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It would involve, as has been indicated, an amendment to The Labour Relations Act. And if we are going to amend it, we are not going to amend it until the entire impact of the proposal by the registered nurses has been thoroughly analyzed.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Chairman, here is where the hon. Minister was right in his first statement. I know it requires an amendment to The Labour Relations Act, as you put it—this even I can understand—but you still have not answered my question. Who are these influential people who have come to you and have persuaded you from giving these nurses, who are entitled to an increase in pay, the opportunity of bargaining for their rights as far as wages are concerned? This is all I ask.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No one has come to the government to prevent or interfere with

the nurses, nobody. The nurses themselves requested it, but there is the registered nurses association and now there are other groups, and if the principle is established that we deal with the nurses along the lines that they request, it automatically means the other groups—

Mr. Bryden: Why does it automatically mean—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, all I said was that the whole area must be canvassed at the one time, if you want good legislation.

Mr. Bryden: Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that each of these groups was excluded from The Labour Relations Act if not at its own request, at least at the request of some representative body, or an apparently representative body, within the profession? Now my understanding is that the nurses—unless there is a new development I do not know about—have not asked for inclusion under The Labour Relations Act, they have asked for a separate Act.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: A separate bill.

Mr. Bryden: Whichever way it is put, if they have now decided that they want collective bargaining legislation applicable to them I cannot for the life of me see what that has to do with the professional engineers. The professional engineers are another question and maybe we will have it actively before the House one of these days. But I do not see what this has to do with nursing, or why the nurses' application should be contingent upon the wishes of professional engineers or any other group.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, except this; I was going to ask the hon. Minister just a moment ago—and it has got lost within about the last 3,000 words—would it be accurate to conclude from what the hon. Minister has said, that the government is contemplating an amendment to The Labour Relations Act that would make it possible for professions to seek collective bargaining rights under that Act rather than an alternative through a separate Act for professions?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No.

Mr. MacDonald: You are not contemplating that?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We have not come to the conclusion you stated.

Mr. Bryden: Well, are you thinking about it?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This government will consider any legitimate proposition and that we are doing.

Mr. Sopha: I am not at all certain that this government will consider, very seriously, granting collective bargaining to people because I am persuaded this government is not in favour of collective bargaining. Whenever I hear a person mouthing the old aphorisms about the trade unions getting too much, that they are pushing too many people around, then I know that person is a Tory.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The hon. member does not like to be interrupted by the Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister said that, I did not. I got into trouble the other night for saying—

Mr. Chairman: Order! We have allowed considerable—

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister of Labour was speaking about—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Letherby: The Chairman wants the hon. member to sit down.

Mr. Sopha: We were speaking about nurses.

Mr. Chairman: Order! We have allowed considerable latitude in this matter, particularly where the bargaining rights of nurses entered into association with The Department of Labour and The Labour Relations Act. Consequently, there has been some mention of other professions, but we are not going to allow any more latitude as far as other professions are concerned; we are dealing simply with hospitals and nurses and no other professions. So, members will stay on the subject of this vote 714.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed, sir, I agree with you wholeheartedly and it was the hon. member for York South who took it astray. He is the culprit of the piece.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I was putting a question to the hon. Minister of Labour on the basis of a statement he made, so I was led astray by the hon. Minister of Labour.

Mr. Chairman: I am making no accusations. We will return to the subject.

Mr. Sopha: Quite obviously the nurses are not going to get any legislation this session, but I throw down the gauntlet to the hon. Minister of Labour. When this next session opens, then I say to him that in all fairness to them, it is his responsibility to tell them whether this government intends to grant them collective bargaining rights or not—in the context of the statement I made categorically that every person in this country, and I do not care what association he belongs to, has the right to bargain collectively through the representatives of his own choosing.

Mr. MacDonald: Including those bargaining—

Mr. Sopha: Members of the legislative assembly do it.

Mr. Bukator: I would like to complete what I started to say, because I did not get my questions answered except the fact that the hon. Minister kept nodding his head when the hon. member for Sudbury was speaking about everyone having a right to bargain for their wages; the hon. Minister kept nodding his head—

Mr. Sopha: He nods his head when he disagrees.

Mr. Bukator: If the hon. Minister agrees, then I am willing to forget about the fact that he does not want to give us the information that I asked for and that is, who are these other groups that are preventing you from bringing in the bill to let the nurses bargain for their wages? Who are these influential people? This is all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not understand the hon. member's question. I would like to discuss it with him out of the House or anywhere but I do not understand the question about the influential people—

Mr. Bukator: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. I have a right to ask a question of the hon. Minister: Who is this particular group that was in today asking for bargaining rights, and who influenced him so the nurses could not get a right to bargain?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: They were just an additional group to the ones I have mentioned.

Mr. Bukator: There you are, Mr. Chairman, that is how evasive the man is, "just an additional group to the ones that I mentioned." And I am supposed to accept that as the member for Niagara Falls.

The hon. Minister can rest assured that he may not answer my questions, but I do not accept his attitude because he is evading the issue.

Mr. Bryden: Before vote 714 is carried, and turning to a quite different subject, I want to call to the attention of the House a specific case of what I would call a denial by the Ontario hospital services commission of certain basic rights of a citizen of this province.

I have found it necessary to raise this case once already in this House, namely, on February 1 of this year, as reported in *Hansard* on pages 181-182. At the time, I thought that would be sufficient to have the problem rectified. I have since found that nothing at all has been done, or next to nothing.

I regret that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) is not in the House at the moment because I would like him to hear the facts I am going to recite. Perhaps when *Hansard* becomes available, I can send him a copy. The reason I am interested in that phase of the matter is that a week or two ago during the debate on a private member's bill for the appointment of a parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman in Ontario, the hon. Minister asked for specific cases indicating the need for such an appointment. I did not cite this case at that time because I thought it would be best to raise it with the Minister directly concerned, namely, the hon. Minister of Health, while his officials were present to advise him and they are now present.

In June 1964, a regulation was approved under The Hospital Services Commission Act providing coverage, among other things, in relation to—and I will now quote the regulation almost in its entirety, or the part of it that is relevant:

The use of occupational therapy and physiotherapy facilities, where available, when prescribed by a physician.

Subsequently, a constituent of mine, who has been a registered physiotherapist engaged in the practice of physiotherapy in the city of Toronto for the past 20 years, applied for recognition under this regulation. A substantial part of his practice is based on referrals from physicians in the area who are in a position, I would assume, to know his work and who presumably have confidence in him. Why, otherwise, would they refer patients to him?

I should state that some years after he was registered as a physiotherapist, he also qualified for registration as a chiropractor and was so registered. He has since carried

on practice both as a registered physiotherapist and a registered chiropractor. He has advised me, however, that when a patient is referred to him for physiotherapy, he gives him precisely the treatment prescribed by the referring physician. I assume that this must be true; I do not think that physicians would continue to refer patients to him if he gave them other than the prescribed treatment.

Under date of September 22, 1964, my constituent was advised by Dr. Boyd of the OHSC that his application would be "reviewed by the physiotherapy advisory board," which was described by Dr. Boyd as consisting of "representatives of the two physiotherapy associations, the medical profession and this organization," meaning the OHSC, which would "recommend approval or otherwise to the commission," whose decision would be final.

Under date of October 1, 1964, Dr. Boyd advised my constituent that "the board has recommended to the commission that your application not be accepted." Apparently, although it is not specifically stated in Dr. Boyd's letter, the commission acted upon this recommendation.

It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that this decision was bound to have an adverse effect on my constituent's livelihood. Whenever a patient was referred to him within the terms of the OHSC regulation, the patient would naturally assume that payment would be covered by the OHSC. Was my constituent to advise the patient that his application for recognition under the OHSC regulation had been rejected and that, in effect, he had been adjudged unqualified by the OHSC?

One need hardly speculate on the effect that that kind of admission would have had on his practice. My constituent chose the only other possible course in at least a number of cases—I do not know if he chose this course in all cases—he simply provided his services free of charge in such cases. He has claimed—and I have not been in a position to verify his claim—so I report merely that he has made in, I believe, a letter to the commission—that since the OHSC regulation came into effect, he has suffered a 50 per cent reduction in his income.

He has been placed in this unenviable position without even having had the opportunity to be heard. As far as I have been able to determine, the board on whose recommendation the decision was made has no formal existence at all under the laws of this province. It is simply an informal committee set up by the OHSC to advise it. It does not have a regularized procedure. It meets behind closed doors. It has never indicated publicly

the grounds on which it will recommend acceptance or refusal of applications. It gives no reasons for its recommendations nor does the OHSC give reasons for the decisions it arrives at on the basis of those recommendations. There is no appeal from either the recommendations or the decisions.

After my constituent received Dr. Boyd's letter of October 1, advising him, in effect, that his application for recognition had been refused, he came to me with his problem. I telephoned Dr. Neilson, chairman of the OHSC, who stated that he would review the file and advise me. After considerable prompting I received the following letter, dated November 16, 1964, from Dr. Neilson, and I am going to quote this letter in full. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not going to divulge the name of this man. The OHSC already knows his name; I am sure they know the case I am referring to. He is in a difficult enough position as it is, without his name being broadcast, so whenever his name appears in any of the letters I am going to read I am going to refer to him as "the applicant." This is Dr. Neilson's letter of November 16, 1964:

Some time ago you spoke to me about [the applicant] who is a registered physiotherapist practising at—

and I have omitted the address:

—in this city.

We have found on investigation that [the applicant] is primarily a chiropractor who has some limited training in physiotherapy, and divides his practice between physiotherapy and the practice of chiropractic.

His application for recognition as a physiotherapist entitled to remuneration by the commission for services given to the residents of the province, was given consideration by a committee which has been examining all applications.

It was the feeling of the committee which contains representatives from the commission, the Ontario medical association and the Canadian physiotherapy association, that [the applicant] was not suitably qualified to be accepted and he was notified to this effect.

From my examination of the matter, I think I am inclined to agree with the viewpoint of the committee.

That is the end of Dr. Neilson's letter of November 16.

Some comment should perhaps be made on Dr. Neilson's statement, that my constituent "has some limited training in physiotherapy."

The plain fact is that he has been permitted under the laws of this province to engage in the practice of physiotherapy for 20 years and has received referrals from medical doctors in the area who presumably know him best.

I will not dwell on this point, however. My interest in the matter has not been based in any sense on a desire to pass my own amateur judgment on the man's qualifications. I simply express no opinion on that point; I am not competent to do so, although I do point out that if his qualifications are not up to standard, it is strange that he has been allowed to carry on the practice of physiotherapy for 20 years.

However, my sole interest is to secure a fair hearing for him. Therefore, on November 18, 1964, I wrote to Dr. Neilson, in reply to his letter of November 16, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of November 16 regarding [the applicant]. I regret to say that I find your explanation most unsatisfactory.

When a committee meeting behind closed doors makes a decision that can affect a man's livelihood, I do not think it is good enough for it to act merely on the basis of "the feeling" that the man is "not suitably qualified." I suggest that, as a very minimum, it should be prepared (a) to state clearly and in writing the precise qualifications that it considers "suitable," (b) to specify the reasons why it thinks [the applicant] does not meet those qualifications, and (c) to give him an opportunity to be heard before a final decision is rendered.

I realize that the commission has to protect itself against unqualified practitioners. I would point out, however, that there is already a significant element of protection in the regulations in that payment will be made to a physiotherapist only where a patient is referred by a qualified medical practitioner. If the commission feels that further protection is needed, then I submit that it should provide for it in an open and above-board manner and not by backroom decisions of an informal committee that does not have to justify its actions in public. I suggest that in simple justice [the applicant] is entitled to a hearing if he wants one and, in any case, to a full explanation, along the lines I have already suggested, of the reasons for the refusal of his application. I would appreciate it if you will let me know if he will receive such treatment.

That is the end of my letter.

I sent a copy of this letter to the hon. Minister of Health. For two months I waited

patiently but did not receive a reply from either the hon. Minister or the chairman of the OHSC. Under the circumstances, I felt that I had no alternative but to raise the matter in this House and I did so, as already indicated, on February 1 of this year. Under date of February 25 I received a further letter from Dr. Neilson as follows and I am quoting it in full:

In reviewing our file on [the applicant] I find that he has not lodged an appeal against the decision of the committee appointed to approve applicants for participation in the outpatient physiotherapy programme being directed by the commission. If he should appeal he can be assured that he will receive every consideration and I would ask that his notice of appeal be sent to me.

In reading over your letter—

that is, my letter:

In reading over your letter to me of November 18, 1964, I took it as meaning that [the applicant] planned to appeal and that you requested assurance that he would be given a hearing. Pending some communication from [the applicant] I had not acknowledged your letter. I am sorry that this misunderstanding on my part has occurred and I assure you that I had no intention of not replying. I just did not think that a reply was expected at that time.

That is the end of the letter.

It came as something of a surprise to me to discover that the commission had been waiting to receive a notice of appeal from my constituent. I did not know then, and still do not know, of any appeal procedure that has been laid down anywhere. And I do not quite know how it should be expected that this gentleman would appeal when there is no known procedure for appealing. Furthermore, he had been advised in the first instance that the commission's decision in such a matter was final. I did not quibble, however. I sent a copy of Dr. Neilson's letter to my constituent and recommended to him that he should lodge an appeal immediately if he should feel inclined to do so.

Subsequently, he sent to me a copy of a letter dated March 8, 1965, that he had sent to Dr. Neilson. His letter was somewhat argumentative and quite lengthy, setting forth in detail his grounds for appeal. He left no conceivable doubt, however, that he wanted to appeal. He stated that:

On the strength of your remarks in the above-mentioned letter to Mr. Bryden, I

would respectfully submit my request for appeal to you.

That was March 8, 1965.

By a letter of April 21, that is, about five or six weeks later, I think, my constituent advised me that he had still not received a reply to his letter of March 8 to Dr. Neilson. On April 23, therefore, I sent the following letter to Dr. Neilson, and this is the last letter I am going to quote, Mr. Chairman, but I will quote this one in full, too:

I would refer you to our previous correspondence regarding the application of [the applicant] for participation in the outpatient physiotherapy programme of the commission.

It was my understanding, from your letter of February 25, that an appeal by [the applicant] from the decision of the committee would be considered. I am informed that [the applicant] sent a letter to the commission to your attention on March 8 indicating his desire to appeal, and I was somewhat surprised to discover that he still has not received a reply to that letter. It would appear to me that action would be in order to expedite the hearing of his appeal.

That is the end of my letter.

From that day to this, Mr. Chairman—the date of the letter I just quoted was April 23 and it is now June 15—I have received no communication of any kind from the OHSC on this matter. Moreover, as of this morning, when I last checked, my constituent has not even received an acknowledgment, much less an indication, of what he should do to forward his appeal. He has not even received an acknowledgment of his letter of March 8, which was sent in more than three months ago now.

To those supporters of the government who so glibly proclaim that the elected member should serve as an ombudsman, I would direct this question. What does a member do when he faces a bureaucratic wall of silence and doubletalk?

In my opinion, this is a case that could appropriately be referred to a parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman. Since no such officer exists in Ontario, the only remedy I can think of is to raise it in this House. I already raised it once and now I have to raise it again. I will emphasize that I do not want to pass judgment on the merits of my constituent's application. I am in no position to judge the merits of his application. I do wish to emphasize, however, that he has in my opinion been denied even the—well,

it is not my opinion, it is fact—elementary right of a hearing, in a matter which virtually affects his livelihood.

I do not think that at the present time there is even a recognized procedure for an appeal in a case of this kind, but in the name of justice I submit that my constituent is entitled to appeal if he still wishes to pursue that course. I submit further that the OHSC, on its record to date, has disqualified itself from acting as an appeal tribunal in this case. I would say that, if the man now had to appear before them, he could allege a reasonable apprehension of bias; he could allege that the commission has already a closed mind on the matter. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the hon. Minister to give this man an opportunity to present his case to a genuinely independent tribunal, setting one up for the purpose if necessary.

I regret that I have to bring this matter into the House once again, Mr. Chairman. I did not want to bring it here in the first place. I thought that, by taking it up with the responsible officers, something that could be considered reasonable could be worked out. Nothing has been worked out. The first time I raised this with the commission was in October last; and the commission, I would say, on the whole has been quite uncommunicative. But when it has communicated with me, its communications, I have found to my sorrow, have meant absolutely nothing, and I would like to find some way out of this impasse.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I had originally some knowledge of this case when the hon. member brought it to my attention by asking a question in the House; and I have to say, regretfully, that this has been a chapter of confusion and misunderstanding. The chairman of the commission was of the opinion that the man knew he could launch an appeal to the advisory board, that he had a right to know on what grounds they decided he had limitations to his training. And I must agree with the hon. member; if he were registered under the Act, I think the board probably overstepped its responsibility or its authority in calling his ability into question. If there was any question in the minds of the advisory board about the registrant's ability, then their duty was to place this before the board of directors, as the Act permits. However, being duly registered under that Act, no matter how many others he was registered under, so long as he had good standing under this, he should have been given consideration.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I have to defend the idea of an advisory board. In fact, I would take a very dim view of the commission if they decided to accept or exclude, on their own initiative, members of professions of which the commission may not have too much knowledge. It is for this reason, for the protection of applicants, for the protection of those who will render services under the Act, that advisory boards or advisory committees are set up. But I can assure the hon. member that I will make it my business to see that this man does have an opportunity to appeal. And if he is not satisfied with the reasons, I will make very clear to him, his right of appeal to his own board of directors, because they are responsible to this Legislature, through me, for the operation of the Act.

I can only say, sir, that I regret very much that this matter has dragged on to this extent, because we all believed that the gentleman in question was given to understand that he had an appeal from the decision.

Mr. Bryden: Well, he did. In fact, as I interpret his letter, which as I say was somewhat lengthy—the letter is longer than I would have written—it did quite clearly say that he wanted to appeal, and this was back on March 8.

Mr. MacDonald: That is over three months ago.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, this is disturbing.

Mr. Bryden: At any rate, I appreciate the statement the hon. Minister has just made. Just so there will be no misunderstanding, I would like to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that this man's registration under The Physiotherapy Act has not been called into question. My only point is that with a regulation such as I have cited now in effect, his ability to practice is somewhat severely restricted, if he is not recognized for the purpose of the regulation.

I would just mention one other point to the hon. Minister—I think perhaps I mentioned it in the course of my remarks, but it is worth emphasizing—that I think, apart altogether from passing or having a review board to pass on these people, the commission is pretty well protected under the regulation as it stands in two ways. First of all, any applicant, to be accepted must be a registered physiotherapist. That is point one. The second is, that payment will be made only if a patient is referred by a physician. I feel that a physician is not likely to refer a patient to someone who in his opinion is not likely to

do a proper job. Whatever I might say about physicians in other contexts, I am quite sure that they are interested in ensuring that their patients get the kind of treatment that they prescribe. So I think there is sufficient protection, without the protection of further review. But if there is to be review of the man's qualifications and if he is in a position where he could be refused recognition so that his opportunity to earn his livelihood could be reduced, then I certainly think a better procedure than this should be worked out.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I was thinking, Mr. Chairman, actually of protection of persons rendering the service, rather than the protection of the commission. I agree with the hon. member. The commission is well protected, but there is the possibility that the person providing the services may feel the need of protection and it is for that reason I feel his abilities and his standing in the profession should be judged by his own peers, and not left to the judgment of the commission only.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 714 agreed to?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter I would like to raise briefly under vote 714, if I may. It is such a broad vote and there are so many matters involved, that it is sometimes hard to keep track of them all.

This relates to the question of the supply of nurses in the province, which as we all know, is a vital aspect of the whole problem of hospital accommodation. The hon. Minister dealt with this matter briefly at the conclusion of his introductory remarks under the estimates. He stated at that time that the government has been advised, and has accepted the advice that we must double the number of graduate nurses from our diploma schools in the next five years. Then the hon. Minister outlined various plans that have been undertaken to increase the facilities for teaching nurses.

I may say that the figures he cited on our records over the last three years, do not hold out, to me, a firm basis for optimism that we will, in fact, double the number of nurses graduating over the next five years. Between 1962 and 1965, the number graduating—that is in a three-year period—increased by slightly less than 500 from 2,186 to 2,650. Now at this time of night, I do not want to go into a detailed discussion of those figures. It may be that there is an accelerating programme in view, but there is one phase of the matter where I understand that a real bottleneck may be created, even if we get all the

physical facilities that are necessary, and that is in relation to teachers of nurses.

The hon. Minister also mentioned that point in his introductory remarks. He said that additional bursaries are being provided to encourage some nurses to take further instruction, and so on, and that efforts are being made to increase the supply of people who are qualified to teach nurses. After all, I assume that they should be of somewhat more advanced qualification than ward nurses. I commend that type of programme, but what I am worried about is this, Mr. Chairman: As I understand it, the salaries paid to teachers of nurses in many of the nursing schools, are hardly any higher than the salaries paid to nurses, which heaven knows are low enough. I would like to ask the hon. Minister just what differential there is between the two, and if he thinks that the salaries now offered to people who will undertake the responsibility of teaching future nurses, are adequate to attract a sufficient number of people into that rather exacting profession.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I also mentioned an accelerated programme of producing teachers of nursing.

Mr. Bryden: I mentioned that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are presently turning out 200 teachers of nursing for the next three years. We will be turning out 500 teachers of nursing, and thereafter, 400 each year, with expansion based on the need at the time. There is to be, I think the hon. member will recall, an acceleration of recruitment at the schools now in existence with the present facilities and without the addition of further teachers. It will take in an additional approximately 600 students this year, as the first step in the accelerated programme.

The matter of salaries, general duty nurses, \$355 to \$420 per month. Assistant head nurses, \$375 to \$440 per month. Head nurse, \$405 to \$480 per month. Supervisor, \$425 to \$525. The teachers of nursing get the same as the head nurse, plus the following bonuses.

Mr. Bryden: Which one is the head nurse, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Head nurse is \$405 to \$480, and in addition, in recognition of the completion of the Canadian hospital association course in nursing unit administration, an additional \$10 per month. In recognition of the university diploma course of eight months' duration, an additional \$20 per month. In recognition of baccalaureate degree of nursing, an additional \$45 per month.

Mr. Bryden: Are these rates in effect in all the teaching hospitals in the province at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is the provincial rate.

Vote 714 agreed to.

Vote 715 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Health.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee of supply rise and report it has come to certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we understand that the Goldenberg report may be presented to the House later this week and I just heard that it may be printed in one of the morning papers. Would the hon. Prime Minister care to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that there is a report in the morning *Globe and Mail* which I have looked at. I have had opportunity to read only a part of the Goldenberg report but I would say, in the language in which that story in the *Globe and Mail* is couched, it is a speculative story. I am not aware that the report has been—there were some rumours around that a copy had been stolen or

something—but I am not aware that any copy of the report has been made public in any way. I was given the report at 4.30 this afternoon.

As I say, I have not read it myself, but I have looked this story over in the *Globe and Mail* and it is my opinion that it is a speculative story.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Could I ask one question following the matter the hon. leader of the Opposition has raised? I understand that arrangements have been made for a release, as of such-and-such a date and hour a few days hence, and the newspaper people are likely to be closeted for some hours in advance. Now, we are always faced with considerable difficulty, because—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt. I have a timetable worked out, which I propose to submit to the hon. member and the hon. leader of the Opposition. This is a difficult matter to deal with, because we have different news media with different deadlines and so on. I have worked out a timetable which I think the hon. member will find satisfactory, which I would be very happy to show him in the morning.

Mr. MacDonald: My question is simply this, and perhaps I should have gotten to my question. Would the hon. Prime Minister consider letting each of the Opposition leaders have a copy—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is in my plan.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, it is in his mind.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, because in recent years I have attempted always to do this, that is with the Budget speech, the Throne speech and so on, and I would be very pleased to. This is in the timetable I have worked out and perhaps we can get together in the morning and I will explain it to the hon. member.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.50 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX "A"

(Concerning the statement by Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) on page 4209)

ACTIVE TREATMENT HOSPITAL BEDS IN METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hospital	1963 Survey Committee Report		W. B. Lewis' Statement, 1965	
	Existing Beds	Planned by 1970	Constructed or Definitely Planned	Indefinite
St. Michael's	770	50	129	
Sick Children's	610	191	186	
N. York Branson	165	238	310	
Ortho. & Arthritic	28	68	68	
Queensway General	198	128	120	
Wellesley	255	328	312	
N. York General	22	278	370	
Scarborough General	337	190	240	
Centenary, Scarborough		200	480	
Women's College	266	148	152	
York General		200	200	
New Mt. Sinai	337	178	181	
Sal. Army Grace	109	126		120
Tor. Western	761	100		80
Sunnybrook	887	100	550*	
Etobicoke				300
Fenway				500
Baycrest			93	
Toronto General	1234	166		
St. Joseph's	584			
East General	647	-7		
Humber Memorial	319			
Northwestern	242			
Princess Margaret	120			
Lockwood Clinic	45			
Private Hospitals	492	77		
Totals	8428	2759	2841	1000

*This figure is not included in the total since it was already included in Survey Committee's total of the 1963 existing stock (col. 1).



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope	4241
Recess, 12.30 o'clock	4256

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from school sections Nos. 3 and 4 OPS, Lindsay.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), notice of which has been given. The question arises from an article in yesterday's morning paper relative to Metro housing and is as follows:

Would the hon. Minister inform the House how much he expects will be paid out by vendors as real estate sales commissions on the housing which the Ontario housing corporation plans to purchase in Metro Toronto this year?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer the hon. member's question in this way. All 1,200 dwellings which the Ontario housing corporation is in the process of purchasing in Metro Toronto were offered directly by the present owners in response to the corporation's advertisement. No real estate commissions will be involved.

The Ontario housing corporation has not retained real estate brokers to purchase properties on its behalf, but if any broker has a property to sell, the corporation would be interested in receiving an offer. In all cases, however, the onus to pay brokers' fees rests with the vendor, not the corporation.

May I also clear up one other point that may arise a little later? When the corporation receives an offer to purchase, the property is appraised by the corporation and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation jointly. Regardless of the offering price, the corporation makes an offer based on the

appraised value and if this is acceptable a purchase is consummated. Should a fee be payable by the vendor at any time this has no effect on the appraised value and is the responsibility of the vendor, not the corporation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), of which notice was given.

Does the hon. Attorney General concur in the statement attributed to Chief Magistrate Klein advocating more frequent and confidential discussions between police officers and magistrates; and if so, why?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member for Downsview is aware that the remark which he attributed to Chief Magistrate Klein was made to the Ontario association of police chiefs at their annual meeting in Barrie on Tuesday, June 8. I am sure that my hon. friend will also recognize the difficulty in removing a statement out of its context where the real tenor of the complete speech may thereby be lost.

Chief Magistrate Klein spoke to the chiefs of police at length upon several matters. One of the matters which he stressed was that it was most important that the independence of the bench be maintained in appearance as well as in fact. For this reason, he pointed out that magistrates might not appear friendly with policemen in the vicinity of their courts and he went on to explain why this might be so. The whole tenor of his commentary on this particular problem was directed to maintaining the independence of the magisterial bench and those who were present and heard the speech recognized this.

However, Chief Magistrate Klein quite properly indicated that the independence of the bench should not prevent a magistrate from having some contact with the police since it is desirable that the magistrate make policemen aware of his own thoughts on law enforcement and on the proper administration of justice. I think the hon. member would agree that the continuing education of the police as to the principles of the

administration of justice and the manner in which they may assist therein is most important and the magistrate is in an ideal position to convey this education to policemen since he sees them in court and in many cases he will be able to utilize this information for the improvement of law enforcement and the administration of justice jointly.

As most hon. members are aware, a magistrate must decide the case before him upon the evidence which is adduced in the trial and if he goes beyond that evidence and acts upon extraneous matters not placed in evidence then the decision will not be sustained by a higher court and his whole decision could thus be invalidated upon appeal.

I would therefore suggest to the hon. member that the comment made by the chief magistrate as stated in the question is unrelated to the context of his speech, and I assure the hon. member that the speech in its entirety was quite consistent with the sound administration of justice and was particularly significant to the chiefs of police.

Mr. Singer: Could the hon. Attorney General, then—since I have not had available to me the full context—make available a copy of that speech?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I inquired of the chief magistrate and he informed me that he spoke "off the cuff." Further than that I inquired of persons who had been there and heard the speech, one of them being the Deputy Attorney General, and the whole tenor and context of his speech was as I have stated.

But I went further still. The press had taken down certain portions of his speech and we are having it correlated and put together. I may be able to give something that will be a complete story before long.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), and there has been compliance with the rules in giving notice of the question—I say regretfully.

What liability, if any, has the Ontario Northland Railway for the recent theft of the gold bricks at Larder Lake? And second, has the Ontario Northland Railway insurance against any such liability?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is that the Ontario Northland Railway is responsible to shippers for

declared value of bullion. In reply to the second part, the answer is yes.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the practice, when such shipments are made, that the shipments are brought from the mine accompanied by security officers and then left in the station with just the agent there? Probably he has a gun, but it is very fortunate in this case that he did not try to use it.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I am sure I did not ask them if this was the practice, but it evidently seems to be the practice because this is what happens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Troy: I have a further question for the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Minister please advise what is the official position of Mr. H. L. Cann, a former CNR employee now on the staff of the Ontario Northland Railway, and what are the terms of reference covering his appointment?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the hon. member's question, Mr. Cann's position with the Ontario Northland Railway is managing director. The terms of reference covering Mr. Cann's appointment are as follows:

The government of Ontario, having created by legislation, the Ontario Northland Railroad commission, which accordingly is responsible to the government, and the government and the Ontario Northland Railroad commission having deemed it appropriate to create the post of the managing director to take the responsibility for the management and control of the day-to-day operations of all the transportation and other business of the commission, it is deemed appropriate that terms of reference be set out for the future guidance of the commission and of its managing director.

Notwithstanding the provisions of The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act, the commission shall function in the same manner as an ordinary corporate board of directors with power to create policies, to set annual budgets both subject to the approval of the government of Ontario.

The managing director of the commission shall be solely responsible for and control the day-to-day operations of all its transportation and other businesses owned

by the commission. He shall have sole power to hire or fire all personnel and to set salaries and set budgetary limits providing that there shall be no recourse by any employee to the commission. Provided further that the commission shall approve salaries for senior management personnel, (c) Deal with all labour-management problems and relationships, (d) Negotiate and complete all contracts with shippers, said contracts to be subject to the approval of the commission, (e) Negotiate and complete all contracts for the purchase of equipment and supplies and services, subject to:

- (i) budgetary limitations;
- (ii) Commission approval of any expenditure over \$50,000 or any expenditure which is not budget-approved.

Taken over practically the whole operation, your commission is a very great thing now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Next order of business.

Clerk of the House: The 56th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, hon. members may recall that last year I prefaced my remarks in the debate on the estimates for The Department of Mines with the comment that I approached the task with mixed feelings, with full recognition that Ontario's mineral production had dropped drastically since 1960 and that, generally speaking, the industry in this province appeared to be showing a lack of its former verve.

Then, if I may be permitted to quote from my own words, I said, a little further on:

I would like to emphasize most definitely that the present ailments of the industry are—or should be—short-term ones, and that, if remedial action is taken promptly, the patient will recover his complete health and be stronger and more robust than ever. That, I think, is a certainty.

Let me say now that the remedial action has been taken, and the patient—who was not really very sick after all—has, indeed, made a most spectacular recovery.

The debate which followed my speech last year showed very clearly that the hon. mem-

bers opposite did not share my optimism. My hon. friend who represents the people of Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), the centre of what is perhaps the greatest single mining area in the world, had this to say:

The mining industry in Canada is sick. Nowhere is it sicker than in the province of Ontario where the mining industry is dying.

Mr. Chairman, if he was right, then this year we have seen one of the most remarkable death-bed recoveries in history. However, in all fairness, I am sure no one is more pleased at the result than my good friend, the hon. member for Sudbury. He has shown that always.

Let us look at the developments of the last year and the situation as it stands today. I intend only to summarize this recent history, but I am sure that the events following the announcement last April of a major base metal discovery near Timmins are still fresh in the minds of all hon. members.

The Texas Gulf Sulphur Company made its successful find after only six years of conscientious search and research in which many hundreds of thousands of dollars were expended in geophysical examination, diamond-drilling, and other exploratory work. The announcement of success was made only after the company had proved up by drilling an estimated 25 million tons of valuable copper, silver, lead and zinc ore. This estimate was later revised upward to 61 million tons and, almost certainly, that is still a conservative figure.

I would like to say now that Texas Gulf, from the time it first began its operations in Ontario, has been an excellent corporate citizen, scrupulous in the observance of our laws, and more than willing to co-operate with The Department of Mines and other departments of the government in every possible way. The company richly deserves all the success that is accompanying its efforts.

Following the announcement, there occurred one of the most fantastic claim-staking rushes of all time as the bushland, for miles in every direction from the original discovery, swarmed with prospectors seeking available ground. The facilities of the department in Timmins were strained to the breaking point in an effort to keep up with the flood of paper work required to document these claims, land transfers, and the multitude of other details required. At one point, in order to keep up with the hectic pace, the staff of the mining recorder's office in Timmins was expanded from the normal two to a staff of 13, as trained personnel were

moved in from other offices in less active areas of the province. I would like to pay tribute now to Mr. Egerton, the recorder at Timmins, and Mr. McGinn, the chief mining recorder, and to all the other officials of the mining lands branch who handled a unique situation so capably.

The ultimate result of all this activity is not yet known, and probably will not be known for some time. About all that can be said at this stage is that a great many square miles of potentially productive ground have been taken over, and the whole area is now being subjected to intensive exploratory work by diamond-drill and geophysical methods. Scores of companies are involved in this work—among them the biggest in Canada—and it will certainly be known before long whether the Texas Gulf discovery will result in one very big mine—a certainty—or a whole group of producing operations.

The stock market furore which followed the original announcement, and which set new records on successive days at the Toronto stock exchange, proved one thing at least—Canadian investors do have imagination and they are ready and willing to invest in Canada's future. Apart entirely from the gains or losses of individuals—and certainly there were both—the most lasting and beneficial result of this speculation lies in the fact that a great deal more money is now available to mining and exploration companies to carry on their work of discovering and developing new properties.

The effect of the Texas Gulf discovery can be seen far beyond the immediate area. The whole history of mining in this province shows that one good find begets another, and 1964 proved no exception. The interest and enthusiasm engendered at Timmins spread throughout the breadth of the province so that prospectors in 11 of the 14 mining divisions worked harder and staked more ground than they have in any year since 1955.

Altogether, last year, there were 51,547 claims staked and recorded throughout the province, nearly three times the number for 1963, which could be considered an average year. It is not suggested, of course, that all or even most of this claim-staking will result in active producing mines, but if even a very few of 1964's prospects result in production this year or in the years ahead, the continuing health of Ontario's mining industry will be assured, and we will have new mines to replace those which go out of existence through the attrition which is built into this great industry. The pace of prospecting is still being maintained at the same rapid pace so that, in the first four months of this year,

14,121 claims had been recorded as compared with 12,476 in the same period last year.

Mr. Chairman, the mining industry is in business to produce the minerals which this country and the world needs. During 1964 it performed this function so successfully that the downward trend of the previous few years was reversed and production shot up by almost \$38 million. The total output of our mines last year was something over \$911 million. I would say, Mr. Chairman—a good effort for a dying industry!

By far the greater part of this increase—\$28.5 million of it—was accounted for by the metallic minerals whose total value was \$711.7 million. While it is not my desire to swamp hon. members in a sea of figures, I think that the contribution made to this impressive total by at least a few of the major minerals should be brought out. Nickel, with a total production of 330 million pounds valued at \$268.5 million retained first place. Iron production set a new record—nearly 8 million tons valued at \$84.4 million. Our mines produced more than 4 million pounds of copper for a value of \$132.5 million, an increase of \$20.5 million over last year. Other major factors in the total for metallic production were zinc—at a new record value of \$19.39 million; uranium \$74.3 million; gold \$80.6 million; silver \$15 million; the platinum metals, \$25.20 million; and magnesium, \$5.6 million.

The total value of non-metallic minerals was \$24.7 million with salt, asbestos, gypsum, nepheline syenite and sulphur being the major contributors. Production of natural gas and petroleum together added \$8.68 million to the total, and the structural materials, such as clay products, cement, lime, sand and gravel and stone, added another \$166 million to make up Ontario's magnificent total.

At the end of 1964 there were 88 producing mines in Ontario, and in addition 709 quarries and pits of various kinds. At the same time, development work in various stages was being carried on at 24 other properties—work which in most cases was expected to lead to the establishment of producing mines. While perhaps it is not necessary to list all of these prospective mineral producers, a few examples might be mentioned to advantage.

In the historic Cobalt-Gowganda area, eight silver properties are being developed. In the Sudbury area, the International Nickel Company has four new mines, and Falconbridge Mines Limited has one very large new mine, the Strathcona, in the making to add to the long list of producers of nickel, copper and

the 12 other elements that go to make this one of the richest mining areas in the world. Six other copper properties, among them Texas Gulf, are being prepared for production, as are three potential gold producers, a possible new asbestos mine, and a zinc mine.

In addition to these, since the beginning of this year, 1965, I had the honour of presiding at the official opening of the Adams Mine of the Jones and Laughlin Corporation, a very large open-pit mine near Kirkland Lake. This operation, which will result in the annual production of one million tons of high-grade iron pellets annually for 30 years at least, will serve as a real shot of adrenalin to the community of Kirkland Lake and to the economy of all that part of northeastern Ontario. This mine will employ about 300 people—nearly all residents of the community—and the bulk transportation of the ore will be important business for the government-operated Ontario Northland Railway.

Also this year, the important mining community of Manitouwadge took a long step forward with the formal opening of the Willecho mine as the area's third producer of copper, lead and zinc. The operation will be conducted by Willroy Mines Limited on property owned jointly by Willroy and Lun-Echo Mines. The ore will be milled and concentrated in the Willroy plant.

Announcements of still other plans which have been made since the beginning of the year will have the most far-reaching effects on our economy and on the growing mining industry in this province.

The Algoma Steel Corporation is engaged in negotiations to option the property of Can-Fer Mines Limited near Nakina, again in the northern area. This is an ore body which has been known for several years, but like other potential iron mines in northern Ontario, it has been awaiting an assured market for its product. It is encouraging, too, if negotiations are successful, that the market is to be found in Canada with a Canadian steel company, thus providing a major field for our skilled Canadian labour.

A similar situation exists in the case of the Strathgami iron property at Timagami. Dominion Foundries and Steel Limited and Cliffs Canada Limited have announced that they have acquired this property jointly and are preparing to mine it. The ore will be treated at Dofasco's steel plant in Hamilton.

I understand, too, that Steep Rock Iron Mines is also negotiating sales agreements with prospective consumer partners and these negotiations are so far advanced that construction of a \$15 million pelletizing plant is

expected to start this summer. As hon. members are aware, the Caland Ore Company is now well advanced in the construction of a similar plant for the same purpose.

Pickands, Mather and Company has exercised its option on the property of Iron Bay Mines Limited on Bruce Lake south of Red Lake. Production of up to 3 million tons of pellets per year could come from this property. No development or production plans have yet been announced.

Finally, Denison Mines Limited, one of the world's greatest producers of uranium, is negotiating with European countries for the sale over the next 25 years of 100 million pounds of uranium oxide. When and if this contract is finalized and the necessary export permit is granted by the federal government, the sale of uranium oxide will conceivably bring more than \$700 million of foreign exchange to Canada and will account for 25 per cent of Canada's economic reserves of uranium. It will also mean, of course, that the Denison Mine will not have to close down as it was expected to do this year, and that Elliot Lake will have taken a long step towards recovery.

Ontario's other giant in the uranium mining field, Rio Algom Mines Limited, has also announced that it, too, is negotiating major sales contracts with friendly nations.

Perhaps on the strength of these developments, I am justified now in reminding hon. members that I have said here time and again that Ontario's uranium industry was far from dead and that a complete revival could be expected before the end of this decade. Indeed, it looks now as though our vast reserves—the greatest in the world—will not be sufficient for future needs and that the mining industry must soon begin to explore for new deposits. We must, in this province, be concerned, I would emphasize, that there will be an ample supply of uranium for the important purposes of Ontario Hydro's projects in the field of nuclear reactor power generation. In this province we have great confidence in the future of atomic power development; hence there is a need to safeguard our uranium reserves for this purpose.

This government, through Hydro, is already doing its share to keep the mills at the uranium mines turning. The first nuclear power plant—at Douglas Point near Kin-cardine—will be in operation early in 1966. Work on another much larger plant is to start this year in Pickering township, a few miles east of Toronto. The Douglas Point plant will require 132,000 pounds of uranium oxide at the start-up and 50,000 pounds per

year thereafter. The Pickering project will require 464,000 pounds for the initial fueling and about half that amount each year to keep it in operation.

All this, of course, has been the best possible sort of news for the residents of the town of Elliot Lake and for my friend, the hon. member, across the way (Mr. Farquhar). It is still "The Uranium Capital of the World," but a capital that has had a pretty thin time during the last few years. In the same vein I should like to offer my most sincere congratulations to my friend and colleague, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), who is not present, for the decision he recently arrived at in concert with federal authorities to establish an adult education centre there, using existing facilities for housing and education purposes.

Let us look at the mineral industry from the national scale, see what it means to Canada's economy and relate this overall picture to Ontario, which alone is responsible for nearly one-third of all Canada's mineral production.

These are all facts: Mining is the very bedrock of Canada's economy. Production of about \$3.5 billion worth of minerals each year represents more than seven per cent of Canada's gross national product.

The mining industry directly provides jobs for 130,000 Canadians—more than 47,000 of them in Ontario—and the wages paid in the mineral industry are higher than in any other industrial division in Canada. It has been estimated that directly, and indirectly, the mineral industry provides employment for approximately 13 per cent of Canada's working force.

With exports totaling \$2 billion annually, mining leads all primary industries in Canada's export trade.

Capital and operating expenditures, including purchases of equipment and supplies, amount to \$1 billion annually and federal, provincial and municipal taxes amount to \$100 million annually. The mineral industry in Canada spends about \$45 million annually in prospecting and exploration work.

Mr. Chairman, minerals represent nearly 41 per cent of all the tonnage moved by Canadian railways and inland waterways.

Throughout Canada, and in northern Ontario, the mining industry has given birth to and is the principal or sole sustainer of some of our most modern and progressive communities, as the hon. member for Sudbury will admit.

Canada's mining companies in 1963 paid

some \$220.5 million in dividends to those individuals who have invested in Canada's future.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on at some length with data indicating the very great importance of our mining industry but perhaps I have said enough to convince the hon. members on this score.

We in Canada, especially Ontario, I do not think fully realize how fortunate we are in natural resources: beautiful agricultural land, plenty of minerals, an abundance of timber, water supplies. I often think we should thank God for this great heritage of ours. Perhaps, however, I might add this quotation taken from an address by a very prominent American banker. I like this and I would like to quote it to you:

Throughout the Rocky Mountains, ages gone, God built stronger vaults in his granite banks than ours. He filled these vaults with gold, silver and copper. He gave the prospector knowledge and insight and guided him on his way to the door of the bank vault. The government handed him his patent title to all therein. It is no crime, but a virtue to enter. With drill, blast, pick and spade the poor man broke the combination lock and entered. But for him our notes in issue would be as the "Stumptail" currency of 1857. But for him this government would be bankrupt. Mines will be producing millions in gold, silver and copper in that future day when national banks are unknown. Remember a mine is simply a crop, already raised, harvested and deposited in the bin or bank. You check it out at your pleasure.

The wealth gathered from the mines immortalized King Solomon. Mining made Rome the mistress of the world. Mining made Great Britain the world's commercial dictator. Mining made the United States the richest country in the world. Show me a country that has no mines and I will show you a people sunk in poverty, and poverty makes cowards of nations as well as men. Mining has transformed more broken men and tramps into millionaires and placed them in positions of honour and trust than any other business. Without the miner you would not have frying pan, a spoon or a hat pin. Eliminate the miner and you wipe out civilization. A nation's prosperity depends largely upon the extent, variety and development of its mineral resources.

Mr. Chairman, I am indeed proud to have been entrusted with the responsibility for the department of this government that is charged

with the supervision and guidance of, and assistance to, this industry that is so vital to our national well-being.

As I proceed with details of the department's estimates, hon. members will be given an idea of many of the ways in which we are trying to further the progress of our mining industry, but first I should like to touch lightly on some aspects and some problems which are not specifically dealt with by the department.

First I should like to express my own great pleasure, and that of the senior members of my staff, in the work that is being done by the hard-working members of this House who are serving on the select committee on mining. Many prominent people in the mining industry have also spoken to me about the work of this committee—and their comments have been uniformly favourable. The committee's interim report, recently tabled by the chairman, the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) whom I see in his seat, reflected considerable activity by the committee since its appointment. Still more important, however, in my opinion, is the list included in the report of areas for probable future study when the committee resumes its activities after the present session of this House has adjourned. The committee was given broad terms of reference and its interim report contains food for thought by this House, by my department and by the mining industry generally. I think that we may reasonably expect tangible and beneficial results from their continuing studies.

Any industry that is experiencing rapid expansion is bound to have certain ingrown problems. The mining industry is no exception. This is an age that seems to belong to the professional man, the technologist and the technician. That is as true of mining as of any other major industry in which brain is replacing brawn. For several years now the mineral industry has been faced with a chronic scarcity of professionally trained men—geologists, geophysicists, metallurgists, engineers and others capable of assuming positions of responsibility at or near the top of their organizations. This chronic scarcity is becoming acute, and governments and industry are keenly aware of the necessity for remedial action. Frankly, I do not know just what the remedy might be, but possibly the select committee might come up with an answer, or perhaps the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) might have a suggestion.

I should like to again commend the same hon. gentleman—the Minister of University

Affairs—this time in his role as Minister of Education, on the recent changes in the elementary school curriculum so that now some elementary training in geology is called for in the early school grades. It might well be that the interest inculcated in these formative years will remain with the student and cause him to enroll in one of the mining sciences when the time comes for him to choose his university course.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that these introductory remarks have served to bring home to hon. members of this House the vastly important place that mining has in our way of life. I hope that what I have said will make it easy for them to approve the appropriations which officials of my department consider the minimum cost of providing the services that are needed to ensure that the industry, for which I have the honour to speak here, is to continue its march forward and play an even greater part in our economy than it does today.

I feel that an explanation, if not an apology, is due those hon. members of the Opposition who, last year, as in other years, said in effect, "If the mining industry is so important—and we do not question this—why then is The Department of Mines one of the smallest departments in the government and why is the budget for the department's work not much greater than it is?"

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the question and I believe that it was asked in complete sincerity.

My reply is this: The department is able to operate with a relatively small staff because, over the years, a very efficient system has been built up to handle the work load in all the branches. Each member of the staff in a responsible position is highly trained, skilled and educated in his particular duties. Because they are, without exception, devoted public servants, they are given sufficient autonomy to handle any but the most unusual situations without difficulty.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that we operate on a small budget, simply because no great sum is required to finance the operations of the department. This government, and certainly this department, has never accepted as a criterion of efficiency the amount of money expended. I ask and expect to receive from this House the amount of money actually required to carry on our work for the coming year. In other years, when the work load becomes greater, or new responsibilities are accepted, it is quite possible that our financial requirements will be greater.

But for this coming year we are asking for

only \$2,657,000 to cover all ordinary expenditures, plus \$1 million as capital expenditure for our share of the cost of constructing roads to resources and other roads under the mining and access roads programme.

This is an overall increase of \$173,000, over the total for the past year. The reasons for this increase will become apparent as I proceed, but about \$70,000 of it can be attributed to the reclassification programme which was put into effect by the civil service commission. I am sure that no hon. member of this House is likely to object to any step which will improve the standing and morale of the devoted men and women who do such an excellent job for the people of Ontario. I suggest that money thus spent is indeed well invested.

Under vote 1201 are included all expenditures of the main office of the department. The total amount of this vote is \$544,000, an increase of \$48,000 over the estimates for last year. Of this increase, \$24,000 is for general maintenance and it may be attributed to a change in operation this year, through which all purchases of office furniture and equipment for the whole department are now centralized in this one vote.

Our total estimates for the geological branch, covered under vote 1202, amount to \$1,135,000, slightly more than half of the total ordinary expenditure for the entire department. The increase in this vote is \$37,000. With that money we plan to add three geologists and one draftsman to the staff.

There will be one more field party at work this year than last year—26 as compared with 25—and altogether the branch will have at least 50 projects of one kind and another in operation. With the addition of the three geologists it will be possible to have nearly all the field parties under the leadership of a regular member of the staff, rather than by extra part-time geologists, however highly qualified these may be. The cost of geological surveys this year will be \$481,600. This includes salaries, maintenance and travel for the personnel involved. The total for this section is \$75,300 more than it was in the current year. There will be one more party in the field, and seven parties in all will be working in areas that are very difficult of access and where aircraft must be used. This, naturally, adds materially to the cost.

Included in the geological vote is a total of \$373,300 for the production of the very large number of maps and reports of various kinds which are turned out during the year. This is a reduction of \$3,900 from the total

for last year. This decrease, in spite of the fact that the number of individual publications will be greater than ever before, is made possible only by the development of new and more efficient techniques in the production of our maps.

This year for the second time we are co-operating with The Department of Lands and Forests in its junior forest ranger programme by giving lectures during a two-month period in the summer to the young students who are enrolled in the programme. The instruction will consist of rock and mineral identification and kindred subjects related to prospecting. The cost in this first year of this work will be only \$3,100, although it may be anticipated that if the experiment is successful, the work will be extended in subsequent years.

Since 1959 a total of 196,000 square miles of northern Ontario has been covered by airborne magnetometer surveys. The maps which have been produced in that time as a result of this work have revealed a great deal of interesting and potentially very valuable information about the geological resources of the province. This work was financed jointly by our government and the government of Canada. A new contract signed in 1964 provides that the remaining 121,000 square miles of northern Ontario will be covered in the same way during the next three years. The cost of this year's programme, including the production of maps, is \$90,500. This represents a reduction of \$59,500 from the cost of the same work during 1964. This reduced cost was made possible by better terms with the contracting company, and that was brought about by the company installing more up-to-date machines that do the work much faster and more cheaply.

The work of the geological branch and the value of the maps and reports which are issued as a result of this work are of incalculable benefit to the mining industry. Occasionally it happens, as was the case with the Manitouwadge discovery, that the information contained in reports may not be exploited for several years, but more often the reports are put to immediate use.

For example, the compilation map of the Timmins-Kirkland Lake area which was published early in 1964 has been widely acclaimed by exploration people as a most useful tool during the recent Timmins staking rush. The first edition of 3,000 copies was completely sold out in six months, an all-time record for department map sales, and a new edition was required.

The recent decision of the Teck Corporation to purchase and explore property west

of the Macassa mine is expected to have great bearing on the life of the old Kirkland Lake mining camp. Company officials have said that a departmental report on deep developments in the Kirkland Lake mines published early last year, together with an older departmental report, had a considerable bearing on the company's decision to go ahead with this mining enterprise, on which \$3.5 million may be spent.

In the Red Lake area a map and report of Heyson township published in 1963 led to detailed exploration for gold in a new locality last year.

The series of publications covering industrial minerals in southern Ontario have given considerable impetus to exploration and development of these industrial minerals, particularly building stone, in that part of the province. In that connection it is a pleasure to note that native Ontario marble is to be used extensively in the new Queen's Park complex on which work was started this year.

New exploration activity in two widely separated parts of the province—one in southeastern Ontario, the other in the northwestern area—can be attributed in large part to recent departmental work that has been done there.

Vote 1203 covers operations of the mines inspection branch. The total estimated expenditure for this branch is \$343,000, an increase of \$14,000 over the current year. Salary increases, because of the reclassification programme and normal increases, amounted to \$16,000. Maintenance was down \$3,000 and travelling expenses increased by \$1,000. The work of the inspection branch is carried out by highly qualified engineers who are responsible for the enforcement of safety regulations and other factors connected with the actual operation of mines. In addition to the headquarters staff in Toronto, the department maintains engineers at seven other points in the province convenient to the mining areas.

In February of this year, we had a disaster at the McIntyre Porcupine mines and these men were called in. I would like to read to you a letter that was sent to me from McIntyre Porcupine mines by Mr. McCodron, the manager. I quote:

Sir:

Four weeks ago, the McIntyre staff began the grim task of fighting an underground fire over a mile below surface and a mile southeast of our main shaft. Fortunately, through the efforts of The Department of Mines, a very excellent system of mine rescue training has been developed

over the years and we knew we did not stand alone.

Our first call for help went to local mines who furnished top-calibre mine rescue teams. As we learned more about the size and extent of the fire we found it necessary to accept offers of assistance from Sudbury and Elliot Lake. Mine rescue superintendents from Elliot Lake, Sudbury, Kirkland Lake, Cobalt and Timmins provided equipment and worked around the clock to keep the equipment serviced for mine rescue teams.

The fact that 44 units of McCoa apparatus were kept in continuous use for 12 days was a test to the excellence of the maintenance. There were no accidents nor illness because of faulty equipment. Messrs. Lockhart and McPhail of The Department of Mines were of great assistance in fire headquarters, helping to make decisions and providing top-level guidance at all times. Mr. A. Graham, local mine rescue superintendent, spent three weeks with us and all other superintendents spent approximately eight days at the mine during the height of the fire, providing us 24-hour coverage.

We are full of admiration for the manner in which these men conducted themselves and for the outstanding work performed by the teams. All work was carried out in accordance with mine rescue training under conditions of intense heat and poor visibility.

We cannot be too high in our praise for the men who did this work and the men who trained them.

Respectfully,

McIntyre Porcupine Mines Ltd.,

P. D. McCodron, Manager.

That is some indication of how important the training in rescue and safety regulations is to this industry and to the province.

Included in the same vote is the work of the cable testing laboratory which is operated by the inspection branch. This laboratory provides a vitally important and highly specialized service to the mining industry. Periodic tests required by The Mining Act are carried out at regular intervals to determine the tensile strength and other factors in all cable used for hoisting in mines. Since a fee is charged for each test, most of the operating cost is recovered directly from the industry.

Research which is being conducted jointly by the department and the Ontario mining association is designed to perfect a method of testing ropes while they are still in actual

use. The electromagnetic instrument which is used for this purpose has been perfected to the point where it can be used for all except lock-coil ropes. This research is continuing. Lock coil is where there is a lock on the outside of all the wires.

The maintenance of two other laboratories, one in Toronto, the other in Cobalt, is covered under vote 1204. The estimated cost of these two installations is \$212,000, an increase of \$29,000 over the operating cost in the current year. Except for a \$5,000 increase in maintenance costs, this is also the result of salary increases. Three additional staff will be taken on by the analytical and metallurgical laboratory which is situated in the tower of the east block.

The other laboratory included in this vote is the Timiskaming testing laboratory located at Cobalt. Total operating costs here are \$82,000, a reduction of \$4,000 from 1964-65. The increase in staff of the Toronto laboratory has been made necessary by increased work by the geological branch which accounts for about 50 percent of the total work load of the laboratory.

The cost of operating the office of the sulphur fumes arbitrator, as covered in vote 1205, will be \$25,000 in the coming year. All of this money will be recovered from the mining companies responsible for the emanation of fumes.

The final item of ordinary expenditure is \$398,000 for the operation of the mining lands branch, covered under vote 1206. This is \$44,000 more than in the current year. The increase is made up by \$36,000 in salary increases, \$3,000 added to travelling expenses and a \$5,000 increase in maintenance costs. The mining lands branch administers The Mining Act insofar as it pertains to the disposition of Crown lands for mining purposes, The Beach Protection Act, The Canada Companies Lands Act and Section 66 of The Public Lands Act.

That, Mr. Chairman, completes our estimates of the ordinary expenditures of the department for the coming year. There remains only one item, sir, of capital expenditure, found under vote 1207, for the construction of roads to resources and mining and access roads. The total estimate for this work is \$1 million, the same as in 1964-65. The cost of the roads to resources is, of course, matched by the federal government and, in some cases, with individual companies that might be in a position to gain most direct benefit from the construction. The mining and access roads programme is entirely a provincial matter, except that here, too, in

some cases companies might be asked to share the cost.

Mr. Chairman, I have given in only the most general terms an outline of what my department is doing, and what we plan to do in the months and years ahead. We have scaled down our financial requirements to the bare minimum necessary if this work is to be done satisfactorily, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that with the highly skilled and devoted staff of this department, every dollar that this House votes for the department's work will be spent to the best possible advantage.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. A. H. Taylor (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, in rising to comment on the estimates of The Department of Mines, I would like first to congratulate the hon. Minister on a much more optimistic and favourable report in regard to progress in the industry than he was able to present last year or, for that matter, several years.

Since this committee of the House was last convened, there have been many happenings and many new mining developments, most of which have been for the good of the province and the mining industry generally. A year ago the general consensus, it seems to me, was that the mining industry in Ontario was deep in the doldrums. One of the all-time great producing mines, Hollinger, was about to close its doors, thus leaving a vacuum in Timmins, one of our most important mining communities. Kirkland Lake seemed slated for a similar fate. The slump in both total production and the search for new mines was continuing, but then the unexpected happened. We had the finding of vast new ore bodies by Texas Gulf Sulphur near Timmins. Their success so encouraged new prospecting and claim staking that the search for minerals is now, at long last, on the up turn. This miracle happened at a time when most part of capital was switching to British Columbia, Quebec and to other areas where the opportunity and the climate for prospecting appeared much better than in Ontario.

The good fortune continued. Besides Texas Gulf, we have seen the Jones and Laughlin iron ore operation established at Kirkland Lake, and latterly, the Sherman Mines through Cleveland Cliffs at Timagami. In common with all of us, I am sure that the hon. Minister feels most happy about these developments. However, to put things in their proper perspective, I wonder how much credit is justly due to The Department of

Mines or to the government for this improved situation. Is it not the simple truth that the change in the mining picture in Ontario was due, not to any new government policy, government action, or government help, but rather to the progressive attitude of certain American mining companies? Their long-range thinking, their energy, their resources and willingness to take a risk, have pulled our chestnuts out of the fire. The hard fact remains that this government was prepared to stand by and write off Timmins and Kirkland Lake and other mining areas, and let exploration and development continue its downward skid.

Focusing now on the upturn in mining, however, the main point is how long can this renewed activity be expected to last? The progress in the mining industry in this day and age, in common with other industries, requires careful planning and positive government action if it is not to sink once again into a situation of fits and starts, of ups and downs, of patchwork accomplishment, unworthy of this industry's true potential.

Just what steps have been taken by this government in the interests of mining? I will say the establishment of the select committee on the problems of mining was a move in the right direction. It is unfortunate, however, that we had to wait until exploration and development reached such a low point before it was set up. It might well have been initiated at least five years ago. The steady decline in mining in Ontario has been apparent for everyone to see over many years. But aside from this, what has been done? Adequate funds have not been provided for roads. The yearly grant of \$1 million does not even keep pace with existing requirements in areas with established potential, let alone with the need for access to new frontiers of development.

Up to now, our hon. Minister has been unable to convince his Cabinet colleagues of the urgent need for seeking out and for positive government assistance in developing our latent mineral resources on a sufficiently broad scale, although I am sure he has pointed out the necessity for such action many times. The Cabinet has apparently not gone along with him to support a provincial investigation of mining possibilities in provincial parks. This government has not moved to provide incentives to ensure that the Texas Gulf smelter will be located in the Timmins area, although the northern Ministers fully appreciate the desirability of doing this and what it would mean to northern Ontario, as well as to the province as a whole. This government has consistently shrugged off its responsibility

for increasing aid to mining municipalities which are fighting against odds other municipalities do not have to face.

It is hard to understand such lack of interest, such indifference and shallow perspective, in matters pertaining to an industry that has contributed in excess of \$16 billion worth of wealth to this province over the years, an industry where the major part of its output has always been exported—thus helping to keep our country's balance of payments in line in a substantial and continuing way, an industry that produces basic materials so necessary for the growth and development of our secondary industries.

Besides all this, we must realize that mining in Ontario now, compared to its future, is only in its adolescence. It has just got nicely started. Geologists claim that we have only scratched the surface. But hard as it is to understand, the facts stand out plainly for everyone to see. This government is ignoring its obligations to a very important industry and segment of our people in this province. Even a preliminary study of the mining industry and the areas where it is located inevitably leads to the conclusion that there are many things that could and should be done to promote more rapid but orderly development. A close study makes this even more important, and further, the responsibility for the future well-being of the industry lies with the government.

It seems to me that this government has a number of very direct responsibilities to this industry to promote its continuing growth and continuing important contribution to our provincial economy.

1. It has the responsibility of encouraging and assisting individuals and industry in seeking out new mineral resources to a far greater degree than has been done in the past few years.
2. It has the responsibility of seeing that the providers of risk capital be given basic guarantees that their money will be used for the stated purpose for which it was supplied.
3. It has the responsibility of reviewing, in all its aspects, the whole field of mining education, health, safety and the future of the people occupied in the industry with the view of making needed adjustments, necessary changes and improvements that are long past due.
4. It has the responsibility of seeing that exposed mineral resources are developed in the best long-term interests of the people of this province.
5. It has the responsibility of providing money and support to mining communities

comparable to other localities making roughly the same contribution to the province, and of guaranteeing these mining communities compensation for the depletion of their resources.

6. At the same time, it must fit provincial capital expenditures into these areas into the long-term overall growth plan for the province.

7. Finally, it has the great and pressing responsibility of taking action not five years from now, but now.

This government could face up to these obligations in a number of ways. With regard to encouraging prospecting and development the committee on mining will shortly point out many opportunities which should be grasped and acted upon. More intensive surveys of our established mining areas should be made. Greater use should also be made of proven technical equipment in conducting these surveys. A more complete gathering of known and available mineral and geological information should be completed and made readily available to anyone interested.

I have already commented on the urgent need for more roads and the need for surveys of our park lands. With respect to risk capital, along with the Kimber report the findings of Mr. Justice Kelly will surely turn up information pointing to the necessity of an overhaul of security regulations for the better protection of mining investors.

In the field of education, as well as the health and safety future of those who work in the mines, there is much to be done. After a few years miners find themselves committed to an industry which has no need for older men. It has been estimated that the average useful work span for an underground worker is ten years. This points up to the need for training services to teach other skills to men who have been displaced by time and changing conditions. This should be an important and continuing objective of this government.

Health and safety laws of mines and mining communities have not kept pace with technological changes in mining. Prevention of pollution alone is a subject worth study by a qualified committee and early action needs to be taken.

On the development of exposed mineral resources, surely the government can take steps to ensure that more of our raw minerals are further processed in this province. I hardly need to point out that this would provide secondary industry employment that we will well need in the future. The accomplishment of this objective would not necessarily call for government restrictions but

rather for government incentives. Other provinces have demonstrated that such a course is practical and of very great help to regional development.

In general, considerably more money's should be allocated to this department in order that it can play the role in the greater development of this industry for which this department was originally created. Greater expenditures by this department will result in much greater returns to this province.

So far I have dealt briefly with four important spheres of government responsibility where action is needed to promote a sound and progressing mining industry in Ontario and the well-being of the people in it.

However, it is the problems of the mining municipalities which I am particularly anxious to stress today.

We should first make sure that the regions producing minerals are properly compensated for the depletion of their natural resources, and then that all provincial capital expenditure in such regions be organized to fit the long-term growth plans of the province.

My colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury has recently pointed out the serious problems of the city of Sudbury and its people in his graphic speech during the estimates of The Department of Municipal Affairs.

The situation in the city of Sudbury has its counterpart in varying degrees in a great many other mining municipalities throughout this province. It should be pointed out that these municipalities vary in size and organization from the city of Sudbury with a population of some 80,000 to the town of Cobalt with 2,300 residents and the township of Buck with about 7,800 people. While this difference in size and organization make for a variety of problems peculiar to each, they nevertheless all have certain major problems in common.

One, they were born and grew up as a result of mining and their life as of now continues to be dependent upon this industry. Their existence is not aided by the presence of manufacturing plants or other industrial activities. Their eggs, as it were, are all in one basket. Inevitably a time comes when the source of their revenue and employment dwindles and eventually dries up, because mining operations are based on a non-renewable resource. When all the commercial ore in a mine has been removed, it has to close up shop. This leaves the municipality in a financial strait-jacket.

Unless alternative sources of employment are found, the need for existing municipal

services diminishes. More rapid amortization of the capital assets of the municipality is required, resulting in increased costs for the financing of municipal capital expenditures. The brunt of these extra costs must then be borne by the remaining residents, many of whom may be unemployed, or face the prospect of moving to another area.

Second, by the very nature of things, a mining municipality must be adjacent to the mines to which it owes its existence. Many are located in hard-to-get-at areas, and usually are quite a distance from the larger Canadian markets. This puts great limitations on the type of new industry unrelated to mining that the municipality can hope to attract.

Third, the rate at which a mine decides to extract and treat its ore often has a great influence on the municipality, sometimes a most detrimental one. Stepped-up production creates peaks of employment, necessitating rapid growth for the community and calls for an equally rapid expansion of civic services. Any reduction in the rate, on the other hand, results in unemployment, yet no corresponding decrease in the municipality's financial burden. Neither the municipality nor the province has the authority to regulate the rate of mine production. A change in world metal markets is quite often the governing factor. These varying conditions and external influences make orderly financial planning development for a mining municipality extremely difficult.

Fourth, as mentioned before, a community serving the mine must be located close to it. This in the past has ruled out the selection of desirable town sites, and has resulted in their locating on difficult ground where costs are high for the installation of watermains, sewers and other services. In passing, I may say the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) is to be complimented on his policy which helps prevent such situations from recurring, but we still have to face up to our past mistakes.

Fifthly, miners are young people. The low average age for residents of a mining community means a large school population, and educational costs well above the provincial averages.

From this summary, Mr. Chairman, you can see that the special nature and characteristics of mining communities require more, rather than less, tax money for elementary and essential services than do other communities.

Now let us take a look at how much is actually made available to mining communities through taxation, and how this money is

raised. The hon. member for Sudbury gave us a detailed breakdown of this in his remarks. To begin with, taxing rights of these municipalities have always been more restricted than for other communities. In many cases, a mine lies just outside a municipality, which merely acts as a dormitory and commercial centre. The municipality receives no tax money in such situations. Where the mine lies within the municipal boundaries, the mineral lands are then assessable, but the actual ore in these lands is not and cannot be taken into account in determining land values. Further, all the buildings, plant and machinery used in extracting ore are entirely exempt. Thus, the mining municipalities are denied the authority of levying either realty or business taxes against the major part of the properties of the industries they are serving.

In place of direct taxing rights on mining properties thus denied them, mining municipalities have received since 1952 an annual payment from the province. Without going into detail, these grants are based on a formula involving a fixed dollar amount for each employee working at a mine within the borders of the municipality. Provision is also made for fixed dollar per capita grants in respect to miners working at mines outside the municipality.

Now here are the important points to note: The provincial grants have never been comparable in size to what would have been received under normal direct taxation rights available to other municipalities. Further, these payments are not in line with the high degree of industrialization of mining communities for what, in all fairness, should be provided, considering their complete dependence on one industry and considering the contribution they make to the general welfare of the province. The association of mining municipalities of northern Ontario has many times pointed out these facts and recommended constructive changes.

It was this organization which was responsible for first obtaining the government's recognition of these problems back in 1952 that resulted in the special grants to many mining municipalities. The association has more recently presented a very detailed brief along these lines, both to the committee on taxation and to the committee on mining. Their requests are very modest in relation to what is due to them, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is quite familiar with these problems, has recently indicated that something needs to be done, but he is awaiting the report of the tax committee.

He quite correctly pointed out that permitting normal powers of assessment to these municipalities would not solve their problems. However, to continue, Mr. Chairman, at this point only half the story has been told. We have so far only examined one side of the coin. Let us now take a look at things from the standpoint of this provincial government.

To begin with, the province receives the benefit of all regular taxes, including corporation tax and sales tax, which are levied against mining companies, just as they are against other companies operating within this province. Since mining operations involve large sums of money, the revenues from these sources is substantial. In addition, Mr. Chairman, this government receives extra revenue from a special source, the provincial mines tax. This tax is levied directly as a percentage of mining company profits, and has produced varying amounts over the years, currently amounting to about \$16 million. It has always seemed to me that while the rate of this tax appears reasonable and is in line with other provinces, the very principle of the tax itself is wrong.

Revenues derived from taxation of a wasting natural resource are being used for current provincial expenditures. In other words, we are dipping into our capital to pay for our day-to-day costs. In any case, one thing is crystal clear in reviewing the actual operation of this tax. An inadequate amount of money collected by it, finds its way back to the municipalities by way of the present grant system. Also, very little of it is being used in operation of the mining branch to develop new mining and none of it is being used to create other productive activities in those regions.

The consistent lack of money justly due the mining municipalities over the years, judged by any or every yardstick one chooses to use, has been the cause of the present plight of these communities today. There was some excuse for this condition in the past because the revenue derived from the mining tax loomed much larger in importance to the overall financing of this province than it does at the present time. Today there is absolutely no excuse since this situation no longer holds true. With provincial spending amounting to almost \$2 billion, the \$16 million revenue from the mine tax is a relatively small consideration and would scarcely be missed in the overall budget.

I hope the House and this government will realize that something needs to be done to rectify these conditions which have gone on much too long—not something small and of

a short-sighted stopgap nature, but rather a far-reaching and imaginative re-examination of our whole mineral resource industry, and not simply plugging holes in a leaky dike whose basic foundations have weakened, but a complete rebuilding job of the basic concepts of mining in Ontario, so that this industry, with its communities, can continue to grow and contribute to the wealth of this province. Growth should be of a permanent nature, not the boom-or-bust type of development we have seen in the past.

In line with the Liberal Party's stated policy of constructive criticism and our hon. leader's (Mr. Thompson's) insistence in suggesting definite and positive methods for accomplishing desirable ends, I propose, sir, that the revenues derived from the present provincial mines tax be segregated from other provincial revenues and be expended annually in the following manner:

1. To pay the operating expenses of The Department of Mines. These expenses should be substantially increased to provide an extension of services to the mining industry by way of geochemical and geophysical work; for assistance in the finding and development of new mineral deposits; to provide additional development roads to known natural resources; to provide a stepped-up programme in existing mining schools, and for the establishment of new courses, thus answering the crying need for a greater number of qualified workers and personnel required for the mining industry.

2. To guarantee grants to mining municipalities large enough to put them on an equal basis with equivalent municipalities in the province. These grants should take into consideration the limited life of the primary industry on which the community is based, as well as the other problems peculiar to mining municipalities.

3. To set up a special northern Ontario and mining area industrial development fund to finance the growth of secondary and ancillary industry in these areas. The administration of this fund should be handled by a board located in northern Ontario, composed in part of northerners. It would be assigned the responsibility of promoting and assisting in the development of, and in some cases, underwriting such industry as may be needed to contribute to the permanent growth of these areas. This industrial development would be designed to provide replacement industries to lessen the existing complete economic dependence on the mines with their relatively short life span, and to co-ordinate the introduction of such replacement industry

with the gradual slowdown that takes place near the end of a mine's life.

To sum up, let us review what such a programme would accomplish: It would adjust the unfair and economically unsound practice of draining the natural mineral resources from an area and leaving that area high and dry, once the spoils had been taken. Such a principle has been recognized for years in our forest industries, and reforestation programmes are now provided to prevent the depletion of their natural resources. It would remove from the minds of the northern people any suggestion that they are second-class citizens who are being exploited by the south, as they have been, and supported by inadequate handouts. It would provide a major impetus for the growth and development of northern Ontario and a permanent—not transitory and makeshift—foundation for this growth.

Development would be stepped up to match the pace being achieved in other parts of our province. Mining municipalities would be revived and revitalized. There would be no more ramshackle mining towns. The whole mining industry would be given new opportunities for expansion. It would benefit not only the mining municipalities, not only the mining industry, not only the north and the people in it, but the province and this country as a whole. The resulting new mines and other industry would compound the wealth of our natural resources, Mr. Chairman, and broaden the tax revenue base of the whole province.

Such proposed action is certainly not out of line with steps being taken by other provinces, other industries and other areas of our country, where it is realized that long-term planning is required for steady progress in today's world.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the hon. Minister that he present such a programme to his Cabinet colleagues, not in any apologetic way, as one of the minor Ministers in this government, but rather in the forceful manner to which he is fully entitled as a representative of a major resource industry that has contributed, and can continue to contribute greatly, to the stature of this province and to the world position of our great country.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): The homage paid to private enterprise in the mining industry sounds sincere, but last July's sudden windfall in the Windfall scandal has mostly benefited those entrepreneurs, promoters and speculators who were already sitting pretty, financially speaking.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The lions' share goes to the lions.

Mr. Freeman: But what came after this windfall can only be described as a tempest with chilling winds. I need not remind the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), unfortunately he is not here, that stock manipulations of the magnitude of Windfall Mines and Oil Limited—

Mr. Chairman: Order. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that any reference to the Windfall inquiry, which is now under the Royal commission conducted by the chief justice, is sub judice and should not be referred to at any time during the remarks that you make.

Mr. Freeman: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that as far as my remarks are concerned with regard to Windfall, or anything in connection with Windfall, nothing I am about to say has not already been said in the newspapers. I have no real reference to the investigation that is going on.

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. With the greatest respect to you, sir, I submit that there is no rule of this House, neither is there any rule of the British House of Commons—to which we look for precedent—which says that any matter submitted to a Royal commission is sub judice, so far as the power of this Legislature is concerned to discuss it. That rule applies to the courts, and I accede to the soundness of that rule, so far as it applies to the courts. It is a proper rule, very salutary. We should not interfere with the due process of law in the courts.

I submit to you, with the greatest respect, that the same soundness does not apply to the submission of any matter to a Royal commission. A Royal commissioner is no more than a servant of this Legislature, appointed under a statute of this government, of this Legislature. He exercises any powers he has, under The Public Enquiries Act, powers given to him by this Legislature, and powers that can be taken away.

Therefore, we do not stand in the same position, sir, of being beholden to a servant of the Legislature. All he is doing is acting under powers entrusted to him, to carry out a specific task and to report back to the government or the Legislature, as the case may be. Therefore, sir, his existence, the conduct of his inquiry, does not in any way circumscribe us from discussing the matters that are in his hands.

It was Leslie Frost who first imprinted

that rule on this House. It was he who raised it in connection with the Roach inquiry. We had not heard anything more about it under the aegis of the present Prime Minister, but I see this morning that it is cropping up again. I submit, sir, that according to our traditions and the rules, no such circumscription exists, and I would be the first to protest against the imposition of any limit to the right of free speech in this Legislature.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, I think the Chairman was unduly hasty, in that I think he could be assured that the hon. member for Fort William was not going to transgress seriously. He was just going to make no more than general comments on an issue that is painfully relevant to mining and, therefore, relevant to a consideration of the mining estimates. He was not going to transgress seriously.

But now the point has been raised because of your apparent sensitivity on the issue, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say—

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: I am speaking to a point of order. Now that the issue has been raised, I want to agree completely with what the hon. member for Sudbury has said. There are two ways of using a Royal commission. One way is to get at the facts, and the other is to take the issue out of the public mind and out of the public discussion, in order to serve the government purposes. If you are going to impose unnecessary restrictions which, incidentally, were particularly unnecessary in light of the remarks my hon. colleague was going to make, then I suggest to you that we have got to get this rule clarified.

This legislative body is supreme in the province of Ontario. We acknowledge that we have to bow in the direction of the courts, but we certainly do not have to bow in the direction of Royal commissions that are established to do a job on behalf of our needs here, and are servants of this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: It has been my opinion that the usual procedure of the Chairman is to rule out any matters that are sub judice, and on that basis I have made my ruling at this time.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, speaking to this point of order, as a complete layman along these lines, I simply cannot

agree with you at all. It has been ably pointed out, not only by the hon. member for Sudbury but also the hon. member for York South, that this is not sub judice; that this has nothing to do with the courts whatsoever; that this is a matter that has been before a Royal commission and that commission is hired, or can be fired, by this Legislature. To me it is incomprehensible that free speech should be stifled by a ruling such as you have made here this morning, in a matter that certainly affects the mining industry of the province of Ontario, and one I think that will be handled with the dignity with which the hon. members of this Legislature usually handle such matters.

We are not going to discuss something and drag the whole affair out in these august chambers. On the other hand, if it happens to cross the way of the estimates, I think the truth must fall where it may, and surely you, as a Chairman who has been in these chambers for many years, are not going to stifle free speech.

Mr. Chairman: Like the member for Bruce, I am also a layman, and I feel at this time I would like to call on the Attorney General to express his views on this matter.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I have to agree that the expression sub judice does not strictly apply to the type of hearing or inquiry conducted by a Royal commission, which is established by this Legislature. There is a great area of such an inquiry which is public, of course, as all the hon. members of the House are aware; much of the evidence submitted before such an inquiry is public matter and can be related and recounted as the press do. Any member of the public is entitled to hear it, see it, see the witnesses, give such evidence and speak upon it.

I think, however, that the good sense of the hon. members would go this far; I think perhaps the hon. members of the House are not apart on this opinion. I would hope, on whatever side they sit—that where the commissioner, who is a judge, after all, sitting as a commissioner, is hearing evidence, and from that evidence will make findings of fact to be presented to this Legislature in due course—and we trust soon, in this particular inquiry, recommendations for action or for legislation, that the good sense of the hon. members might be called upon to refrain from seeking to draw their conclusions from the facts, and to make their recommendations.

There is always, first of all, the danger that the facts as they have been related and, with

great respect to the press, may not be exactly as they were recorded on the transcript of the evidence in the inquiry. I think it is only fair, proper, reasonable and sensible to ask the House, in discussing the Windfall matter which is, as the hon. member for York South has said, somewhat related to mining and the securities field, or the dealing with securities where money is raised for mining, to go so far as to refer to the facts.

I think in discussing it we may go so far as to refer to the facts as we have heard them, but I suggest—and I think the hon. members would accept this—that we refrain from trying to draw conclusions or perhaps express recommendations; we have a most eminent judge of our supreme court seeking to do that very thing from facts which have been presented in a judicial inquiry, a Royal commission. His duty is to draw the essence of the evidence and then present recommendations. I think within those limits, Mr. Chairman, you might very well allow some latitude.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I agree entirely with the hon. Attorney General. When you, sir, called my hon. friend to order I thought that the hon. member for Fort William was making passing reference only to the Windfall episode. The fact that you jumped in so quickly seemed to me an indication that you were not going to allow the name Windfall to be mentioned, let alone discussed. I agree entirely with the hon. Attorney General. I am glad that he has spoken thus for the government. There is only one point on which I disagree with him, and that is from a layman's point of view. My hon. friend says we should not discuss in depth or make recommendations; I doubt the wisdom of putting that imposition on the members. It seems to me that any discussion that takes place in this House in relation to Windfall will help the judge in making his final recommendations to the House. Surely it would not be prejudicial to the cause that he seeks to examine, and surely any discussion that takes place here will be helpful rather than harmful to the final disposition of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you do not press your ruling in view of what the hon. Attorney General has said; I am sure that the hon. Attorney General and yourself can rely on the hon. members of this House to discuss this not only intelligently, but with the certain reservation that should be applied in situations of this kind.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There is just one small comment, if I may. I do not cast any doubt

upon the wisdom of hon. members in this House, or upon their intelligence in discussing any matter. I would just say this again. The facts as they have come forth in public may not—again, I throw out this caution—have been the spectacular facts, and not all the facts, I think, are before this House, as they are before the Royal commission. The other point is, therefore, that in discussing them a person might be led into some error by drawing conclusions from them. The report, of course, will be presented and tabled in this House. I suggest that then perhaps would be the time to make full and proper reference to the facts and the recommendations and to criticize them, offer suggestions of amendment, and so on, if this were found proper after the report had been tabled. I merely say to the House that I think considerable discretion and sense should be used in a discussion of this kind.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly again to this point of order. I think perhaps the hon. Attorney General has put his finger on the solution to the problem in suggesting good judgment and discretion. Nobody wants to rush in and violate what is an area demanding certain propriety. But there was one point in his comments that I just want to isolate for a moment and focus attention on.

He said: "We should not draw conclusions; we leave this to Judge Kelly." Now, with respect, I want to suggest to you that if this is what should be done, I have rarely seen it violated more frequently, rightly or wrongly, by not only the press at the editorial level, but even by the Toronto stock exchange, which has drawn its own conclusions. Some of the conclusions, as a result of this inquiry were painfully obvious. The Toronto stock exchange has now publicly announced, I think in the past 48 hours, some pretty far-reaching changes which years ago they dismissed as unwarranted interjections from outside the operations of their private club. Every editorial, every daily paper in this city have, in effect, had their own report on the Kelly commission.

So it gets a little thick that hon. members of the Legislature, who are responsible in a most critical way for public policy in this province—some of us advanced the ideas now being put forward five and six years ago—should be denied an opportunity. So I make this plea, that even in the area of drawing conclusions, while we should respect certain proprieties, if we are denied the right to our conclusions we are going to be denied something which the Toronto stock exchange, the

newspaper editors and a lot of people are indulging in as a result of that inquiry.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member and myself are apart only on the matter of timing. I simply suggest that when all the facts are before us properly, with any recommendations that may be made, the hon. members of this House are certainly capable then of having, I think, the fullest discussion and offering any suggestions, conclusions or recommendations by way of resolution or legislation they may see fit. This is all I have to offer, Mr. Chairman, on this point. At this time we perhaps should be restrained to some extent in trying to reach conclusions when we have a Royal commissioner trying to reach some recommendations for us.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to comment on this at this moment. This is a Royal commission inquiry and, although the evidence has been presented, until Mr. Justice Kelly reports, it is still sub judice. When you deal with the depth of the discussion that should take place, it puts the Chairman in an awkward position of when to call order. I feel that you should contain yourself in whatever you say in this connection with a great deal of sound judgment and understanding; I would ask the hon. member to carry on with his remarks.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Chairman, it is closely approaching the hour of 12.30, but I would like to say to you, sir, and to the hon. members of this House, that I am somewhat surprised at you, sir, as Chairman, and at the attitude which is apparently adopted by the chair so very quickly on the opening of my remarks. I have thought for the brief time that I have been a member of this House, that I had exhibited some degree of common sense, some degree of restraint, and some degree of courtesy to all of the hon. members, to the Speaker, to the Chairman and to everyone in connection with this House. I regret that you, sir, as Chairman, or that your advisors may have suggested to you that I had any intention of going beyond the bounds of reasonable decency in laying a basis for my approach with regard to my remarks on the estimates of The Department of Mines. This I regret exceedingly and I am very sorry that you, sir, should have adopted an attitude of that kind.

Mr. Chairman: I did not have any intention of hurting anyone's feelings, nor did I take any advice from anyone; it was my own advice in the remarks which I made. I apologize if the member took it that way. All I am trying to do is to conduct the Chairman's job in an orderly manner.

It being 12.30 o'clock, the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 16, 1965

Estimates, Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope, continued	4259
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	4295

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF MINES (continued)

Mr. Chairman: Before continuing, I wish to bring to the attention of the members of the House that we welcome as guests to the Legislature this afternoon, students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Colborne Street senior public school, Whitby; in the east gallery, school section number 1, Harwich Wilson school, Chatham.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, to begin now leaves me in a bit of a quandary. I think, with your understanding, perhaps I should begin again to carry the intent of the remarks I have to make.

Mr. Chairman, the homage paid to private enterprise in the mining industry sounds sincere, but last July's sudden windfall in the Windfall scandal has mostly benefited those entrepreneurs, promoters and speculators who were already sitting pretty, financially speaking. But what came after this windfall can only be described as a tempest with chilling winds. I need not remind the hon. members that stock manipulations of the magnitude of Windfall Mines and Oil Limited resulted in the appointment of a Royal commission whose findings we will learn later this year.

The Windfall scandal is a direct result of private enterprise taking advantage of existing loopholes in the Acts connected with the mining industry, a result of a toothless Ontario securities commission, and a desire to get rich quick. The fact that the Windfall scandal could develop on the basis of innuendo and rumours speaks for tighter controls of mining stock manipulations by the government.

I have always found that when an association starts defending its credo there is something seriously wrong. Here is a quote from the brief submitted by the broker-dealers' association of Ontario to the select committee on mining:

Even though the broker-dealer may be the controlling shareholder, underwriter, a director and distributor of the company's

shares, there is not necessarily an undesirable conflict of interest. Securities regulations and association requirements make it difficult for a broker-dealer to benefit to the public detriment as a result of this relationship.

It was not very difficult in the case of Texas Gulf or Windfall and I must marvel at the lack of sagacity on the part of the association to reveal themselves for what they are in the brief that was written and submitted after the Windfall scandal came out into the open.

However, I am prepared to wait and see what the Kelly commission recommends, and what the government will or will not do after reading this list of proposed do's and don'ts.

How did the Windfall scandal start? It was a by-product of a large mineral finding by a United States firm, Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, near Timmins. This company had explored the Timmins area for several years and had finally been rewarded by success. The Windfall myth could not have developed had it not been for the US company.

Why, we could ask, had not a Canadian mining company found the mineral deposits near Timmins?

After all, the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrobe) has said recently, and I quote: "Private enterprise can do a better job than government in mining exploration." In the light of what happened in the Windfall scandal, I consider this a very fatuous remark, and I am prepared to offer proof that the private enterprise system worked to the public detriment in the Windfall example.

The announcement of the large mineral findings was made by Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, and there is reason to believe that certain insiders got rich quicker than the general public which was officially unaware of the find. Yet the hon. Minister of Mines said in the same interview, published by the *Toronto Telegram* on May 13, 1965, and I quote: "Geological information is made available to the public as soon as it can be published by the department, so that everyone has an equal chance to acquire mining lands of interest."

We of the New Democratic Party do not hold the view that private enterprise can do a better job than government in mining exploration. On the contrary, and I will spell out our reasons. But first, let me propose what in our opinion would stimulate the mining industry in Ontario and the Canadian industry in general.

We ask the Ontario government to establish a Crown corporation for the exploration of minerals in this province. With an initial capital outlay of about \$3 million a year, this corporation could get into the business of finding mineral deposits and developing new mines.

This corporation should be given discretionary powers to acquire mining claims or properties, and to lease management rights for such properties to bona-fide mining companies. This corporation could acquire shares in any operating company formed to exploit such properties, or it could undertake the operation of mining properties under its own jurisdiction.

The aspect of private or free enterprise would be maintained by allowing this corporation to be taxed and to be subject to the same competitive conditions that exist today in the mining industry. This corporation, in other words, should be a profit-making body.

It could be argued that this is not the time to explore for mineral deposits as the mining industry generally is doing very well. But the market for mining products is expanding rapidly, except for uranium and gold. However, if President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Pearson decide to make a deal, France will want \$700 million to \$800 million worth of uranium from Canada. This would rekindle the dying embers of the uranium industry in Elliot Lake and elsewhere in Ontario.

The market potential for more and more minerals is there, but what is Ontario doing to explore new ore deposits? Only the giants in the exploration field are able to finance a systematic search for mineral deposits. Because of the risk, and because of tax considerations, smaller exploration companies have to rely on the unhealthy system of raising money through the so-called penny market. This often results in investors losing their money because they are victims of what we call non-mine promotions.

Furthermore, may I point out that of this capital invested through the penny-stock market, only about 40 per cent ever reaches the corporate treasuries. Sixty per cent of this invested money goes into the pockets of

promoters, broker-dealers and for other profits in the non-mine game. And of this 40 per cent, only 18 per cent is used for exploratory purposes.

Even E. K. Cork, the author of the 1962 staff study for the Royal commission on banking and finance, said in his report:

Government should adopt wise rules to ensure full and honest disclosure to the public, including prompt and detailed reporting of trading by insiders. Greater domestic participation and control—and these two words are emphasized—in Canadian mining could be encouraged.

The voices who advocate a direct participation of government in mining exploration and development are by now forming a chorus whose general theme is that something must be done. We believe that our proposed Crown corporation for the exploration of minerals in Ontario is the perfect answer.

Here is the opinion of five international experts who reported to the organization for economic co-operation and development in 1964:

Canadian prosperity will in the long run depend on the exploitation of a judicious mixture of its rich reserves of natural resources and its equally rich—but almost wholly untapped—reserves of scientific ingenuity and technological competence.

There are some of the positive voices in the chorus. Commenting on the Canadian mining industry, two members of the department of economics at Laurentian University in Sudbury found fit to state, and I quote:

Whatever the source of the disturbances, it is manifestly true that the mining industry is characterized by sudden and random fluctuations in production . . . The purpose here is not to suggest how this variability might be lessened, since the possibility of doing so appears to be minimal unless the province resorted to such close government controls as to stifle the initiative and growth of the industry.

This is a remarkable statement. Here are two professors stating the ills of the mining industry, suggesting a cure but shying away from their own conclusions. Again I must stress that the proposed Crown corporation could very well act as a catalyst to the entire industry, reforming its unsalient aspects, stimulating its progress, helping the junior mining companies along their way and, last but not least, making sure that the individual prospector has more than just a fighting chance of succeeding to maintain his identity.

Last year, the industrial mineral produc-

tion in Ontario amounted to \$911 million, less than in previous years. In 1960 Canadian metal mining companies spent a total of \$44,345,000 for exploration, much of which was done in Ontario. Of this \$44,345,000 for exploration, 86 per cent was spent by companies of appreciable financial strength, leaving a meagre 14 per cent to the fledgling junior companies.

The reason for this imbalance becomes clear when we consider that of all the mining prospects under exploration, only one in several thousand ever goes into production and returns a profit. In other words, the odds against a mining prospect turning into a profit-making mine are pitifully small. Bearing this in mind I think it is only common sense to leave much of the exploration to an Ontario Crown corporation which can afford to lose money and under the circumstances of the earnings that the province gets from the mining industry, this could be money extremely well invested.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): That is a great theory; wonderful!

Mr. Freeman: It works.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Where?

Mr. Freeman: In many countries in the world. Our neighbouring province is putting it into operation very soon, on a much larger scale than I am proposing.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): You might protect some of your own backbenchers who put their money in and lost it.

Mr. Freeman: If the Crown corporation's team of prospectors strikes it rich, the mining industry will gain from the find, and so will individuals or junior mining companies.

Hon. members on the government side of this House need not be afraid that what I propose is what they like to call creeping socialism. While I do not pretend to advocate the Crown corporation as a cure-all for the mining industry I maintain that it will supply our province with new vigour, new hope, new opportunities. An effective cure-all would entail measures far more sweeping and thorough than a Crown corporation, but that is a matter which we hope the Kelly commission in its report will bring to the attention of the government.

I haven't exhausted my reasons for the establishment of a Crown corporation by any means. The Ontario mining industry has little if anything of what could be termed

a general inventory of mine prospects with marginal deposits. Some of these deposits of minerals are not rich enough to be developed at this time. But unless the mining industry systematically tables these prospects with their exact data, it cannot hope to know when the time has come to develop a mine.

A provincial Crown corporation could serve as the central library of such deposits and a team of computer experts could then determine when the development of a mine becomes feasible. The price of the metal involved could rise slightly, or the production methods could become more economical—the two main reasons for going ahead and mining these marginal deposits.

Better still, the Crown corporation could acquire these marginal deposits and lease them back to the original owner or to a new company for development depending on the interest shown by the mining industry.

Let me take a look at the methods used in exploration today. The old time prospector cannot hope to compete with modern methods of exploration such as geophysics and geochemistry. So what should he do when faced with advanced technology? If you can't lick 'em, join 'em. That sort of philosophy doesn't apply to the members of this party when we look across the aisle to the government benches. But it applies very well to the prospector.

Those bright young men from the universities with all their new-fangled ideas and techniques will, I can assure you, be very grateful for some sound advice from the oldtimers. And so, I can envision teams of traditional prospectors, mining graduates, and technicians combing northern Ontario for mineral deposits under the auspices of the proposed Crown corporation. These team members will be free from financial worry, free from pressure of having to make a strike as soon as possible, free to use nothing but the best in geophysical and geochemical detecting methods. I think this makes sense.

Up to now, an exploration prospect was normally optioned to a mining company or a syndicate for further testing. This is the time when frustration sets in for the prospector. What will happen to his exploration prospect? With the Crown corporation moving in and exploring the prospect, the finder can rest assured that he will get a straight and honest deal in return.

The other current method of exploring prospects is even more hazardous. Often a promoter will form a new mining company before sufficient work has been done on the mining property. The promoter then tries

to issue stock to the public because cash is needed to test the property.

As I said earlier, only a few cents of every dollar invested by the public in new mining prospects goes to actual exploration. Even the most apologetic, free-enterprise adherent cannot call this lopsided ratio satisfactory or efficient. What is more, this antiquated method of financing exploration is dangerous. In Ontario, most exploration companies get started in this manner and often find that the subscribed money is used up before a strike is made, or worse still, that the property being explored is not worth developing because it shows only a marginal deposit.

But let me pursue this line of thought for a moment. Suppose the exploration company has hit, literally, pay dirt. If it is an old, established mining company with large assets, the development of a new mine is no headache.

In 1962, Ontario mining companies had stashed away \$400 million for the development of new mines. Because of the risk involved in the mining industry under the present setup, banks do not normally go in for financing mine developments. But what about a new company that has not got a functioning organization? Where can it get the money to develop the strike?

Again, a Crown corporation is the answer. It would then buy the mineral rights from the new company and lease the mining rights back to the newcomer in the field, acting both as low-interest banker and consultant.

Obviously enough, the Ontario government should exercise strict control over such a Crown corporation for the exploration of minerals. The government should impose time limits for the exploration and development of mines. The sale of mining properties or deposits by the corporation should be by tender or by public auction, guaranteeing a fair chance to every interested party.

I have described the main reasons why the New Democratic Party proposes a Crown corporation for the exploration of minerals in Ontario. The select committee on mining, of which I am a member, will go on this year, I believe, trying to assess the ills from which Ontario's mining industry is suffering.

Many of northern Ontario's mining communities are dissatisfied. Some are moribund, others are struggling against taxation odds. They have not grown homogeneously because their reason for existence is a mine. As the erratic mining market fluctuates, as mines deteriorate or are abandoned, the communities that depend on the mines suffer.

If these mining communities were banded together, if they were organized in district governments rather than fending for themselves, if, in fact, a sound regional economic development programme for northern Ontario were instituted, their future might not look so bleak. Such a reorganization into district governments would do more than provide immediate help where needed. It would stimulate the entire mining industry and the mining communities would lose their stigma which is the result of depression-based attitudes adopted by the mining industry.

We know that the industry is short of manpower, both of miners and of scientists. If the industry were given incentives, if it were cleaned up, then we could expect young men all over Ontario to take a second look at mining and think twice before getting a job that promises more economic security than mining does at this time.

I am sure I have the indulgence of the House for using so many ifs, whens and buts. The fact that I have to do so points out the deficiencies in the mining industry and the way it is set up in the province of Ontario, Mr. Chairman.

At this time, mining in Ontario is being shaken up by the investigation of the Kelly commission. The industry and the government have been jarred out of apathy and complacency by the Windfall scandal, by the radioactive pollution of several lakes near Elliot Lake, by the—we hope—temporary decline of the uranium mining industry and of the gold mining industry.

Through the select committee on mining, individuals, companies, associations and communities in northern Ontario have voiced their criticism. They have presented their suggestions on how an unstable industry could be made stable.

We believe that the need for the establishment of an Ontario Crown corporation for the exploration of minerals is pressing. We are fully aware that most practices of the Ontario mining industry and of the stock market promotion of new mines have to be remedied. But these are measures of repair. What we suggest with the establishment of a Crown corporation is a novel way perhaps of getting things done.

The government need not wait for the final report of the select committee on mining. Surely the hon. Minister of Mines is aware of the benefits of such a Crown corporation which we see as a happy marriage between private enterprise ideology and government-sponsored and financed incentive. The offspring of such a marriage

will be the expansion of the mining industry, tailored to export markets.

Our province has a vast hinterland full to the brim with mineral deposits. Having these resources puts us in a position where we can explore and exploit our soil. But unless we grasp this chance and explore this soil methodically with government backing, we are being shortsighted to the point of negligence.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I wonder if the hon. Minister would inform us of the details—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

On vote 1201:

Mr. Sopha: By your leave, sir, I was about to ask the hon. Minister if he would inform us of the details of the terms and conditions under which certain concessions were granted to various companies for exploration in the James Bay watershed at some time between the two meetings of the House.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Would the hon. member like me to give him all of them?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, please.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: These are three-year exploratory licences of occupation at the James Bay lowlands.

The licence area 13788: An area of 58,650 acres; total expenditure, \$100,000, \$25,000 the first year—these are the terms under which they were let, you understand—\$35,000 the second year, \$40,000 the third year; rent \$3,000 annually; no bond; name Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, c/o of N. H. Ursel, Toronto.

The next one was licence 13798: Area of 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; the name, Fort Reliance Minerals Limited, 25 King Street West, Toronto.

The next one, licence 13799: Area of 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name Duncan R. Derry Limited—

Mr. Sopha: Duncan R.—?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Derry, D-e-r-r-y, 25 King Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13758: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Consolidated Morrison Exploration Limited, Suite 1502, 80 Richmond Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13759: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Argore Explorations Limited, Suite 1502, 80 Richmond Street, Toronto.

Licence 13760: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Goldray Mines Limited, Suite 202, 220 Bay Street, Toronto.

Licence 13761: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Keevil Mining Corporation Limited, Suite 1000, 11 Adelaide Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13788—is the hon. member able to get these down?

Mr. Sopha: Yes; oh yes, fine, thank you!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Licence 13788: Area 58,650 acres; total expenditure \$100,000, \$25,000 first year, \$35,000 second year, \$40,000 third year; rent \$3,000 annually; no bond; name, Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 85 Richmond Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13798: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; the name, Fort Reliance Minerals Limited, 25 King Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13799: Area of 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Duncan R. Derry Limited, 25 King Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13758: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Consolidated Morrison Exploration Limited, Suite 1502, 80 Richmond Street West, Toronto.

Licence 13759: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Argore Explorations Limited, Suite 1502, 80 Richmond Street, Toronto.

Licence 13760: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Goldray Mines Limited, Suite 202, 220 Bay Street, Toronto.

Licence 13761: Area 64,000 acres; annual expenditure \$1 per acre, \$25,000 minimum; rent \$1,000 annually; bond \$25,000; name, Keevil Mining Group Limited, Suite 1000, 11 Adelaide Street West, Toronto.

Mr. Sopha: Does that mark the making of a precedent within the province of letting the

exclusive right to export the minerals in this fashion to people such as these?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: This was done quite recently and the reason it was done was because there was no outcropping in the area at all. It was all marshy water, and so on. Any signs of minerals were indications by the magnetometer survey, and it takes a lot of money to do it.

The thing is tied up. If they discover anything of value then their acreage is cut away down and the money that they pay is increased, and so on.

This is an area that we want explored. We had no means for years of doing it. It cannot be done by men on foot, the prospector. He goes up in the winter time, he puts stakes in and in the spring when the ice is all gone and the water comes the stakes are all gone and we cannot keep any track of whether it is staked or not. So we thought that this was a good way to do it. It brought money in to the department and it had the appearance of developing an area which has never been touched or developed before.

Mr. Sopha: I think this does represent a precedent. I agree in general outline with the desire to get these areas explored. I am less impressed with whether there was an outcrop of precambrian shield; there was no outcrop of precambrian in the Texas Gulf Sulphur discovery, but yet they ended up with several scores of millions of tons of gold-bearing ore.

However, the price for these concessions does not appear to be out of line, \$25,000 is not a lot of money to be required to spend in respect of 64,000 acres which, according to my calculations, represents—I am not very good in mathematics—that would be about 100 square miles of territory.

I just want to draw a comparison with Quebec. The Department of Resources in Quebec, under the leadership of the hon. Rene Levesque, I see in the paper, has granted a concession for prospecting for minerals in northern Quebec, I think in Abitibi county. Mr. Levesque was shrewd enough to keep 11 per cent of the action—if I may use a little bit of jargon from the street.

He decided that if people were going to get an exclusive right to look for minerals in part of Quebec then the people of Quebec would participate in the profits. If I understand the deal correctly, Quebec and therefore the people of Quebec, are to get 11 per cent of the net profit accruing from the development of any ore bodies within that

area and without having to put up a five-cent piece toward the exploration.

Now, I would have thought—in fact I was rather surprised—we have not had any difficulty in this province in finding the major ore bodies; they have become revealed from time to time and exploited pretty progressively over the years. In regard to some, a market had to be created, and that is true of an ore body in my own community which ore, when found in 1882, was not of an economic nature and a market had to be created to use it. But I do not see that our ore should be given to groups—and I must say that other than the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway, I thought they had enough mining lands.

We have discussed them at great length in this Legislature and they have too much land. I would like to see us take some back from them and here we see them coming further into the piece and getting leases on further lands to explore for minerals. That really surprises me, because they made a great thing before the mining committee that they were granting licences to people to look for ores in the lands they now hold. If they are not willing to look for ores in the lands they now hold, what are they doing up in the James Bay watershed with a lease from this department to look for ores that may or may not be found under the great clay belt up in that area?

May I ask the hon. Minister whether the thought occurred to him that he might make one of the terms of the lease that the government would participate in the profits from the development of any ores?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Speaking of the Algoma Central, they surrendered the mineral rights of eight and a half townships. The procedure has been finalized in the following: The mineral rights of the townships of Alderson, Mildred, Gurney and the west part of Glasgow.

Is the hon. member familiar with these areas? These are ones they had before: (a) Voluntary surrender dated March 2, 1965; (b) Withdrawal order dated April 9, 1965; (c) Notice of determination dated April 10, 1965; (d) Order dated June 2, 1965, throwing the mineral rights open for staking on June 29, 1965.

The mineral rights of the townships of Martin and Templeton—these have all been returned to us—voluntary surrender dated June 4; notice of determination dated June 29; withdrawal order dated June 29; order dated August 10, throwing the mineral rights open for staking on August 31, 1965.

The remaining townships, Landry, Way and the south half of Franz, have not, as yet, been finalized. The searches of title to complete the documents are so involved that I have not been able to proceed with this matter further at the present time. That is signed by our supervisor of our granted lands section.

The documents surrendering the south half of Franz is in the hands of the railway solicitor. Mr. J. Grant is examining the title of Way and Landry this week. Delay on these townships is due to involved titles.

That is the story on that, but in the new ones in the north—James Bay—if there is anything found, they get 10 per cent and we keep 90 per cent of the area, if they lease it, and then all results of what they find come to us. That is the deal. We thought at the time that it was very fair, and we were also anxious to get this area explored and magnetometerized, and so on, so we would know exactly whether there was anything there or not. That is the story.

Mr. Sopha: When you say you keep 90 per cent—what do you keep 90 per cent of?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Of the area; they get 10 per cent and we keep 90 per cent.

Mr. Sopha: If they find something, they can point out 10 per cent of the area they want?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Checkerboard.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, I see—using the checkerboard grids.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Sopha: I see.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister to enlarge a little bit upon the Algoma Central situation. I understand it to be an attempt to discover a china clay deposit which would establish an industry in that area, and I think it was generally pointed at that idea. Perhaps the hon. Minister could—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to say how proud I was to be associated with my friend, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor) who made such a thoughtful presentation as he did today. I do not want to be accused of flattering him, but he is a man of success in the business world and this House has been deprived for too long of the

very useful comments based on his own experiences that he is able to make, as demonstrated this morning.

Some hon. members: Hear hear!

Mr. Sopha: I thought his remarks concerning the grants, to mining municipalities and the general use of the mines' profit taxes were very apropos and, of course, one is faced, despite the entreaties of the municipalities, with sharing more gratefully in those grants. Yet one is faced with the stolid and steadfast reply of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) that we have to wait for the Smith committee to report. Now that is all I want to say about it.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: At this time, if the Minister cares to reply to some of the comments made in the introductory speeches, I think he should be given this opportunity, and then we will deal with the items under this vote.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have the same comment to make about the hon. member for Timiskaming. I want to congratulate him on a very thoughtful presentation, and he may be assured that The Department of Mines will give the items their very sincere thought and attention. I have some personal knowledge of the hon. member. The Taylor Hardware Company has been a renowned organization in the north for years. I think it was in 1925 that I took the first diamond drills into Red Lake, and those sleighs were loaded with boxes labelled the Taylor Hardware Company. So it shows the House how long his father, his grandfather and he himself have had a long line of succession in that very successful organization that has been of tremendous help to the mining industry, not only through this province, but through the rest of Canada.

So I agree with the hon. member for Sudbury, it is a very thoughtful presentation and there is no man more able to give it than the hon. member for Timiskaming.

The other thing that I want to mention is one that the hon. Attorney General generally asked about. This is kaolin and china clay mentioned only in those licences that will go to the Algoma Central and these other people. All the other minerals are open for staking to anybody else. But if you are advising any of your friends, it is a very difficult territory and very costly to work, because it is so heavily overlain with overburden and water. But that is what the licences are for, kaolin

clay and china clay. Does that answer your question?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, under this vote I would like to spend a few minutes speaking about the development by way of exploration and prospecting of mining prospects within the province of Ontario, and their proper financing, which, of course, is a matter of great concern to our party.

My colleague, the hon. member for Fort William has put before this committee, Mr. Chairman, an imaginative proposal as to the way in which the mining prospects in the province of Ontario could be developed in the public interest. I would like to spend a few minutes comparing his proposal, imaginative as it is, with the pattern under which so much of the speculative mining development has taken place in the province of Ontario under antiquated financing methods. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that any similarity between what I have to relate and recent events, is purely coincidental.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, might I just say a word to the hon. member for Riverdale? That comes under vote 1206, and if you will wait till that time we will go very definitely into the whole thing with you and discuss it at that time, if that is satisfactory to you.

Mr. Renwick: Just so that I will be perfectly clear, I intended to outline in some detail, a typical pattern of financing in respect to the mining field, and I would assume that the hon. Minister means I may do so under vote 1206?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, if we are back on 1201, the main office, I wanted to raise and carry through a point that my colleague, the hon. member for Fort William touched on, and this is the question of research. I presume that the main office estimate would be the appropriate place for discussing this. If it is not, I will be guided otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I think that is right.

Mr. MacDonald: My colleague drew attention to something which I think this House may or may not be aware of, but which is rather startling—that a study was made by a committee for scientific and technical personnel of the organization of economic co-operation and development, more familiarly known as OECD, in 1964. This was a committee that came, in the first instance, to study education aspects related to the mining in-

dustry. In the course of their official report, they had some comments with regard to research in the mining field in the province of Ontario or, more broadly speaking, Canada, which I think this House might well ponder.

The first paragraph of what I am going to quote from this report was referred to by my colleague the hon. member for Fort William in the course of his introductory statement, namely, that:

Canadian prosperity will, in the long run, depend on the exploitation of a judicious mixture of its rich reserves of natural resources and its equally rich, but almost wholly untapped, reserves of scientific ingenuity and technological competence.

Before I go any further, let me say that this was a team of five examiners from the mining industry of the US, the UK and France. In other words, here are the disinterested observations of experts and knowledgeable people with extensive mining experience in the field from three other countries. They came to look at education related to the mining industry in this country, and it was in the course of their report that they made the comments that we have this almost wholly untapped reserves of scientific ingenuity and technological competence. Let me give the rest of the four or five paragraphs of quote, and then I have some comments that I would like to make. I am quoting:

A low level of research initiative hampers the development of a unique Canadian province which Canada needs if it is to compete successfully in international markets as something other than a mere supplier of raw materials. The volume of research activity in Canada is relatively low. Canadian research is only about one-third that of the UK or the US. Curiously and unhappily, the sector which seems to be least aware of the need, and the least excited by the challenge and opportunity of research, is industry itself, and the Canadian investors who might profit handsomely from the harnessing of modern science to Canada's vast reserves of natural resources. Canada's economic life has been dominated by industries which depend on the exploitation of natural resources rather than on the exploitation of technical competence and ingenuity. The creation of distinctive Canadian products will depend on Canadian research and developments. The appeal of tax concessions for research expenditure is offset by the fact that expenditures for the purchase of research results from parent firms or others are tax deductible as a normal business expense. Government subsidies are a very dull spur on the

thick skins of conservative managements. A more effective stimulus seems to be the research contract, under which research becomes a commodity for the firm to sell. To be effective, Canadian research should be directed to meeting Canadian needs and to exploiting Canadian resources both natural and intellectual.

Interestingly enough, this gives me rather authoritative confirmation of a point that I have attempted to make a number of times in this Legislature on debate on the mining industry, particularly with reference to uranium. The hon. Minister—I say this happily; all of us say it happily—points to the fact that we may, before the end of this decade, be getting out of the slump into which the uranium industry fell. But the tragedy of that, Mr. Chairman, is that when the uranium industry came into its own in the mid-1950s and got contracts through Crown agencies at Ottawa, chiefly for delivery to the United States, they got contracts, as we have said so often in this House, at price levels which gave them a fair return on the investment of their capital, adequate profits on an annual basis, plus a complete capital write-off in a five or six-year period. This means to say that those red-blooded, hairy-chested free enterprisers who went in to develop Elliot Lake and put in \$325 million were working on a pretty sure thing, because at the end of five or six years, collectively they had all got their money back. The people who were left holding the bag were the little fellows, the small business men. I heard somebody behind me say here is one. I will not look to see who said that. As a matter of fact, I think there are a fair number around this House.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Not a hairy-chested one.

Mr. MacDonald: Not hairy-chested, he says. Maybe you need to have a hairy chest to be able to get the kind of deal so that you do not lose the money.

However, let me pursue this and not get side-tracked. The other people who lost, Mr. Chairman, are the Canadian people. Or let me put it another way—the Canadian people as a whole who put money into the federal government, and the Ontario people who put money not only into the federal government, but the provincial government. These are the people who lost the money. Unfortunately, what has happened, as always happens in this rather lawless free enterprise system, is that the little fellows get bought out; they have no alternative. You have two giants left in the field who have had all their

original capital returned, sitting on a magnificent resource which was our resource until we leased it to them. Already, sooner than we expected, there is now the prospect that this industry is going to come booming back.

We built it. Any money they put into it they got back in five years. They are now sitting on the resource with a proprietary control, and, in the very near future, face the prospect of reaping great benefits. They will get the profit. We carried the risk—they did not—the little fellows and the people of this nation and this province.

Now I come back to tie in with my comments on research. We were deploring the decline in the uranium industry and anticipating the prospect that decline was going to continue maybe into the early 1970s. Many times in this House we have asked why is it not an obligation on an industry that found itself in the position of being left with almost exclusively civilian markets, which could not absorb the peak production that they had a few years ago, to use some of the millions which they had accumulated into developing their own markets. Or, alternatively, if the government does not feel that you need to leave this obligation wholly to the private enterprise itself, why did not the government to a greater extent sit down with them jointly in mapping out a research programme?

Let me throw this into what I think is an accurate perspective, and one which has been used in the House before. What has happened to uranium in the past few years is not a unique development in mining; it is a duplicate of what happened to nickel after World War 1. The nickel industry was a wartime creation. At the end of the war, when the wartime needs suddenly disappeared, the nickel industry was, to a considerable extent, a white elephant. It would be very interesting to have somebody go back and look in and get the details in a serious research project as to the amount of money that was put by nickel into research in developing the civilian markets, with the result that we all know today. You can hardly turn around, no matter where you are, but you will find some product in the civilian market of the nickel industry. They developed it themselves.

What I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister and this House is that the amount of money that was put by the uranium industry to developing the civilian market was peanuts.

It has been pointed out, for example—and

I would be curious if the hon. Minister can reply to it—in the latest report on this area of research, which I understand was being looked into provincially and I know federally, too, namely, that uranium might be used with iron in an alloy because it is an anticorrosive. The amount of uranium that would be required for the automobile industry alone—and thereby get rid of that problem that bugs the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) when salt corrodes his car until it collapses on the road, as he is driving down from Owen Sound each week to get to the House—would be about 13,000 tons, our peak production in, I think it was, 1960. What is the reason for the lack of this development? It is too costly?

This is only one of the many illustrations of what might have been done to develop the civilian market. But the uranium industry did not do it. Here we have a study by experts in the United States, France and Britain, who are pointing to the fact that there is a refusal or a failure on the part of the industry on the whole or Canada as a nation—and we suffer the consequences of that failure—to develop the scientific aspects in this industry, to intensify the research, so that the mining industry would not be so much a simple proposition of producing raw material and exporting it to the rest of the world in keeping with our role as hewers of wood and drawers of water throughout history, but rather would be one that would really develop the full potential of not only our natural resources but our human resources.

I wonder if the hon. Minister has any comment on these general observations with regard to more intensive research and more particularly, what has happened, if anything, in the uranium industry to assure the development of civilian markets rather than hoping so completely, or trusting so completely, on the whims of de Gaulle for the future welfare of that industry.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is a very knowledgeable submission and it shows that the hon. member has made a lot of study of it. All the companies in the uranium industry did not make money. Stanrock, if you remember, went bankrupt.

Mr. MacDonald: The little ones that lost got bought out for a song.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The USA provided the risk money for those uranium mines and, as you know, the federal government controls the uranium markets.

But there are two things I would point out. The group that the hon. member mentioned is financed partly—I do not know how much—by the mines at Elliot Lake. I think they are paying part of the research. And then, of course, at the present time, as the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) will know, we are making examinations at Sheridan Park—the very thing the hon. member was speaking of, which is so important for different metals in the car business and other things.

Research on that has been gone into very extensively by International Nickel, Falconbridge, Rio Algom and Consolidated Mining and Smelting. They are all in it in a very big way, although they do not tell us what amount of money they put into it, but they are all in that field. That paper the hon. member mentioned is by a very significant group, who did a great job. I have seen some of their submissions and that is a good group there.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we are confusing things. This comment was part of a report of a five-man team that was sent in from the OECD and I am convinced that it has nothing to do with this joint research—I know it was announced in the House in earlier years during consideration of the estimates—that has been going on in the province of Ontario. In fact, this really has nothing to do with research itself; this was to study our research practices and our educational practices in regard to mining in this country and it was in the course of their report on what we do in this connection here that they made these observations as to the rather pitiful amount of research that is going on and our failure to develop our technological potential as well as our natural resources. So that nobody may be confused, I do not think this has any relation to what the hon. Minister was talking about, namely, the rather joint effort in industry, and to some extent with the government, through the Sheridan Park development.

Mr. Sopha: I want to say I listened with great interest to the hon. Minister with his euphemistic summary of the developments in the mining industry over the past year, and noted the contrast with the atmosphere of gloom that he had last year about it. His report, of course, was followed by the appointment of the select committee of this House to look into the problems of the mining industry.

He quoted my comment about the mining industry being sick and I do not retreat one

inch, nay, not even a millimetre, from that position, and I take the position now that the disclosures of the Windfall Royal commission have indicated to me that the mining industry is sicker than I thought it was.

I sometimes validly hold the point of view that I think it is questionable whether we should have a Department of Mines at all in this province, whether the expense is justified. After all, the development of the mining industry, that is to say, the supply of its financial resources, resides in The Department of the Attorney General. The hon. Attorney General has far more to do with the character of the mining industry than the hon. Minister of Mines has, for it is within his department that the regulation of the supply of funds into the industry finds whatever proscription or limitation or regulation that government is pleased from time to time to apply to it.

Then again, The Department of Mines, as I have pointed out, does not advise anybody on mining methods; indeed, if The Department of Mines wants to know anything about mining, it goes and asks the leaders in the field how to mine. Inco and Falconbridge are world leaders in the development of mining techniques, and they could tell anybody in the world how to attack an ore body. They would not go to The Department of Mines and ask for advice, the process is the reverse. Inco and Falconbridge would give The Department of Mines advice on how they mine if the department wanted to seek it. I am not trying to be provocative, I am just stating the facts.

The Department of Mines has something to do with mine safety and as far as I know, it carries out that aspect of the responsibilities very efficiently. It never seems to be able to please various unions operating in the field, but then again, on balance, probably their safety precautions are executed in the public interest and with all possible despatch and care. The department, as far as I can see, could as easily be a branch of The Department of Economics and Development and we could save all the overhead that is connected with setting up an administrative group—you must not use the term bureaucracy any more; somebody resented it the other day—setting up administrative machinery that surrounds a Minister of the Crown.

However, I am not argumentative, I do not want to dwell upon that. I just wanted to reflect that from my personal point of view and my experience and from the fact of having lived my life in the mining community, save for that part of it that was spent in other

parts of the world, I do not exactly view the mining industry with rose-coloured glasses. Quite apart from the production of the metals and the tremendous wealth that the mining industry has produced for our people, and indeed for the American people, it has in some respects a very sordid history.

The history of the mining industry in at least two respects is a quite sordid thing. One of them is the fact that in all the years of the half century that mining has been an important activity, there has been on the part of the entrepreneurs—those red-blooded, hairy-chested, free enterprisers, who were neither free nor enterprising but who have come in to exploit our mineral wealth—an utter ruthlessness toward the people they employed to do it.

At first it was the silicosis, which was the bane of the hardrock miner for perhaps 30 or 40 years. Many of the miners who worked in the precious metal mines finally wound up in sanatoria or else spent the last days at home suffering from the dread disease and for a long time not much was done by way of correction of that evil.

The other aspect of the ruthlessness was the utter disregard for what happened to the miner when his energy was spent, when he no longer could go underground and take hold of the drill and carry on his day's work to produce the wealth that abounded so much in the ground. Really, you should bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that only two companies in the mining industry, to this day—the hon. Minister says there are 88 mines producing in Ontario—but only two to this day, provide a pension for their workers, Inco and Falconbridge.

None of the mines in the constituency of my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs provide one. Hollinger Mine will close down this year and they will throw those workers out on the scrap heap without any pension for their retiring years.

So it is in Kirkland Lake. To correct that evil, the people of this country had to come in with the national pension plan. It is almost the operation of the dialectic. Anything that contains the seeds of its own decay is corrected by other measures. The national pension plan is a means of remedying that evil. And yet, I am told by one of the relatives of W. H. Wright—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I do not know how many other companies the hon. member may have omitted, but I would like him to add Algoma Steel Corporation to those that provide pensions, and they are provided entirely by the company.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, but it is not really a mining venture.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is a very large mining company.

Mr. Sopha: No, it is not really a mining company.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It has a very large mining development at Wawa, which maintains a city of 4,500 people and quite a few in the surrounding area; a very large and most up-to-date and modern mining company.

Mr. Sopha: Listen till I tell you something. You took the opportunity to interrupt. That is a steel company and that is a reflection of their policies with regard to dealing with the steel unions. They are not basically a mining company at all, in the sense the Hollinger Gold Mines and Lakeshore Gold Mines, Wright Hargreaves and Teck Hughes are. Their history is not the same. Their attitude toward labour is not the same. The steel companies are accustomed to dealing with labour unions.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, I shall always take the opportunity to interrupt when a statement is made that is not entirely factual. I do not think my hon. friend said it with any intention of leaving out information, but this is a large mining company, in addition to its refining and smelting of steel and ore, and I did not want it to pass unnoticed. Now it is corrected.

Mr. Sopha: I will repeat again, it is not a mining company at all, in the sense I am speaking of mining companies. It is a steel fabricating company.

However, what is the other side of the picture? The other side of the picture, I am told by some of the living relatives of W. H. Wright, is that when W. H. Wright went to his great reward he left an estate of \$47 million. I would be willing to sit up all night for some Tory to explain to me, to show me, where the moral right inheres in any one individual to come into our north country and point to a section of the terrain and say the mineral wealth that is in here, put there by providence, belongs to me.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is within the national interest.

Mr. Sopha: That was what W. H. Wright was saying, and he left his life leaving \$47 million which he ripped out of the ground in the great golden mile of Teck township. And yet, as I say, the general— notwithstanding the intervention of the hon.

Attorney General—the general picture of the mining industry is that there are no pensions provided to people who spend their lives moiling in the ground to produce this wealth.

Another side of the picture. I do not know, other than in connection with Inco and Falconbridge, I do not know of any individual or any corporate body that ever exploited our mineral resources, that ever left any testimony to its passing that way in the communities in which they operated. Inco and Falconbridge, of course, support many public ventures, including large contributions to the university at Sudbury.

But Harry Oakes went into Teck township and made untold tens of millions of dollars. Then he took off and ended up in the Bahamas, I think it was, or Barbadoes, where he came to his untimely and unseemingly end. Strangely enough, the only community Harry Oakes ever benefited in this country, so far as I know, is Niagara Falls.

Niagara Falls had no connection whatsoever with the mining industry, but if you walk the streets of Kirkland Lake you will search in vain to see some monument to the fact that Harry Oakes passed that way; Harry Oakes, whom the secretary of the YMCA in Cobalt told me a number of years ago, around 1912 had to borrow \$2 from him to buy himself something to eat. He was a prospector, with the seat of his trousers not quite intact. Later he became rich as Croesus from exploiting the mineral wealth which belonged to the people of this country. Now that is part of the other side of the picture of this euphoristic canvass that the hon. Minister of Mines stretches out before us.

The third aspect, and I am not going to dwell on it. I never intended to mention the Windfall probe, but I am content to wait to see what Mr. Justice Kelly has to say to it. But in the meantime, I can read the testimony that is coming out. I know that down on Bay Street they are frightened stiff, the family compact, the establishment, are scared skinny about what is going to emanate from this.

In the interval between the two sessions, and pending the appearance of Mr. Justice Kelly's report, I am going to go back the six years I have been in this House to collate, assemble all those things that I said about government control of the Toronto stock exchange and the necessity for it, and the control of the primary distribution. I will just compare those remarks with what Mr. Justice Kelly has to say, and the Kimber commission, because many of them are

referring to a number of years. It is refreshing not to have to wait for a decade or 20 years to see the rightness of what you say come true and to see somebody else come to the same conclusion and make the same observation.

What is sick about the mining industry, of course, on the financial side, are two things.

There are the machinations of the people on Bay Street. They do not need to be elaborated at this time any more than to refer to them as machinations—people who would rather mine the public than mine the ground and they have been doing it for years.

And the other thing, more honest but one cannot say that it is any less enervating, and that is the reluctance of the large financial institutions to invest in the future of our country. The banks, the insurance companies, the trust companies, they will not put a nickel into equity stocks, if they can avoid it, to invest in the future of our country; they will not take the risk. Those people do not buy stocks in mining companies except to a very minimal degree.

That has been the history of economic growth, or I should say economic retardation in this country. This country has been retarded because the large blocks of capital in the hands of the classical financial institutions are invested in debt securities and not in equity securities.

I remember a number of years ago my friend the former Minister of Economics and Development made quite a speech about that in this Legislature. That is to say, the large stores of capital go to putting a mortgage on everybody's house. The banks, the trust companies and the insurance companies want to have a mortgage on everybody's house in this country, but they do not want to invest in risk securities which would lead to the development of this country.

Bear in mind—a good example that I never forget—that when they had to build that leg of the trans-Canada pipeline across the northern reaches of the precambrian shield, Trans-Canada Pipelines did not borrow the money from the banks or the insurance companies, they had to go to the public Treasury at Ottawa to get it. We, the people had to put it up in the same way that we had to build the CPR; we the people had to put the money up, \$80 million, and the government fell as a result of getting involved in it.

When the mining committee met, in Sault Ste. Marie I think it was, one of the Trans-

Canada Pipelines persons came before us with a brief and talked about the future of mining in the north country, and talked about how Trans-Canada Pipelines was ready to lend an arm and to give every support to it. He read this long brief; it sounded as though it had been prepared by a very expensive public relations expert—somebody of the quality of Don Fairbairn. So when he finished I said to him, "You know you should never come before a government body without acknowledging your debt to the people of Canada and the money the public loaned you to build your pipeline in the northern parts of northern Ontario."

But that has been the history of our economic development. The economic growth of this country—with a scant 19 million people in the seventh decade of the 20th century is a history of economic retardation forced upon it by the unwillingness of large owners of capital to invest in its future. When they do invest, they want a tremendous return; they want to become as rich as Croesus.

We went through Elliot Lake. My hon. friend from York South talked about the lack of risk of the uranium companies. Indeed, we heard many briefs and many beefs from people in Elliot Lake about the economic depression in that area. I made a comment in the presence of some of these big wheels from Dennison and Rio Algom. They said that there was one group that did not suffer in the Elliot Lake process, and that was the mining companies. They went away well-heeled. Consolidated Dennison ended up with a cement company. They have their mines and a bread company as a result of the profits they made.

That stock was selling for 30 cents on the exchange. Just a short while before the discovery of uranium at Elliot Lake you could buy all the Dennison you wanted for under half a buck. Now, it is one of the giants in the Canadian mining industry because its profits were guaranteed by the people of Canada, and the government of Ontario. I do not rue the fact that they have a bread company and a cement company—I just hope that they do not mix the bread with the cement.

I made some comments at an earlier time about how much I regretted the fact that the mining companies, with lots of money in the treasury, seemed to go out of the mining industry; how they seemed to shy away from it. I cited examples—Gunnar and the other giants who made a lot of money out of uranium. Gunnar went into the construction business.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Unfortunately!

Mr. Sopha: Unfortunately, my hon. friend from Bruce, and I suppose there is a lot of support for that proposition, because the stock dropped from \$10 to \$5. But I wanted to mention the Toronto stock exchange, the headquarters of the family compact. For 15 years I have been studying their operations, and we are almost at the day of vindication of our criticisms. As soon as Mr. Justice Kelly reports—I do not want to suggest what he should put in it—but there are very likely some suggestions for control that he will put in there.

However, that is my view of the mining industry and I had better put it in context, too, just so I will not be misunderstood. I put it in the context of a man who is the son of a miner—my father worked in the mines at Cobalt for 21 years; he worked in the old Buffalo mine 21 years before I was born and worked a good long time afterwards. He went back to work in the mines at the age of 70; he came out of retirement during the war and went back to work, looking after the blast furnace at the Nipissing mine in 1941, I believe it was. I have always felt that I have some ownership of some of those ores in a sort of an indirect way; that they do not all belong in Bay Street; they do not all belong to individuals who come along and want to get as rich as Croesus, like W. H. Wright.

The *Toronto Globe and Mail* was founded in 1844—it is in its 122nd year—and until 1937 it was a Grit newspaper. It was founded by George Brown as an organ of reform. In 1937, W. H. Wright and part of the \$47 million I spoke of came along and bought the *Globe and Mail*, put George McCullagh in charge, and George McCullagh supported the Grit Party for a while—I think until about 1941 or 1942. My hon. friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver) gets the message and he nods—and eschewed the Liberal Party. So you see the interrelationship of the mining industry to practical politics. As a result of the wealth created in northern Ontario the Liberal Party lost the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Under what estimate is it appropriate to discuss the various aspects of the problem of mining municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The one we are on.

Mr. MacDonald: I have one point I would like to raise, Mr. Chairman, before we leave it, then.

In the brief that was presented by the

association of mining municipalities of northern Ontario to the select committee, they had this comment, and I quote it:

None of the other member municipalities—
that is, other than the government-created Elliot Lake:

—of this organization have anything approaching comparable housing or services. Many residents of some of the member municipalities lack adequate water and sewage services. Most of the municipalities are trying to supply these basic needs and improve housing standards, but are prevented by insufficient revenue from industrial assessment and by the increasing cost of other municipal services, particularly to persons.

Now, without going into the full range of problems faced by mining municipalities, I want to focus attention for a moment on one, Mr. Chairman, and to raise with the hon. Minister whether or not this is not an area through our Ontario housing corporation—through your colleague, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development—in which some further government action could not be taken. I was very interested a few weeks ago to hear an announcement from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) that he is tackling this area of poor housing in rural parts of the province—these pockets of poverty, if you will—by a housing programme which is directed specifically at this problem.

I think the hon. Minister would agree that if you go into mining towns one of the most shocking things is the quality of housing. This is not true perhaps of some of the new ones, though some of the bunkhouses, I think, leave something to be desired. Indeed, I wonder whether there should not be minimum standards that would have to be met, and those minimum standards conceivably should be set down by the provincial government. But on the housing itself, would it not be a fair proposition for this government, through the housing corporation, to intervene with the Central Mortgage and Housing, and produce some arrangements which would make it possible for houses to be built for low enough rental, perhaps for purchase, and that any deficiency below an economic financing figure could be met by the industry involved? After all, these industries are not paying the full level of municipal taxes in many respects. Therefore, I think it is a fair proposition that the industry should meet any deficiency that might accrue in developing this kind of a housing programme.

I wonder if the hon. Minister, either through his department or in conjunction

with his colleague, has given any consideration to meeting the housing problem in mining communities?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Yes, I would say that we have. The standards that apply to public housing in these new mines—the standards for bunkhouses—are set by The Ontario Department of Health now, and we are working out a project whereby the mining companies, Central Mortgage and Housing and so on, whoever wants to do it, can finance those homes and the companies will look after the payments for the people who occupy them. There is a move on foot that all these new areas where new mines are springing up have bettered their housing situation; they try to make them more permanent. We have been faced in the past by mines bottoming out, and then we are left with a community with poor buildings and all these things are a tremendous cost—in the final analysis—to the government who has to step in and take over. So we are trying to see that the mining companies and the others interested come along at the inception of a new community, and make it a worthwhile place to live after the mines are bottomed out.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, could I just follow up on the remarks of the hon. leader of the NDP? I realize I am swinging, in one sense, to another area, but I know it is an area in which the hon. Minister of Mines is very interested, and that is with Indians who are working in mines. So that I can get it into context that I can talk about it here, I notice in Manitoba that there is legislation between the Manitoba government and the federal government to do exactly what my hon. friend has suggested, and that is to improve the housing conditions of Indians through Central Mortgage and Housing. Has the hon. Minister contemplated this for areas near a mining area, for example, at Red Lake?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: They do work but it is not under our department.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): I think perhaps I can speak on that, sir. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) spoke on some estimates a few weeks ago about the programme we had with a Cabinet committee working on the Indian problem and the small mining communities were involved in that. We have had discussions with Central Mortgage and Housing with reference to building, not the portable housing that is usually referred to,

but portable housing that would be almost permanent although it could be moved on somewhere else if the Indians were moved or the mining camp was moved.

This is one of the problems in northern Ontario. If it is going to be a permanent town or village then these facilities can be put in on a permanent basis. If it is going to be one which may have to move off to some other location in a year or two, we are looking at the possibility of building good accommodation, that Central Mortgage and Housing will assist in financing, which can be moved to other communities. This is part and parcel of the programme between the federal government and this government with reference to the Indian programme that will include these mining communities the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. Thompson: I realize that there must be a close association between the two departments. We read some pretty shocking statistics about Indians at Red Lake. Just last year we again read about housing and their lack of opportunity to get employment.

I have really two questions; my first is about the housing programme. Have there been studies to learn the need for housing in this area? I would like to get the hon. Minister's opinion about the Manitoba legislation, where they have moved even to the extent of calling Indian reserves, and I want to emphasize with the co-operation of the Indians, to call this a municipality. They are trying to disintegrate the traditional reserves in order that CMHC could then be used for loans for the Indians.

In view of the shocking figures and write-ups you have had of the deprivation and poor conditions under which Indians have been living in the outskirts of certain mining areas, how extensive is this? What kind of studies have you done on this; and have you looked at the Manitoba legislation?

Then while I am on this subject, sir, I move to another question to the hon. Minister. Do you have any knowledge of the number of Indians who are working in mines, what kind of training is available to encourage them into this particular field?

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: We have no exact figures, but I would like to just digress for a moment on your idea.

I have two communities in my riding. One at Lansdowne House, it is run by Father Ouimet. It is one of the most up-to-date places in the north and the Indians are clean. They have a beautiful recreation hall there, a saw-mill. They have all these things and it

really all stems from the efforts of that one man—Father Ouimet.

The other one I have—and I will not mention it—is really very difficult to handle. There is nobody there who has really taken the lead—you know the Indians are great followers and somebody—it might be an Indian who is big enough to take the lead, or a white man who is big enough to take the lead—can make a tremendous change in the Indians.

They need to be taught and they will go along with it. I have found that in my own riding. As far as the mines are concerned, I think that most of them have some Indian labour and those who are there are good workers, they do a good job. As soon as they get a job that is well paid and steady, then their home environment and everything else changes. But I do not know the answer to what Manitoba is doing and I did not know they had a specified policy. I do not think they have any specified policy unless you know of one yourself, I have not heard of any.

Mr. Thompson: It is more in the arrangement of housing that they have made an agreement and perhaps I could just refer that to the hon. Minister for his attention.

Hon. Mr. Randall: I might say—excuse me, sir—I might say that in this study we are making of the housing accommodation in northern Ontario, particularly with reference to Indians, I think, as you appreciate, it has been a jurisdiction under which the federal government have operated for many years, particularly on the reservations. We are concerned with the reservation problems as well as Indians off reservations. The reason for this committee being formed is primarily to improve the opportunities for teaching them a trade, a permanent trade, and also for educational facilities and welfare facilities. But most of all, as the hon. member has already pointed out, they need good housing; and good housing means sewer and water facilities and all the things that go with a good housing programme.

We expect to have, when this committee has finished its work in the very near future, an area we will take and use as an example of what can be done to improve the housing such as we are talking about here.

The hon. member mentioned Red Lake. When I came into this office the former Minister had completed a housing development up at Red Lake. I think some pictures appeared in the Ontario housing magazine when I had it in the House here last year, indicating what it was before and what

happened when the housing authorities moved in and built houses for the people in that area. I would suggest to you that anywhere in Canada where they have an Indian problem, we are putting together the knowledge we have in all provinces. I hope that through this committee we will have further studies on our own Indian problem.

From what I know about Manitoba, they have perhaps a more difficult problem than we have here because I think they have more Indians. I would not be sure of that, but there is quite a bit more controversy about the Manitoba Indians than there is here. I would think our problems are similar. We have not only a training programme to give these people work, but also a housing programme and educational programme that has to be implemented.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Timiskaming has the floor.

Mr. R. A. H. Taylor (Timiskaming): Mr. Chairman, there are two points I would like clarification on from the hon. Minister. The question of miners' health, what vote does that come under; and miners' education?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Vote 1203, the mines inspection branch, is the inspection branch and health is under that vote as well; they are both under that, vote 1203.

Mr. Taylor: In connection with 1201 then, Mr. Chairman, last July the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), in an address at Orillia, stated that serious consideration might be given to decentralizing some of our government departments and specifically mentioned Agriculture and Mines as departments that might operate well in their more natural areas.

With respect to mining, this idea has considerable merit, particularly in such cases as such established mining centres as Kirkland Lake, Cobalt, Timmins or Sudbury, which might well be considered as a central point for conducting the mining affairs of this province. It would certainly not be difficult to secure experienced staff, people who were familiar with the problems of the industry, and it would be a positive governmental step towards regional development of an area that is presently being milked of its natural resources.

This would mean perpetuating such a mining town and would simply be returning to northern Ontario some of the contribution that it has made in the past. Has any serious consideration been given to the possibility of decentralization?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, we have our geologists and our mining recorders and others in these areas, but I think of Geraldton in my own area. Geraldton now is almost not a mining town. It started out as a mining town, yet it has become quite an area economy in timber and other things of that kind. It is quite a town. At the inception of it I think there were four mines; today there is one that is not going too well, so they have gone away from mining. I think that is the eventual outcome of these areas, and into that picture would fit what you are bringing up. I think that perhaps we could quicken the pulse along that line by the government doing something, but I have found that the people are doing it themselves anyway.

What is your own opinion? What do you find is happening?

Mr. Taylor: I think it would be a very good idea, Mr. Minister. Along those lines, I wonder if the department has ever made any investigation of a project that has been underway in West Virginia, that of raising mushrooms in abandoned coal mines? I understand that it is a very favourable spot.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Darkness down below would help mushrooms.

Mr. Taylor: Darkness and dampness, and there is commercially quite a market available for them. Has the department ever made any studies in that direction at all?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, not to my knowledge. I do not know whether Agriculture might have, but I can see your point. As a matter of fact, I never thought of it myself. But you have got the darkness, you have got the moisture and you have got the heat. So it could be done. I think that is a problem for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I think you should pass that on to him; it is a good idea.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): You have not answered the question about decentralization.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1201 carried?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, on this first vote, I would like to make one or two observations. Over the past ten years, during which time the present Minister of Mines and the Minister that preceded him have been presenting their estimates, glowing remarks have been made about our great natural resources in this province, and how thankful we should be for this natural heritage. But I have said before that in as many years there has been a great dis-

regard for the problems facing the people that make these resources worthwhile—that is, the miners who go down and dig the ores and the minerals in this province. I think it is about time that the hon. Minister, in making his opening remarks, would deal with some of the problems that are facing the communities.

Year after year we have to get up and raise them, and we seem to be losing track of the real contribution made by the people in these industries. We all know that the select committee on mining has been sitting for some time and is going to sit on in the current year. Representations were made to that committee, particularly by the united steel workers of America, that dealt with some of the problems facing the miners in their community. I think some of them were of such importance that the hon. Minister should have reported to this House on them, and advised the House as to what action might be taken to rectify some of the immediate problems. Certainly the hon. Minister is aware of some of the housing problems at the present time; certainly he should be aware of the apparent shortage of experienced miners. I have press clippings that tell me that some of the mines may have to curtail production because of the lack of experienced miners. The steelworkers' brief sets out this problem quite clearly, as to what should be done to provide an adequate work force in the mines.

But dealing with the community itself, I think the opening remarks in their brief should have given the hon. Minister some reason to report to this House what the problems are in regard to housing in the communities, and the conditions of the miners who are losing their jobs through various reasons, such as health, and by reason of the mines shutting down. I was enticed to read the whole brief after looking at page 3, giving the steelworkers' comments on the economic position of northern communities. I quote just briefly:

Northern Ontario, where most of the province's mines are located, is very much like a colony of the south. An ordinary road map tells the story well enough. Southern Ontario is criss-crossed by highways connecting numerous cities and towns. Two railways and two highways pass across northern Ontario on their way west. Stretching out from them at various points are the deadend company railways and secondary roads reaching to the mines and timber limits. Heading north along the eastern border is the ONR, the provincially owned development road now cutting back some of its services, and dotted along the

railways and highways are the mining towns, some on their way up, economically speaking, and others on their way down. Every mining town falls, of necessity, into one of these two categories.

I would have the House pay attention to the next paragraph.

Old Cobalters are fond of saying that the wealth that once made Cobalt the world's richest silver mining camp is now in the head offices of Bay and King Street, or the smart homes of Bayview Avenue.

Wherever it is, there is no sign of it in Cobalt, I think all hon. members can agree, if they travel through the north and through some of the mining towns that once were bragged about in the southern parts of the country. But certainly I was disappointed that the hon. Minister had not dealt with some of these questions in his opening remarks.

I would like to refer also to page six, dealing with the steelworkers' recommendations in regard to the problem of the miner. It deals with the shortage of miners; this is something we ran into in the past few months and that is why I thought that the hon. Minister might have dealt with it at this particular time. The following editorial appeared in a recent issue of *The Miner's Voice*, one of this union's official publications:

WHY THE SHORTAGE OF MINERS?

The Canadian mining industry is suffering from a dearth of experienced manpower, reports the *Northern Miner* of September 10, 1964. All classifications of mine employees are in short supply, but the greatest shortage is in experienced underground miners. Hardest hit are the gold mines. Ontario mining associations blame the industry's losses of experienced workers on the lure of the cities, buoyant industrial conditions in more southern areas, impending closure of a number of long-producing Ontario gold mines, and a move by older miners to join families in southern towns and cities.

The president of a prominent Quebec mine, Campbell Chibougamau, blames the city as the major lure for miners, saying that wages do not appear to be the dominant factor.

I am not going to continue with the brief, Mr. Chairman, because I am sure that the hon. Minister has read it, but I think that one or two paragraphs dealing with the shortage should be put on record, hoping that the hon. Minister will relate to this House what plans he may have in coping with the shortage at this particular time.

I read from the paragraph at the top of page seven:

MINERS REPORT

Too often miners are tied to a bad job by a growing family. Their children see the crippled bodies, broken homes, unemployment fears and job restrictions of a mine-dominated town and aspire to escape to better jobs and living conditions. When they are successful, it is not surprising that the parents would follow their children to comparative economic and social liberty.

And on the same page, the third paragraph from the bottom reads:

SECURITY

In the whole of the Kirkland Lake and Porcupine gold fields or the silver-cobalt area of Gogama and Cobalt, there is not such a thing as a pension for a miner.

When the great Hollinger mine shuts down, supposedly within the next year after pulling more than \$552 million worth of gold out of the ground in its 54-year existence, it will put about 1,300 people out of work. About 250 of these are miners who have worked a lifetime at Hollinger and have no pensions to show for it. There are those, too, who have spent a lifetime in the mines without accumulating a very large service record with any one mine.

Maybe some of the employers and perhaps the hon. Minister—I hope not—feel that one mine is shutting down and the miners from that mine can go to work in the other mines that find they are running short of experienced help, but I do not think this is the case. Because of their age and because of their desire to get out of that kind of environment, they are moving out of the districts.

I would hope that the hon. Minister would pay attention to the recommendations of the steelworkers' union in regard to the shortage of experienced miners and help to establish, in co-operation with the federal government, a comprehensive training programme—an apprenticeship programme that thoroughly trains the miner for all aspects of the mining industry and which will, in turn, give him some security in promotion and advancing to the highest paid job on a regular basis with the full knowledge of what the job entails.

I would leave it at this point, sir, and would hope that the hon. Minister will give the House some idea of what might be done, or what the department might intend to do, with regard to some of the community and personal problems of the miners in that district.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, I know that this is very close to the heart of the hon. member for Wentworth East and he has made an extremely good study of it. He mentioned about highways in the north—"That is very close to my heart"—and so on. I am always trying to get more highways in the north. You go home every night and you come back here and you see the 401 highway. My people say to me up in the north, "What is Toronto doing with all those big roads down there and this is all we have here?" Even with all of that highway on 401, at times you can hardly get on or off it. I sympathize with the northern people and work as hard as I can to get every road that I can for them, but I do realize what has to be done down in these tremendously populated areas as well.

You mentioned the shortage of miners. Mr. Gates of International Nickel told me not so long ago that when these new mines came in in Sudbury and Falconbridge they would be short 2,500 miners—2,500, not 100—and they need a lot of skilled men in that 2,500. Miners today can get jobs almost any place, as you know. But you brought up a point that is one of importance, and that is when a man reaches middle age or beyond and the mine he has been working in for so many years is bottomed out, very often he does not feel like going on to another area and carrying on the life of mining, especially if his health is not A-1.

Fifty mining companies and the universities and ourselves are trying to get a course going for these miners, both the older miners and the young men coming along, to attract the young men into the industry and to try to get new skills for the men who have spent a large part of their life in mining but who do not want to follow it any longer. There has been a lot of work done on this plan and it is a case of money and planning. But we are having very good results and I hope that before too long something will be done.

You talked about that brief of the steelworkers. I always look at their briefs very closely because they are a knowledgeable group, one of the oldest groups in Canada in the way of unions and they have some top men all through the organization. They write me continually about problems in the mines and about things that are going wrong and so on, and I certainly read them all. I do not pass any of them up; they do not let me, because they come along before too long and want my opinion on what they wrote me about. They are a knowledgeable outfit and I assure you that I pay attention to them and so does my department.

About the apprentice programme, as you know, we are going to enlarge our school of mining up north at Haileybury. Professor Walley is the head of the mining institute and we hope to make some room there for the younger men. These plans are all being enlarged and looked at and we are trying to do the best we can for miners generally, both young and old.

One of the things I found in the universities is this—and it is very reasonable, when you think of it. A young man going to university and a girl going to university become engaged and they think of marriage. She says to him, "Look, Bill, I do not like you going away out in the wilds in mining. We cannot live there and have a family; there is no school for the children and it is full of mosquitoes and flies and the housing is not very good." She is the greatest influence in preventing that boy from continuing in mining or work that will take him out in the wilds. It is natural. I have often mentioned that to men in the universities and they agree with me that that is one of the problems.

The thing we have to do is to try to make these mining areas attractive in every way and then take the couple up and show them what a fine life they can have in a mining community. I saw a moving picture in colour of Thompson, Manitoba. The International Nickel Company there is a colossus. They have a whole little town there, 400 miles north of Winnipeg. They have only about two months' summer, and a lot of the town is built on a cement slab because the frost keeps heaving it; they have it on jacks, that is how they keep it level. The most beautiful flowers grow there for two months of the year. If you showed that coloured picture to a girl who is thinking of marrying a fellow who is going up there, she would jump at the chance.

We have to bring to their minds that these mining towns are not dog holes with old houses and all that sort of thing. That is what we are trying to do, we know it is a big job to attract miners to the far north. The hon. member for Sudbury is not here but the way they are beautifying Sudbury and getting the university and everything up there, this is going to make it very attractive for young men to tell their wives, or if they are going to marry, "It is a beautiful city and I am going to go up and work in the mines. It has a university and everything." That is what we should be trying to do. I know of no other way to cure the difficulty of attracting young miners.

The hon. member spoke of a very important thing, about the middle-aged miner who, when one mine is closing, does not want to continue in that vocation because he has worked very hard and would like something a little easier. I do not blame him at all. Well, we are doing things there, too. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) is sitting beside me saying yes, and they are conducting a tremendous amount of study on these changes in industry for men at the senior age.

I assure the hon. member that we do not just throw the steelworkers' briefs in the wastepaper baskets; we look at them and we study them.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. Minister is in such a friendly mood, would he inform myself and the House as to why he has not been able to convince the hon. Minister of Labour that he should bring in the voluntary revocable check-off that has been asked for so often by the steelworkers and which pertains to the health and welfare of the community? I understand the hon. Minister of Mines and some of his predecessors were in favour of it, but they have not been able to convince somebody to—

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question. This morning he spoke of the number of claims that were staked in the province. We know there are small mining companies trying to develop ore bodies; we also know there is an individual gentleman in the province trying to develop an ore body, too. Of course, I understand it is always the money which slows them up in order to develop these prospects. Is there any money available from The Department of Mines or The Department of Economics and Development, if there is a good prospect, for assistance to these small companies or individuals to see how large an ore body they have?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Would the hon. member bring this up under 1206—that is the mining lands branch—and we will go into that for him?

Mr. R. Brunelle (Cochrane North): Mr. Chairman, with reference to vote 1201, I would like to say that I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth East with reference to the retraining of miners and diamond drillers. I would like to mention that this matter was brought to the attention of the select committee on mining. About two weeks ago, the president of the Timiskaming

mine operators association, Mr. Jerry Jerome, wrote to me and sent a copy to the hon. member for Timiskaming and as a result we contacted The Department of Mines, The Department of Labour and The Department of Education. I am happy to report that on Monday next there will be a meeting in Haileybury to discuss the possibilities of the courses for the training of diamond drillers, and also for the retraining of miners.

I wish to compliment the hon. member for Timiskaming for his assistance and also, once more, The Department of Mines, The Department of Education and The Department of Labour for their co-operation.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, may I just direct a question to the hon. member in regard to his remarks? I am very pleased to hear what he has said. Have the departments working with the unions involved, or the employees, if not organized, involved, going to have representation on the employer-employee groups in their talks about the retraining programme?

Mr. Brunelle: I would hope so. We will make sure that the representatives of the unions are included. This retraining programme will be in conjunction with the federal authorities.

Vote 1201 agreed to.

On vote 1202:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister consider, starting now, that mining companies in production be required to keep logs of the geology which they discover? And to have it filed at some central place with The Department of Mines, so future generations will be acquainted with the geology of the actual workings underground? I am sure it would save a good deal of expense at some future time, rather than having to do it all over again. For example, from the point of view of the Cobalt camp, where the incidence of silver is found so sporadically, had there been mapping in the early days of geology it would have saved a good deal of exploratory expense.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have, in the central library of our own department, a great deal of that material. It was given to us voluntarily by all the companies, and it is available to anybody. I think if we have not got it there in our central library, and if somebody came in who wanted certain information that we did not have in our library, we would endeavour to get it for them. There is a central library that has that information

on the old properties. I suppose they would not give it to you while they were operating, but once they are through with a property they would make it available. Does that answer the question?

Mr. Sopha: Well, yes, but it leads to another supplementary question. Would it be feasible for The Department of Mines to require companies in stages of exploration to make regular reports to the department—say weekly reports—of the contacts they have had with the drills? The Department of Mines could, of course, keep that secret, and keep it to itself, but there would be a measure of control over wild speculation; in the public interest The Department of Mines could publish the results if it became necessary.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told that if it comes to The Department of Mines it becomes public property, so it would be hard to keep it secret. That is one of the difficulties.

Mr. Sopha: Well, a little amendment to The Mining Act.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who would believe you?

Mr. Sopha: Here now, my friend, the hon. member for Timiskaming, passes me this clipping: "Central Registry for Mining Data Proposed." I am quoting from the *Globe and Mail* of Friday, March 12, 1965:

Fenton Scott, a geologist with Area Mines Limited, said that there should be a law to compel the filing of information about the geology covered during drilling.

He said:

Availability of results from exploration work, the correlation and re-examination of this data, could conceivably lead to the drilling of a successful hole on property where nothing had been previously found.

Speaking as an individual, I say there is no reason why this should not be made available. It would not affect a company's development to disclose this geological information. The cost of transmitting the information from a property to a central registry would be negligible. The benefits from a central registry of this kind would be elimination of extensive and costly duplication and the speeding of ore discoveries.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, we will certainly take that under advisement. But the thing I am afraid of is forcing a private company to disclose their geological information until such time as they agree to do it. You

know, they have their money sunk in there, after all; they might want to do something in the future and they probably want the person who is seeking the geological information to come to them and say: "Look, we will pay you so much for this information and knowledge because the owner may have paid out money for it." Now if they have given up the land a new group can go in there with a drill or a geologist and get the information. I think you will agree that is pretty fair.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, under 1202, last year the hon. Minister pointed out that most of the croppings of rock in this province have been prospected and that we are having to put more stress on magnetometer surveys, geophysical surveys and seismic work on the technical side of prospecting because the favourable geology is now buried deep beneath the surface of the ground. I agree with the hon. Minister that this job of prospecting today depends more and more on technicians and technical equipment. Such being the case, my question of the hon. Minister is, why are we not making use of all the available technical equipment in searching for our minerals? We are currently completing a series of magnetometer surveys that may disclose certain anomalies. Why are we not making use, at the same time, of electromagnetic surveys and geochemical surveys if, by so doing, we can more closely locate and identify our latent mineral resources?

Up to now, the government has maintained that it is not in the prospecting business, and that should be left to private individuals and companies. The mines department seems to be operating under the ludicrous policy of spending money to locate mineral deposits, but are afraid to make use of all available technical instruments for fear they might find something. It seems to me that any airborne magnetometer surveys being made should be expanded to include simultaneous electromagnetic and other equipment surveys. It is estimated that this could be done with only a 20 per cent increase in cost. The problem in this respect is that today only the larger companies can afford to make such surveys on an individual basis, and as a result of the present system, there is costly duplication of effort by government and by private companies.

The result of such an expanded government programme would make more complete airborne survey information available to all those interested in mineral exploration. If such a programme had been followed in the past, it is likely that the Texas Gulf discovery

in Kidd township might have been made ten to 15 years earlier.

In this connection, with respect to the work being done by the government department, Dr. Hearst, in one of our committee hearings, indicated that at the present rate that studies were being made, it would take another 25 years for the province to complete the mapping of the areas they intend to do. Surely, with the current demand for minerals and the speed-up of our civilization, more money and effort could be put into the present programme.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, might I request that there be a five-minute recess?

Mr. Chairman: At this moment, I request a five-minute recess and I now leave the chair and resume at 4.05.

The House resumed at 4.13.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, in addition to my previous remarks, there is one other thing I would like to say in this connection, and that is that under the estimates I note that the salaries budget for this year for geologists is \$716,000, against last year's budget of \$606,000. The increase is certainly very desirable, but in view of the fact that last year you only spent \$504,000, I wonder what are your hopes for getting additional adequate staff in the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: While I am getting the answer to that, I will give the hon. member for Timiskaming the other answer.

It is doubtful whether an electromagnetic survey conducted simultaneously at the same flight altitude of 1,000 feet and flight space in one-half mile as the aeromagnetic survey, would have been satisfactory. As a rule, electromagnetic surveys are carried out at lower altitudes and over smaller selected areas. And the speed of mapping depends on available geologists. We would very much like to step up our geological mapping programme, but we are limited by trained personnel. We have difficulty getting geologists, as you know. They are all in strong demand, and if a company realizes we are after a certain man, probably they will boost the ante a little bit and get him away from us. But we are studying this all the time. We want to get the survey done as quickly as we can. We have set certain goals and are certainly glad of the suggestion that the hon. member made.

Mr. Taylor: In that connection, do you have an age limit on the hiring of geologists? An upper age limit?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, we have not, but we try to attract young men into the field. That is why we try to keep the age down, and I think that government should do that more than industry. They can go out and hire whom they like, but we try to get young men started who will stay with us.

Mr. Taylor: My point in that connection was, of course, that if you are short of geologists, maybe there are some geologists that are available at an older age who would help you complete your programme.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told that the older men are not physically able to do the field work. That is one reason why we have not done more of it. But I assure you that if we are short and we can find a man, regardless of his age, if he can do the job, at all, we will get him.

Vote 1202 agreed to.

On vote 1203:

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, under 1203, this deals with safety and mine inspection, and I would raise the question with the hon. Minister that has been raised so many times before. I have always felt that the hon. Minister looked favourably on the suggestions made by the employees, or the union on their behalf, in regard to a situation. I refer to part eight of The Mines Act, operation of mines. The hon. Minister may recall our previous discussions, that is section 152, section two, responsibilities as to qualifications. The section reads:

Subject to the requirements of this Act and except as otherwise herein provided, responsibilities for the authorization and decision as to the qualifications of employees shall rest with the employer or his agent.

As I say, we have raised this question many times and given what we felt were good reasons for a change in that Act that would provide in the second line, where it says: "except as otherwise herein provided" — "or subject to a collective bargaining agreement."

Many mines are organized, with a trade union as their bargaining agent, and all union contracts carry provisions for grievances to be processed in an orderly manner. They provide, also, seniority provisions, provisions to provide for the promotion, demotion or transfer of an employee from one job to another. Of course, they also carry provisions that where management and union cannot agree, they can arbitrate their case, take it to a board of arbitration, and have a binding decision made by an arbitrator.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. member a question? Often, I wonder, and I represent a big part of labour—about people who are not in the labour movement—farmers, druggists, grocers and everybody else—how do you account for that?

Mr. Gisborn: I would say that the hon. members from the ridings can represent their particular group as they see fit. I happen to be a trade unionist, and I think it is necessary, if one believes in the trade union movement and they have problems, that this is the place to raise them and try to convince the government to pay attention to their problems. I am content—

Mr. Edwards: May I ask a supplementary question? I appreciate and agree with that, but I would say that so often you fellows in unions—and I appreciate all you do—but you do forget all the other people.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): He is trying to organize them!

Mr. MacDonald: You do not know anything about the trade unions.

Mr. Edwards: What do you mean? You were not up in my riding last time.

Mr. MacDonald: I will come up some time shortly—

Mr. Edwards: You come up and see how far you will get!

Mr. Gisborn: Briefly, in answer to the question of the hon. member for Perth, Mr. Chairman, I would say that I believe that the trade union movement plays a type of role in the life of our society, and I would also say that he has not been listening very well if he has not realized that this party has taken an active part in the whole community and has applied its considerations to all of our community.

Mr. Edwards: Which party are you talking about?

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, to get back to the section of The Mining Act I was referring to—section 152, subsection 2—that gives the mine management or its agents the complete right to determine the qualifications of an employee in regard to his work. I related that to the collective bargaining agreement that provides for grievance procedure and provides for seniority provisions relating to promotions, demotions or transfer of em-

ployment and the methods on which they settle their problems in this regard.

The trade union movement and its local unions have felt that this section has been used, in some sense, to reduce the intent of the collective bargaining agreement. I have raised this many times in the House and as I said at the start, I felt that we received some favourable replies from the present Minister and previous Ministers of Mines that they were giving consideration to amending this section so that the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement would prevail in regard to qualifications.

Certainly, both the employees' representatives and the employee and management have mutual responsibility in making sure that the man is qualified to carry out the job assigned to him, but where there is a collective agreement and seniority provisions prevail, the union likes to have the right to grieve against any kind of a promotion or demotion, in relation to an occupation. With this section as it is, the union has no right to invoke the terms of the collective bargaining agreement, and I would appeal to the hon. Minister to give consideration to having this section amended so that the collective bargaining agreement would prevail in this regard.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister indicated that miners' health came under 1203. I understand that when a miner applies for work underground he is required to take a series of chest x-rays and when employed has periodic x-rays to check whether there might be any indication of the development of silicosis. All of this service, I appreciate, is under the direction and control of the workmen's compensation board.

However, one of the most difficult problems for the board as well as for an injured miner, is to establish and settle fairly the problem of an injured back incurred while working in a mine. The workman has a great deal of difficulty proving that his back was injured on the job and the board itself has the problem of finding out whether the back injury occurred because of a previous injury or whether the condition came about through working on the job.

It strikes me that it might be helpful to all parties if, when the workmen's compensation board takes an original chest x-ray, it might also take back x-rays which would provide a continuous history of each miner's condition. Such x-rays might show early back deterioration and preventive measures could be taken, as in silicosis, to prevent the employee from becoming a compensation case. Would that be possible?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I think that the hon. member has a point there. I do not think that this has come to my attention before, but when they are taking a chest x-ray, it would seem feasible to take a back x-ray, too. Have you found cases where a man's chest has been all right and some trouble has developed in his back that was traced back to the same time?

Mr. Taylor: No. My point is that after a miner has incurred a back injury, or supposedly incurred an injury, while at work, the problem for the board is to determine whether this was the result of a previous back injury or not. If continuous back x-rays were taken each time a chest x-ray was, they would establish the fact of whether there had been any prior back deterioration or not. In that way the board could more fairly rule on the present condition of the miner.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is a good suggestion, and a novel one. We will follow it up.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I understand that miners' education comes under this vote and I would like to refer to something that the hon. Minister has touched on earlier in one of his other votes. That is that the one bright spot on the Canadian mining educational scene is the increasing number of mining technicians who are being trained at the provincial institute of mining at Haileybury.

Even here the demand for technicians exceeds the supply. In 19 years of operation, 684 students have completed the mining course, or an average of 36 per year. These graduates, as you know, have had ready acceptance by the industry and many have risen to prominent positions. Commonly, Haileybury graduates now occupy positions that were formerly filled with bachelor of science graduates. The enrolment for the past year in Haileybury was 126, with 61 students in the first year, 42 in the second year, and 23 in the third year. This was an increase of 30 over the previous year.

When you appreciate the shortage of technical personnel that has developed in the mining industry, you can appreciate the importance of the provincial institute of mining as a whole. The mining departments of nine Canadian universities graduated only 33 engineers this past year. For this current year, 1965, the estimated number of graduates is 34. By 1966, all the mining graduates will come from only four universities in Canada.

Sir, if our mining industry in Ontario is to develop and expand in the future, provisions must be made to supply the required technicians, and the provincial institute of mines appears to be the only school in Canada capable of so doing. A request is currently before The Department of Education for the expansion of these facilities at Haileybury and the interim report of the committee on mining has recommended immediate action be taken by the department to ensure that the present accommodation, facilities and teaching staff of this institute be expanded to meet the constantly increasing number of applicants, and that necessary facilities be ready for use when the school year begins in 1966.

I am sure the hon. Minister and the department will give their full support to this request. However, the very expansion of this institute brings up another problem that The Department of Education should be considering. The hon. Minister of Education, in his announcement of the creation of community colleges, indicated that because of the sparse population and the distances involved, residents might be built for these colleges where they are located in northern Ontario. Similar conditions do exist at present and will intensify with the expansion of the provincial institute of mines facility. While local boarding arrangements have worked well in the past, as the school expands these facilities will become more and more limited.

Of the total enrolment of 126 in this past year, 63 students came from north of North Bay, 38 from south of North Bay, 15 from other provinces and ten from other countries. One can appreciate that with the increase in educational facilities, residential requirements will increase sharply. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he confer with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and strongly recommend not only the immediate increase of educational facilities but also the provision of a suitable residence for the students. I am sure the town of Haileybury would co-operate fully with both departments by finding suitable land and providing the necessary services.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would say to the hon. member that I cannot imagine not wanting to live in Haileybury. But I think Mr. Mawhallig and that school is rated, as you know, very highly in mining and other circles as well. I think that the hon. Minister of Education has made up his mind that he is going to do quite a lot up there. I will bring it to his attention; the hon. member should do so, as well. The necessity is for housing for these students who might go

up there, because not only will they get a wonderful education, but there will not be so many other diversions around to take them away from their seat of learning. I am all for it, and I will certainly help it all I can.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Just one step further to that.

I have spoken on two or three occasions to Mr. Mawhallig, in connection with people desirous of entering the university there, or at least the mining school. I am wondering if the hon. Minister would advise me—I think the question is more properly directed to education—but is there any qualification under the student loans for this particular school, or is there any help of any kind available for people? We recognize that they can go to Haileybury from grade 12, but I am wondering if this would not be another approach that would help to interest young fellows to get into the mining field.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would like to inform the hon. member that there are scholarships available from the mining companies for these boys. If there is somebody that the hon. member has in mind who would like to go there, and if the hon. member notifies the department, they will tell me who to get in touch with. I think they will see that he is looked after, because they are very anxious to see boys go up to that school, too.

Mr. Farquhar: At the same time, in a formal way through The Department of Education, there is no—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Sure—that would be all right too, because it will get to them.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, while we must admit that there have been great improvements in reducing safety and health hazards, I feel that we must also admit that there are still too many accidents taking place in the mining industry. We should be doing everything we can to reduce them.

I would reiterate my appeal to the hon. Minister to make provisions in the safety inspection section of The Mining Act to make it mandatory for the management to establish joint safety and health committees. Certainly from the last Royal commission we had on industrial safety, the McAndrew report recommended that there should be joint management and employee safety and health committees. There is no doubt that the employees, those who are performing the work, have a great knowledge of the operations and where hazards would exist. Joint co-operation is, in my opinion, best in all fields. I do not think we can stick forever with the

idea that management must have the sole right to determine what is safe and what is not safe.

I feel that in the brief the steelworkers point out that the employees are asking more strongly for this measure now because of the type of supervisors who are being appointed by management. The employees have not, in all instances, confidence in their supervisors; as the situation is now, if an employee reports to an immediate supervisor that he feels that something is not just right and, if in the opinion of the supervisor, it is right and he is instructed to continue his work, he has to do it. I do not think this is a good way to promote safety. I do not think we can fear the fact that it would disrupt operations, because it would not mean in every case that the employee would stop work if there was a joint committee, or had the right to report to management or to a joint committee that he had reported to his supervisor that there was a hazard and it was not looked after. I think there would be a lot of co-operation if it was made mandatory under the Act, and I think it would do a lot towards reducing hazards. As we do away with safety hazards on one hand, others spring up; they are there at all times. For the best results mutual co-operation is best in the long run. I would appeal to the hon. Minister to have provisions made under the Act to make it mandatory for joint management-employee safety committees.

Vote 1203 agreed to.

On vote 1204:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 1204 I would like to ask the hon. Minister a number of questions with regard to the Timiskaming testing laboratory in Cobalt. This comes directly under the estimates here. Do I conclude correctly, then, that employees in this institution are civil servants? Or are they in some separate category?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We have both; some are civil servants, some are not.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the number of employees and how many of them are senior employees at the testing laboratory?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Four permanent civil servants, and it ranges from eight to 14 casuals.

Mr. MacDonald: The point I really wanted to get to is that I have been informed it ranged from eight to 14 casuals. Can the hon. Minister give any explanation as to why

you would have casuals, almost on a permanent basis? The hon. Minister will recall that some years ago we really came to grips with this issue in The Department of Highways and The Department of Lands and Forests. In one instance—I believe it was The Department of Highways—where the hon. Minister stated that for other than seasonal employees, if a person was hired, within one year he went on permanent staff. He did not have a “permanent casual,” the kind of situation that you discover in some departments where a man has been a casual for 20 or 25 years. Do you have people coming and going, so that there is any excuse at all for people being casuals all the time? What is the score there?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told, sir, that these casuals are coming and going. Some that were asked if they would prefer to be a civil servant rather than a casual said no. Now why, I cannot tell you; a salary cut, that is it.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, there is an opportunity to become a member of the permanent staff if they so desire?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: This is fair enough. I understand that the manager is Mr. O'Shaughnessy?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: How long has Mr. O'Shaughnessy been there?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Fifteen years or more.

Mr. MacDonald: I have never met the gentleman. The one occasion when I tried to visit the place, he happened to be out just at that time, or that day. I have never met him.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Very fine fellow.

Mr. MacDonald: I hope this does not embarrass him. But I am told, for example, that he has never been able to get into the pension arrangement available to civil servants. I assume he is a permanent civil servant, as the manager. I am just curious as to why you have what appears to be—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I am told he was over age when he came on.

Mr. MacDonald: He was over age when he came on. How old is over age in this government?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You have to put in 15 years before you come to pension age of 65, and apparently he was over 50 when he came to us.

Mr. MacDonald: I see.

Vote 1204 agreed to.

Vote 1205 agreed to.

On vote 1206:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I would make would be to compare the imaginative plan which my hon. colleague from Fort William put forward to the antiquated pattern of financing of mining properties in the province of Ontario, which has been used for a great many years.

I have attempted to set out seriatim the steps which I think are typical of the way in which mining ventures in Ontario are financed within the speculative field. I do so because I want to make just two points. There are many other points which can be made, but I wish to make two points, and draw them to the attention of the government in anticipation that something will be done about them.

Within broad limits, you will find in the financing of speculative mining ventures something along the following steps.

1. A prospector stakes and records a group of claims.
2. A group takes an option to buy the claims for, say, \$25,000 cash and 300,000 shares of a mining company.
3. The option is exercised.
4. The mining company is incorporated, or control is acquired of a mining company whose shares are already listed and traded on the Toronto stock exchange.
5. Let us say the capital of the company is three million shares of \$1 each.
6. The group agrees to sell the claims to the company for \$50,000 cash and one million shares.
7. The group comprises or controls the board of directors of the company and the chief executive officers of the company.
8. The company enters into an underwriting and option agreement with the group for, say, 1,600,000 shares at prices ranging from 12.5 cents a share to \$2 a share, to be taken up within certain time limits at the rate of, say, 50,000 shares per month.
9. The first of these options is for 400,000 shares at 12.5 cents per share, or \$50,000.
10. The payment by the company of \$50,000 for the claims is made by transfer to

the group of the first 400,000 shares from the treasury of the company.

11. Therefore, the group receives one million vendor shares and 400,000 treasury shares.

12. Of the one million vendor shares escrowed by the Ontario securities commission, 400,000 are released from escrow on the basis of one share of escrowed stock released for every share of treasury stock sold.

13. An additional 100,000 shares are also freed from escrow following the policy of freeing ten per cent of the vendor's interest.

14. At this point, the group owns 900,000 free shares.

15. The balance of the vendor shares, 500,000 shares, remain in escrow, of which 300,000 belong to the original option or prospector who located and recorded the claims.

16. The group cost for the 900,000 free shares is, therefore, \$25,000 plus incorporation and other expenses, say \$5,000, or about three cents per share.

17. The group also has options on treasury share blocks, as previously stated, now commencing at about 15 cents per share.

18. 500,000 shares are now offered to the public at 30c per share.

19. If not already listed, a prospectus is filed with the Ontario securities commission and the shares of the company are listed and called for trading on the Toronto stock exchange. If already listed on the Toronto stock exchange, no prospectus is required.

20. Within a few weeks, the stock is selling on the Toronto stock exchange at 78c per share.

21. The group recoups its original outlay by selling some of the 900,000 free shares.

22. \$150,000 is paid into the company on the exercise of the options for the 500,000 shares which are sold to the public.

23. Let me say that there has been no concealment by the group in any way.

24. A new situation now develops.

25. Shares are taken down under the option, say, 150,000 shares, for which the company receives \$50,000.

26. Accounts are opened with brokerage houses and shares are deposited in those accounts.

27. Public interest is stimulated to create a demand for the stock, for orders to be filled from the brokers' accounts.

28. The market price goes up from 78c to \$.144. A market is made. The group sells 467,

800 shares, against purchases of 348,700 shares, or a margin of sales of 119,100 shares.

29. Later the account shows a short position of 19,100 shares and a credit balance of \$53,136.

30. The market is now \$2.07 per share.

31. The price is artificial so that professionals move in to break the price by short selling.

32. The groups buys 330,300 shares to maintain its position in the market.

33. Within days, the account shows a long position for the group of 154,000 shares, and a net debit balance of \$340,597.

34. The group advances 200,000 to try to place the accounts in good standing.

35. A few days later the group's accounts are long by 204,000 shares and owe \$276,064.71.

36. The group transfers 250,000 shares to stabilize the market.

37. The wave of share selling continues, the price holds briefly at a peak of \$2.64.

38. The price breaks, the group are long 624,600 shares and owe \$828,377.74.

39. The exchange auditor orders buying to cease by the broker until the accounts are liquidated.

40. By a deal between the shorts and the longs, their respective problems are solved and the price drops back to 40 cents.

Within the framework of that pattern, Mr. Chairman, most of the speculative mining ventures that have been financed through the Toronto stock exchange, have taken place. There are variations, because the persons who are engaged in this kind of activity are able to think of all sorts of variations and methods by which this basic scheme can be altered.

You will notice throughout the recital of the particular steps the actual value of the property does not have a great deal to do with it. The quality of the property, the likelihood that there is mineable ore body on the property, is not really an important feature of the various transactions in any way, shape, or form.

This particular transaction, again not in specific detail, is one which was investigated by the Ontario securities commission some 19 years ago, and I am quite certain that there are hon. members of this Legislature who can think of similar patterns of financing prior to that time, and similar ones that have taken place since that time.

One of the recommendations that was made

as a result of that particular investigation was that the stock exchange should study the daily buying and selling by each member broker, and any rapid or unusual fluctuation in the market price of any stock should be fully inquired into. If it appears evident that a market has been, or is being, manipulated in a manner detrimental to the public interest, appropriate action should be taken and full disclosure made to the public.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply comment to this House that we are aware that among the hasty steps that have been taken by the Toronto stock exchange in the last few days, the recommendation that was made by the Ontario securities commission in October, 1946 is likely to be implemented finally by the Toronto stock exchange within the next several days.

You will readily see from the example which I have outlined to the committee that the price itself at a certain point became entirely artificial. The number of dollars that actually went into the company was negligible—I believe in this particular instance, up to that time, about \$200,000 only went into the company for use, presumably, for further development and exploration work; but quite likely only a small portion of the \$200,000 was, in fact, so used. So it would be fair to say that the treasury of the company did not benefit in any way by reason of either the high price to which the stock rose or by reason of the volume of trading.

Again, I would emphasize that so far as the group was concerned in terms of the criminal law or accepted practices in Ontario at that time, and in a very broad sense within the framework of accepted practices today, there was not necessarily any deceit or falsehood or other fraudulent means used for this purpose.

The advertising was rather quaintly referred to in the report of the commission as "optimistic, enthusiastic, flamboyant, misleading, but never false." As a result of that particular transaction, the securities commission conducted an extensive review and study of the fluctuations of the stock. If any hon. members are interested in it, they will find it in the *Northern Miner* for the year 1946, in the month of October, where the whole report of the commission is quoted verbatim. The *Northern Miner* in its editorials and elsewhere has a number of useful and worthwhile remarks to make about it.

The second point that I would like to make is related also to that pattern, but I would refer to the report of the hon. Attorney General's committee on securities legislation in On-

tario, which has been placed before the House and which has been discussed on other occasions, and particularly to the section of the report dealing with this question of primary distribution of the shares of companies engaged in speculative mining ventures through the facilities of the Toronto stock exchange. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, I am certain, the recommendation of that committee that this particular facility for distributing shares to the public by way of primary distribution should be discontinued. We here had criticized the report on this particular point, not because we could or could not assess the validity of the recommendation, but the report itself simply stated that it was a good thing to do in Ontario because it had been done in the United Kingdom many years ago and because it had been done in the United States of America in 1933.

But in making that recommendation, I would like to again refer to what took place in the debates in this Legislature some 18 or 19 years ago and to the remarks at that time of the present Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) who, I regret, is not in the House today and who, of course, was a former Attorney General of the province and was at the time of this particular debate a private member sitting for his present riding. I shall quote from *Hansard* of October 28, 1947, from the debate by the committee of the whole on that date:

Clerk of the House: Fifth order. House in committee on Bill No. 31, The Securities Act, 1947—

which was the bill of Leslie E. Blackwell, who was the then Attorney General of the province of Ontario.

I notice that the hon. member for Grey South was present in the House at that time and made some comment in the debate, but I am particularly interested in the remarks of the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests when the section of The Securities Act which presently exists and which presently exempts this kind of distribution to the public from the prospectus requirements of The Securities Act, was considered. He had this to say:

Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in regard to section 46 (b); I noted that this section makes the provisions of sections 43, 44 and 45—

which are the prospectus sections:

—not applicable to a sale of any securities which are listed with any recognized stock exchange, for sale through such exchange.

This is the same as it was in the 1945 Act. It has the effect of permitting primary distribution to take place through a recognized stock exchange without the necessity of producing a prospectus, which otherwise would be required.

Now, I think I should bring to the attention of this House the fact that in that section [not "in that section," but "that section"] was involved in an inquiry that took place last year when the 1945 Act was in force. A company currently known as the Beaulieu Yellowknife Mine Limited, under investigation, a copy of which I have here—an 11-page finding by the commission, or rather by Colonel O'Connor, senior solicitor, and Mr. J. H. Collins, senior accountant for the commission, and bears date of October 18, 1946. Briefly, in this case, the report indicated a shocking method of high financing.

And in another portion of his remarks:

The Beaulieu shares, it must be remembered, were listed on the Toronto stock exchange at the time. The transactions at this stage brought no new money into the company's account.

And further on his remarks:

A great volume of sales consequently went through the Toronto stock exchange and at a certain stage of the manipulations a short interest appeared and rumours circulated on the merits of the property as reflected by the then high price of the shares on the Toronto stock exchange.

And further on:

Now the unloading through the Toronto stock exchange of several hundred thousand shares to get money to clean up aposition of \$680,000, that unloading undoubtedly was the sale which occurred in the course of the primary distribution of shares and yet no part of that went into the company. What was purely a manipulation in the broadest sense of the word in my opinion, a market manipulation carried on in that manner. With that fact facing us at this time in the findings of this commission with this section before us, I felt in duty bound to bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and to the attention of the hon. members of this House, that that sort of thing can go on under this section. Whether it can be stopped or not may be another question, but it seems to me at this point that we ought to pause before we pass a section which permits tradings of that sort to go in the primary distribution through an exchange, without

even the formality of passing out prospectuses which must be done in all transactions outside of the stock exchange.

It is true that several recommendations were made to the stock exchange and some have been carried into effect. Mr. Chairman, I content myself with making these remarks with respect to the section and draw respectfully to the attention of the House that if we pass section 46, we are permitting primary distribution to be carried on through stock exchange, exempt from the accompanying passing on of the prospectus, as is required in all cases which are carried on outside of the exchange.

The then Attorney General, Mr. Blackwell, made a few remarks about the suggestion of Mr. Roberts at that time and ended his remarks by stating:

The proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Roberts) is quite off the path which is being followed by the commission and is not acceptable to the government.

After some questioning, Mr. Roberts again replied:

I do feel we should pause at this section and determine whether or not some correction is necessary here. The stock exchange was put on trial and the stock exchange was found wanting in that report. Whether they have corrected their actions and methods sufficiently to prove for the future they will not be found wanting, yet remains to be seen.

Later on, at the conclusion of that debate, Mr. Meininger, the member then for Waterloo North, said:

If this is so serious would it not be advisable to withhold the bill in the meantime?

Mr. Blackwell: No.

Section agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, without going into any number of other questions which are related to the relationship between the Ontario securities commission, the Toronto stock exchange and the proper development in the public interest of mining prospects in northern Ontario, I would suggest that for 20 years, on these two points, this government has done absolutely nothing, and from what I have seen today the hon. Minister of Mines is not interested in pursuing the topic.

I would urgently suggest that, after 20 years, perhaps this government, on those two issues could recognize that they must be attended to, and that because of these

two items there must be several other items which equally would require the diligent attention of the government.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, under vote 1206, I have two subjects I would like to mention.

Under the mining lands branch, one thing that has been very hard to reconcile is that while this department states it is anxious to provide adequate facilities for the expansion of prospecting and mining in our province, it would at the same time consider closing one of its most active mining recording offices. The Montreal River office at Elk Lake registered the fourth highest number of claims of the 14 such offices located in Ontario last year. This office was also the fourth highest in 1963 and the third highest in 1962. The activity in this area has been steady and continuous over the years. In 1964, there were almost double the claims staked in 1963.

Apparently because of housing problems, the department has been considering combining this office with the one in Haileybury, which is located some 50 miles away. For prospectors residing in Elk Lake, this would mean an additional 100 miles of travel to register claims; for those from Cogama, it would mean 150 miles; from Matachewan, 160 miles, and from Shining Tree, a full 200 miles. And these are the areas in which the claims are being staked.

Quite often, also, two or three trips to the recording offices are necessary in the staking and recording of a group of claims. The move to Haileybury would definitely inconvenience, and present additional problems to, the local prospectors.

While this mining office in Elk Lake normally employs only two people, it is still the most important industry to the people of Elk Lake and brings considerable traffic and other business to the merchants of the town. For the past several years, because of lumbering and pulp problems, this has been a distressed community. A transfer of this office would not only have a considerable effect on the community, but would be contrary to the best interests of the department and to the encouragement of prospecting and mine development throughout the area.

This has been discussed with the hon. Minister and the deputy a number of times, but the shadow still lies over the community. Can the hon. Minister put this to rest, by assuring the chambers of commerce for that area that no such move will be made in the foreseeable future?

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, the hon. Minister said for me to ask the question in regard to—as he said this morning—the number of claims that were staked. We know that in this province many small mining companies and individuals are trying to develop ore bodies. Suppose there is a good showing of ore and then it takes these small companies a lot of money to drill many different holes, is there any assistance that would help these small companies or individuals to develop the size of these ore bodies, either from The Department of Mines or through The Department of Economics and Development?

Another question I would like to ask the hon. Minister—maybe I could do it now and shorten the time taken—is in regard to the mining roads. When is the decision made by The Department of Mines as to when it will assist with a mining road? I understand it pays 50 per cent of a mining road. Of course, these small mining companies build the road first, to the prospective mine, then I understand The Department of Mines has to be sure there is some kind of ore body there. It takes, I understand, two to three years before The Department of Mines will pay over its 50 per cent share of the road, which delay I am informed does cripple or hold back some of these small mining companies from going ahead as fast as they could, if they had this money from The Department of Mines earlier.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Could I answer the previous hon. member's question and say this: My heart rather goes out in the direction yours does, you know. We have no alternative but to move, as we are being evicted from our building in Elk Lake. Nothing definite has been done about this. Approximately 90 per cent of the business at Elk Lake can be carried out by mail; now that does not say it is going to be. But we will certainly take the hon. member's submission under advisement and see what we can do about it.

Mr. Taylor: In that connection I understand an alternative has been proposed by the local people there. They are prepared to build a building for The Department of Mines if that is the deciding factor.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Vote—

Mr. MacDonald: No, Mr. Chairman, there are two topics that I would like—

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent East, we are going to answer yours under vote 1207. It is on the other side of the page. Is that all right?

Mr. Spence: All right!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there are two points which I would like to raise under this estimate. One is, I want to go back and underline and expand a bit on the problem and the solution that my hon. colleague, in his introduction, spelled out to this House, suggesting that the establishment of a Crown corporation for exploration and development of minerals would make a real contribution in this province.

The hon. member for Riverdale has given us a rather interesting glimpse into a chapter of the history of this Legislature some 20 years ago, when problems that are now besetting the mining industry and the Toronto stock exchange were investigated by the Ontario securities commission, and recommendations were made but no attention was paid to them. Indeed, previously the same kind of plea has been made time and time again since about six or seven years ago, when Toronto *Saturday Night* had almost a full article exposing the operations on the Toronto stock exchange. Those of us who dared from this side of the House to raise the issue were sloughed off as people who knew nothing about the operations, and we were going to frustrate the whole development of mining in the province.

After listening to and reading some of the things that go on in the market, I am almost tempted to quote the old adage of somebody who one time said: "Why be a crook when you can gouge the public so successfully on a completely legal basis?" One is almost driven to that conclusion when one sees some of the things that have been tolerated, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the hon. member for Sudbury in his earlier observations, when he spoke on the first vote, made a comment that rather puzzled me. He said: "We have not found any difficulty in discovering ore bodies in the province of Ontario." It puzzled me, because I can remember a year or two years ago when the same hon. member really went into oratorical flight in browbeating this government for presiding over a province in which there had been no new discovery of ore for ten years. He went back to Manitouwadge and others—you name it; it was ten years or more ago. You had the Texas Gulf shortly afterwards, and he has changed his mind so quickly that he now comes to the

conclusion that there is no problem in getting ore bodies.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): It shows you how inconsistent the Opposition is.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this is par for the course, as a Liberal spokesman. Indeed, I was also intrigued in another thing. We will concede in the New Democratic Party that the proposal of a Crown corporation for the exploration and the development of mining is, as far as this province is concerned, and as far as I know, not completely novel. It is an adaptation, insofar as we have been able to look at it, of the kind of thing that Rene Levesque has proposed in the province of Quebec. But I did not notice the Liberals raising it here. They are willing to praise what is done in Quebec, in terms of the government there making sure when they handed over these resources that they retained 11 per cent, but they are not willing, as I have suggested on a number of occasions in the past—because they are closer to those Bay Street boys whom they browbeat than they would like us to believe—to come up with the real answer to the problems.

Mr. White: It would be worse than the shoe factory in Saskatchewan.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, nonsense; the shoe factory in Saskatchewan. The oil development and the mineral development in Saskatchewan under the aegis of a democratic socialist government was as spectacular as any province in this country.

What I want to draw to the attention of this House, to the hon. Minister and to the government which will be getting another set of recommendations from the Kelly commission shortly, is that before the Kelly commission was set up at all, before the whole Windfall storm broke upon us, a study had been done for the Porter Royal commission on banking and finance—a study of finance in the mining industry by a man by the name of E. K. Cork—to which my hon. colleague referred. Let us hammer his points home, because they are fundamental. Eighty-six per cent of the money that goes into the development of mining came from the big companies who dominate the field. They did not have to go to the stock exchange to raise the money at all. They have it in the treasury, notwithstanding the complaints that we sometimes hear from the business world because of very generous tax and depreciation allowances. I can remember, for example, when International Nickel went into the development in

Thompson in Manitoba about ten years ago and spent \$180 million. The fact of the matter is that in the first ten years after the war, in depreciation allowances and favourable taxes they had accumulated something like \$250 million. To use the hon. George Dunlop's inimitable phraseology years ago, they had it "in the sock." It was in the sock, ready for rainy days. They had accumulated, by generous tax structure, \$250 million. So for the development of Thompson, they did not have to go to the stock exchange; they did not have to go to the public; they just dipped into the sock for \$180 million of the \$250 million. That is what is being done on 86 per cent of the mining development in this nation by the big corporations.

Let us go to the 14 per cent—the junior companies, those who do their financing on the stock market, the penny stocks, and so on. What happened in the 1953-63 period, upon which Cork based his analysis and his report to the Porter commission? The fact of the matter was that the junior companies in that period raised \$850 million on the stock exchange. Sixty per cent of it went to the brokerage houses and others engaged in the promotions. So out of the \$850 million that was raised in the stock exchange, \$510 million went to the promoters. Three hundred and forty million dollars got into the treasury of the companies. Now, how much of that 40 per cent—\$340 million—was used for actual development of mining? The answer, Mr. Chairman, was 18 per cent. Eighteen per cent of it, or a total of \$150 million. The rest of it? Well, you know what happens when you get money in the treasury, and it is used for paying the directors who have control of it and a little bit of development—or so-called development.

Mr. White: Your biases are showing.

Mr. MacDonald: My what? My biases are showing? My facts are showing, too, and I want you to look at the facts.

Mr. White: You are cooking the books.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not cooking the books. I am quoting the authoritative study of E. K. Cork for the Porter commission. If you want to repudiate the Porter commission, go ahead and repudiate it.

Hon. J. R. Simonett: (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Eighteen per cent of your millions is out.

Mr. MacDonald: Let's just review the record: \$850 million was gotten from the

public. This is by the junior companies who represent only 14 per cent of the development of mining. Eight hundred and fifty million dollars were raised from the public, 60 per cent of it went to the promoters, leaving \$340 million in the treasury of the company. Of that \$340 million, only \$150 million went into the development of mining.

Mr. Chairman, if you can come up with a more incredibly inefficient financing procedure to developing mining than that, quite apart from the elaboration of other aspects of it that my hon. friend, who is knowledgeable in a professional sense about how these things operate, I would like the hon. Minister or anybody else to get up and defend it. And this is what you defended for years. No wonder you make intelligent people become overnight socialists—if that is capitalism, you can have it.

If only they will face the facts instead of looking at the biases. I lay this before the House along with the Kelly commission report, and along with the ignored reports of the securities commission for 20 years, so that next year when we come back and all of this is here for action, that we will get some action, and not sort of slough us off as Leslie Blackwell sloughed off Kelso Roberts 20 years ago. The result is that a lot of people have had a lot of difficulties in the last year because we did not correct the procedures.

Now I leave that, Mr. Chairman. I have a second point that I wanted to comment on.

I want to get to mining after I have set the background, which will take about one minute. To go back to the Algoma Central Railway; we have raised this with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests who is in negotiation with the Algoma Central Railway. It has been going on now for about a couple of years. Some concessions have been made on both sides, but the House, I think, will be interested, and I suspect the hon. Minister from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart) will be most interested.

In the current issue of the *London Economist*, June 12, 1965, there is, in keeping with this very authoritative and well-known publication of the business world, a report of the annual meeting of the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railroad Company. Sir Denys Lawson made a report on the company's progress. In it is this paragraph. I read it to the House and I invite them to go back and read what the hon. Minister said he would be going to do.

During the past year, the provincial government began serious talks with the company concerning our 850,000 acres of

land grant lands north of Sault Ste. Marie. At this point the company has no way of knowing the extent of any takeover, the timing of such a move by the province, the price that might be arrived at by negotiation, or in fact whether the matter will be pursued to a conclusion.

I remember the very tough statements by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, how he was going to sit down and get an answer to this a year ago, and repeated a few months ago. Here we have the president of the company, in a report to the shareholders printed in far off London, England, asking when the matter will be pursued to a conclusion. That is how much determination they think the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has in coming to a conclusion on these unresolved things.

However, let me quote the rest of the paragraph:

Naturally we would prefer to retain and develop our own lands for which, in effect, we paid a large price many years ago, calculated to have been the equivalent of at least \$18 million at the time, and are only now about to reap some return on that benefit.

I invite the Cabinet at their next meeting to sit down and try to figure out when Algoma paid \$18 million, or the equivalent thereof, for what they got as a handout for building that railway 60 years ago. They are just as unrepentant as they ever were, and I would like to see some evidence soon that this government is really coming to grips with this problem.

However, Mr. Chairman, this is all mildly irrelevant, because it is within Lands and Forests. I want to get down to the mining aspect of it, because last June, there suddenly emerged the most innocent little press release, the most disarming little press release I have ever read. It came from The Department of Mines, June 3, 1964, and announced that Algoma Central Railroad had handed back to the government nine townships on which they had been holding mineral rights. Now the background of that—hon. members of the House may or may not be aware of—is this problem.

If you are paying land tax, you do not have to pay the mineral rights. But if you dispose of the surface rights and you do not have to pay any land tax from that point on, then you become obligated to pay the mineral rights.

Back about 1952, some clerk in The Department of Mines, I presume, accidentally

came across the fact that the Algoma Central Railway had been disposing of land from 1925 on. Therefore, from 1925 on, they became obligated to pay for a tax for mineral rights, which is ten cents per year per acre, from way back in 1925 or 1927. Indeed, there was one news story which quoted an unnamed—and I will bet he had better remain unnamed for the future of his security in the civil service—spokesman in The Department of Mines who stated that the accumulated mineral tax for Algoma Central Railway at that point stood at \$3,250,000.

Now, when this clerk innocently came across this backlog in 1952, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Frost, entered into some agreement with Algoma Central Railway—how cosy and solicitous these arrangements are. We found that they owed three and a quarter million dollars, so did we insist that they pay up? Oh, no! We entered into an agreement, giving them 10 years to see whether or not they wanted to hold the land any further. And so for ten years, or a little better, they continued their explorations and admittedly, they spent some money. Indeed, if you read this annual report of the chairman of the company, he said they spent \$80,000 during 1964 in mineral explorations. They spent some money, and at the end of the ten-year period they came to the conclusion there was nothing for them, so they handed back the nine townships. There are even more townships that I think may be handed back when they have completed their explorations.

But what happened to the three and a quarter million dollars back taxes? Nothing, Mr. Chairman. They got away with not paying them. They not only got away with that, but they got away with the little deal that the Liberals handed them in 1940. You remember back in 1940, they had not been paying land tax since 1925, and they had accumulated two-and-a-half-million dollars in back taxes. And so the Liberals of that day—no different from the Tories, merely the opposite sides of the same coin because they acted in precisely the same way—said to Algoma Central Railway; “you owe us two-and-a-half-million dollars, give us back half of the land, we will let you have the other half and we will forget the bill.” And not only that. Just to show you how solicitous they were—the Liberals passed a law that legally give the ACR the right to pay no taxes from that point on.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Looks like your honeymoon is over.

Mr. MacDonald: Our honeymoon was never on. Whatever you saw for a little while there was "a common law" arrangement, I can assure you. It was not very honourable. The only thing that pushed us into it was that what you were doing was even less honourable, so we got into an alliance to try to cope with your tactics.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I leave the matter there. But how in heaven's name, can any government on that side of the House, with the record in The Lands and Forests Department, with a record now in The Department of Mines, deny that Algoma Central has been handed out of the public Treasury, directly or indirectly, something in excess of \$4 million taxes that they have not paid and which they have been forgiven, and now we have the president of the company, reported in London on June 12, saying that at this point the company has no way of knowing the extent of any takeover. Remember that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests said they were thinking of taking it over, and it got quite some headlines up in Sault Ste. Marie—that they were going to reclaim these lands back to the Crown.

At this point, the company has no way of knowing the extent of any takeover, the timing of such a move by the province, the price that may be arrived at by negotiations, or in fact whether the matter will be pursued to a conclusion at all. I will tell you who is running this province on this issue, not this government, but Algoma Central Railway. They have been running it, not you. I hope sometime soon that you will stand up, and be men, and protect the interests of the people of this province, instead of letting them call the tune, which they have been doing for 30 or 40 years, and getting money out of the public Treasury while they are in the process of doing it.

Mr. Taylor: On this vote, Mr. Chairman, the other point that I would like to discuss stems from the very useful interim report of the Legislature's select committee on mining. That committee recommends that extensive geological and geophysical surveys be undertaken prior to the scheduling of areas as provincial parks, and that every effort be made in the establishment of new parks to locate them in tracts of low mineralization. I believe this to be an excellent proposal, Mr. Chairman, and it is a proposal which I suspect the hon. Minister of Mines views with some approval.

I hope that this report, and what I am going to say, will strengthen his hand in his discussions with his Cabinet colleagues.

There is one salient point about our mineral resources, and that is that the minerals we take out of the ground cannot be replaced. Every ton of ore that is mined is a ton that can never be mined again. Even though improving technology may mean that we can get more value from each ton of ore we mine—in fact we are now going back and obtaining commercial minerals from the refuse of earlier mining operations—but nevertheless the amount of useful mineralization in the rock of this province is limited, and in the long view of human history will, at some time, come to an end. We must, therefore, accept a couple of fundamental truths about mining in this province, and build from there.

First, we must recognize that our resources are limited. While we may not know these limits yet—and the total of our mineral resources is many times larger than even the optimistic of us now imagines—nevertheless we are dealing with a diminishing resource. This fact suggests, and even demands, that we should manage our mineral resources in the full light of the knowledge that they are limited, which brings me back to the recommendations of the select committee.

They tell us that we should ascertain the extent of mineralization in an area before that area is designated as a provincial park. If potential mineralization is present, then other arrangements should be made for park land.

Actually, the reasoning behind this is very simple, Mr. Chairman. Because we are dealing with a diminishing resource, and because world demand for minerals is going to increase steadily in the foreseeable future, eventually the economic imperatives involved will require us to extract minerals, no matter where they might be found. In fact, Mr. Chairman, our consumption of minerals and metals is bound to be so voracious in the future that if at some date in the 21st century, someone found nickel in the ground in this area, then I am certain that our successors of that day would have no choice but to remove themselves to other locations.

I foresee this kind of condition everywhere. I foresee it particularly in our park lands. In future, there is no doubt in my mind that parks will have to be sacrificed if commercially valuable minerals are found within their boundaries.

Right now, Mr. Chairman, we still have a lot of undeveloped land in this province. This means that park land is not yet in critically short supply but in the future the supply of suitable park land is likely to diminish. The effect of this is this, if we do

not act with foresight now, we will find ourselves in the future sacrificing irreplaceable park lands at a time when the province is more fully settled and new park formation has come to a standstill. How much better it is to make that decision now when alternatives are still available to us, rather than to lose our parks later by default.

This argument leads on to another. What is true of our new parks now is equally true of existing parks. If valuable mineralization exists under our provincial parks right now, we should know this fact. We should do the geological work necessary to determine the extent of mineralization in existing parks and we should, on the basis of this knowledge, prepare ourselves for the day when it becomes imperative to exploit these mineral resources. This might mean altering the boundaries of the existing parks; it might mean other solutions to what is admittedly a very difficult problem.

Hon. members should try to visualize the problems they would face if an ore body like that discovered by Texas Gulf Sulphur turned up in the heart of Algonquin park. Pressures from all sides would be enormous. Faced with such pressures the government of the day would have to reach a decision and if it did not have a clearly formulated policy in advance, its decision would probably be a bad one.

Thus it is imperative that such policies be worked out now. Adjusting park boundaries is one possibility; imposing conditions and restrictions on mining operations is another. The only possibilities that are impossible are the obvious ones, either prohibiting all mineral extraction in the park land, or sacrificing parks to the economic demands of the mining industry.

The second possibility I mentioned above is a useful one I believe. It is no longer necessary for mining operations to turn the landscape for miles around into the kind of terrain the astronauts are going to find around the moon. Mining operators can, in fact, be required to return the land to its original condition. This is done today in northern England. Restoration of its original beauty to the landscape is possible through the underground disposal of tailings or by restoring tailing storage areas to other uses, as Hollinger and McIntyre have learned to do in the past. International Nickel has even experimented with the growing of grain in these tailings.

Undoubtedly if government penalties and inducements were applied, the necessary technology could be developed, probably at

a very modest long-term cost, to ensure that mining operations do not permanently blight the landscape. Even now, far-sighted and public-spirited mining operators are able to run their industry with a minimum disturbance of the terrain and of other potential uses for land. Timagami Mining has operated in this way. In fact, this firm has probably added to the usefulness of its area through the construction of a mine access road.

Government policy requiring respect for terrain should be instituted now for all mining operations. It is desirable everywhere and it is essential if, as I believe is inevitable, we reach the time when we are mining within the boundaries of provincial parks. Such policies cannot be created and imposed in ignorance, and here is where immediate action is essential if mining and parks are not to be in conflict in this province now and in the future. We must know what mining potential, if any, underlies our existing parks. Only armed with this knowledge can we save ourselves from future trouble.

My remarks, Mr. Chairman, boil down to three proposals which I submit to the hon. Minister. First, as has already been recommended, thorough survey work for mineralization should be undertaken before the location and boundaries of any new provincial parks are established. Second, similar survey work should be carried on in existing park lands so that we will be able to plan intelligently now, for the day when mineral resources in existing parks must be used. Third, legislation should be introduced now to require mining operators to respect the value of the land on which their mines are sited. Such legislation should provide both penalties for unnecessary neglect of the terrain, and inducements for mining companies which undertake energetic programmes to maintain the natural beauty of the land which lies over their ore bodies.

I might add one final word on this: Most hon. members will apply these remarks almost completely to northern Ontario, but we should remember that they apply equally well to the sand and gravel and aggregate extraction operations in southern Ontario. Everyone is familiar with the ugly scars on our landscape produced by abandoned gravelpits. The proposals I have made are intended to be applicable to all such operations as well as to the hardrock mines in the north.

Vote 1206 agreed to.

On vote 1207:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, before this vote is carried I wonder if the

hon. Minister of Mines has any comment to make on the matter raised by the hon. member for Riverdale and the hon. leader of this party relating to the financing of mining operations and the role of the stock exchange in that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: No, I would say to the hon. member that I have very little knowledge of those things. It comes under The Department of the Attorney General and the securities commission. It really does not affect us; we have nothing to do with the market at all, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. members are aware, the report of the Attorney General's committee on securities legislation was received some weeks ago and tabled in this House. I think I have informed the House previously but I will now do so through you, sir, that legislation was immediately got under way and is in preparation of being drafted. It is not being presented to the Legislature at this session and one of the reasons for that is so that these proposals may be given full study and that the legislation may be carefully drafted. The other is, of course, that the Royal commission which was appointed in July or August of last year, just finished hearing its evidence and the report, I believe, is being prepared now by the commissioner, Mr. Justice Kelly, and will be received, no doubt, shortly.

I think, as the hon. Minister of Mines says, this matter of the financing of particularly mining companies, industry perhaps to some extent also, and the security market falls within the area of the Attorney General's department with respect to the regulations thereof, and that the legislation which will result from the committee's report and from the Royal commission I feel sure will meet this problem. I should think it would be reasonable to expect that we might give an opportunity for that legislation to be presented.

Now I think I can say that to the House, without in any way suggesting that there is any delay whatsoever taking place in the matter.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think there is one phase of this matter which relates to The Department of Mines and which should be noted and emphasized at this time.

A justification that has often been advanced for the sort of skin game that goes on down in the Toronto stock exchange is that it is essential for the mining development of this province. Now, whatever may have been true 40 years ago, I think it is quite obvious now

that that operation has so little to do with mining development it does not matter.

The hon. Minister of Mines—and I think quite properly—does not even consider that it is a matter of any great interest to him in his capacity as Minister. I think we should bear that in mind. The amount of money raised by primary distribution through the stock exchange for mining development in the province is not a drop in a bucket. Actually the operation is essentially a skin game for taking as many suckers to the cleaners as possible.

I can understand that the hon. Attorney General has to have time to consider these matters, but they have been under consideration for many years. I would suggest to him that he should not wait until the last report of the last Royal commission is given, because until legislative action is taken, I venture to suggest to him that there will be Royal commissions regularly investigating whatever may happen to cause the latest scandal. I think there is now enough information for genuine legislation to be brought in at the next session, whenever it may be; I hope it may be this fall so that we can get moving on the matter.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We agree. We have just received the report a few weeks ago.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but then the hon. Attorney General mentioned the Kelly commission as the occasion for further delay.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I can tell the hon. member legislation is being prepared and it will be produced, I am quite confident, at the next session.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Chairman, may I say to the hon. member for York South, with respect to the matter of the Algoma Central Railway in which I am very interested, that it is by no means at an end and that there are developments of matters going on which he knows not of and which I at this moment am not at liberty to tell him.

Vote 1207 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Mines.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions and beg leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will deal with second readings, committee of the whole House and with estimates of The Department

of Public Welfare. At five o'clock an hour will be set aside, as previously arranged and understood, for other public bills. There will be a night session tomorrow evening.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:55 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported	4299
Tax on the consumers of tobacco, bill to impose, reported	4301
Establishment and operation of commuter services, bill to provide for, reported	4303
University of Toronto Act, 1947, bill to amend, reported	4306
York University Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported	4306
Lakehead University, bill respecting, reported	4306
Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	4309
University of Guelph Act, 1964, bill to amend, reported	4309
Department of Education Act, bill to amend, reported	4309
Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	4309
Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	4309
Department of Public Welfare Act, bill to amend, reported	4310
Pension Benefits Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported	4310
Université d'Ottawa, bill respecting, reported	4311
Raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, bill to authorize, reported	4312
Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, reported	4312
Liquor Control Act, bill to amend, reported	4312
Liquor Licence Act, bill to amend, reported	4313
Establishment of regional detention centres, bill to provide for, reported	4314
Milk Act, 1965, bill intituled, held	4314
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, reported	4315
Recess, 12.30 o'clock	4315

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we extend a special welcome, in the Speaker's gallery, to a group of United States editors who are touring the province as guests of The Department of Tourism and Information. I may say these members of the press represent some 26 states of the United States and come all the way from Vermont, Massachusetts and New Jersey in the east, to the Carolinas in the south and even as far west as Utah and that other republic known as Texas.

We also welcome, in the west gallery, students from Cataraqui public school, Cataraqui.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The forty-eighth order, committee of the whole House; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

Except as provided in subsection 2 of section 2 of The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965, every person shall, at the time of purchase or delivery, pay to the Treasurer for the use of the Crown in right of Ontario, a tax at the rate of 20.5 cents per imperial gallon on all diesel fuel purchased, or delivery of which is received by him in Ontario for his own use,

as provided in Bill No. 143, The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965.

Resolution concurred in.

THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 143, The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) with regard to section 2, if he is familiar with any violations of the use of diesel fuel, which has up until now been tax free for agricultural purposes, and if this is perhaps the reason why this bill has been brought in?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I may say that we provide in the bill for the continued use by farmers of diesel fuel without any inconvenience to them, and the bill is not for that purpose, it is rather to provide better administrative practice covering the whole Act.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, I inadvertently overlooked the first resolution with respect to Bill No. 143.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor also recommends the following:

That,

the moneys required for the purposes of The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965, during the fiscal year 1965-66, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund, as provided in Bill No. 143, The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965.

Resolution concurred in.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if any of the producers of the fuel have raised objections to this. Are there other additional expenses attached to the marking of the fuel?

Hon. Mr. Allan: There will be some additional expenses incurred by the marketers of fuel oil because of the colouring of the fuel oil. This has been discussed at very great length with the companies concerned, and I would say, with one exception, that there is a reasonably good understanding and agreement with the provisions as provided in the Act.

Mr. Nixon: There is provision under The Gasoline Tax Act, I am thinking now of the use of gasoline by farmers, for the tax rebate for the fuel that is used in the agricultural industry, and I believe that that has worked fairly well without the marking of the fuel. There is no marking under those circumstances and I was wondering why the hon. Provincial Treasurer feels it is essential in this particular area when it is not in the other.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member for Brant that we really were not thinking particularly of the diesel fuel that is used by farmers as a reason for bringing this bill. This is indicated by the fact that farmers will be permitted to use coloured diesel fuel, there will be no problem so far as the farmers who use diesel fuel are concerned. It will be even more simple than claiming a refund. Now if they do use the clear, uncoloured diesel fuel in their tractors, they then can ask for a refund. But I would expect that they will, in all probability, use the coloured fuel and obtain it more cheaply in that way without paying the tax at all; they would not find it necessary to claim a refund.

Mr. Nixon: If that is the case, then, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. Provincial Treasurer might foresee, in the next session, a comparable bill that would permit farmers to buy marked gasoline as well, and not have to go through the procedure of having to get a rebate. Is that possible?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The hon. member for Brant is thinking always of the welfare of the farmers. I may say that the—

Mr. Nixon: Nobody else does.

Hon. Mr. Allan: —the member for Haldimand-Norfolk is, also. However, I am afraid I cannot make any commitments.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, may I raise another question which rose directly out of what the hon. member for Brant has just raised? I think there is validity in what he has said, and if the

government is going to consider it, why do they not consider it also in reference to gasoline that is used in boating? I have had representations made to me by people who say that to claim the rebate that many people are entitled to, which may amount to only \$10 or \$15 a year, they simply do not know the procedures, or the routines. They do not retain all their bills, and the result is they do not get what they are entitled to by way of a rebate. Now, to avoid all of these administrative difficulties, it would seem to me that if you are considering what the hon. member for Brant has raised, which is an extension of this for farmers, that it be done for gasoline that is going to be used for boating and marine purposes. It would obviate the necessity of paying the tax in the first instance, and you would then not be getting, by default, money that you really do not want—or you do not want to take, let us put it that way.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid the hon. member for York South does not know the Provincial Treasurer as well as I thought that he did.

Mr. MacDonald: My tongue was in my cheek. You could see it, but it did not get registered in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I would be very glad to discuss this at another time, Mr. Chairman. There are considerable difficulties in undertaking your proposal. On the face of it, I agree that it looks quite reasonable. We have given this consideration and will continue to consider it, but very great problems are apparent.

Mr. MacDonald: Five or six other provinces have done it.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Not many.

Mr. MacDonald: I am told—five or six.

Hon. Mr. Allan: I doubt that there are that many.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could we ask your indulgence, sir? Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer give us some of the reasons for this, because I, like the leader of the new party, have had letters where people have not collected all their bills for gasoline for boating. I had one about a month ago where the fellow had been writing back and forth; the cost of the mail going back and forth covered more than the amount he had spent on the gas. Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer tell us some of the reasons why he would not consider it?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The reasons, I might say in a general way, are that it is very difficult to sell untaxed gasoline and make sure that it does not get in motor vehicles. To put it very plainly, that is the real reason that this has been done. Many of the hon. members will remember that during the war there was an effort made at marking gasoline. The experience at that time was most unsatisfactory from the point of view of collecting the revenue that was due.

Sections 3 to 22, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 143 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

during the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, the money required for the purposes of administering and enforcing The Tobacco Tax Act, 1965, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on the consumers of tobacco.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor also recommends the following:

That,

every consumer shall pay to Her Majesty in right of Ontario a tax computed at the rate of

(a) one-twentieth of one cent on every cigarette purchased by him;

(b) one-fifth of one cent for every five cents or part thereof of the price at retail of every cigar purchased by him;

(c) one-half of one cent per ounce or part thereof of any tobacco, other than cigarettes or cigars, purchased by him at a rate of less than 50 cents a package or one cent per ounce or part thereof of any tobacco purchased by him at a rate of 50 cents or more a package, but on any purchase under this clause the minimum tax payable is one cent, and every fraction of a cent shall be considered as one cent,

as provided in Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on the consumers of tobacco.

Resolutions concurred in.

TAX ON THE CONSUMERS OF TOBACCO

House in committee on Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on the consumers of tobacco.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I move that clause (c) of subsection (1) of section 2 of the bill be struck out and the following be substituted:

(c) One-half of one cent per ounce or part thereof of any tobacco other than cigarettes or cigars purchased by him at a rate of less than 50 cents a package or one cent per ounce or part thereof of any tobacco purchased by him at a rate of 50 cents or more per package, but on any purchase under this clause the minimum tax payable is one cent and every fraction of a cent shall be considered as one cent.

Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation, I may say that before drafting this bill we gave this subject a great deal of study. We visited other provinces which had experience with tobacco taxes and had most helpful and informative meetings. I am grateful for the co-operation and assistance received.

Since the bill received first reading on May 13, and copies have been made available to those interested, we have had further contacts with persons who were experienced in the tobacco tax field and more suggestions have been forthcoming.

I mentioned a few days ago that in the transition from retail sales tax to tobacco tax we did not want to see a reduction in tax on the higher price of cut tobacco. The modern trend in taxation is to tax cut tobaccos on a weight basis. On further studying this feature, I now believe that consideration should be given to the lower priced tobacco items, the largest of which is the fine-cut tobacco used by those who choose to roll their own cigarettes.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister this? This seems to be doing away with the nuisance of collecting a sales tax on tobacco in the province of Ontario. If it can be done with tobacco, is it not possible to do it with soft drinks? There are many small businesses in this province which have to keep a box or a scribbler to keep track of the sales tax on soft drinks and tobacco. If it is being done away with on tobacco now, why can it not be done away with on other products?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, we shall always be glad to explore the possibilities of doing away with any inconvenience so far as the merchants who collect the tax for us are concerned. This was an area in which the lines are few; it was an area in which experience has been gained by other jurisdictions,

and we shall see how we get along with this in the meantime.

Mr. Spence: In other words, the hon. Provincial Treasurer is going to try this out?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, that is right.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, section 4 says the controller may suspend or cancel the permit of any wholesale dealer who does one of the things set out in the balance of the section.

I am very puzzled as to how the government justifies what appears to me to be indirect taxation. They are obviously going, from the intent of section 4, to impose certain burdens on the wholesaler to do collection of taxes. We all know that section 92 of the BNA Act does not allow us to do this. It would seem that when you read section 4, together with the regulation section, you will have this broad power of passing regulations and you are trying to circumvent the legal method of our constitutional system of taxation. The province can tax directly, but it cannot tax indirectly. Now, surely the implication in section 4 is that you are going to tax indirectly? I want to know on what basis the hon. Provincial Treasurer is putting this forth.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, I might inform the hon. member for Downsview that we do not propose to tax indirectly. The tax will be collected as a part of the price of the tobacco and will find its way back to the Treasury, to the consolidated revenue fund. As the hon. member knows, this is the same principle as is followed in the collection of gasoline tax.

Mr. Singer: Well, it may be the same principle, Mr. Chairman, but I can only read section 4 one way. You are going to impose certain burdens on the wholesaler. If the wholesaler has to collect taxes and he passes it on to the retailer, who in turn passes it on to the consumer, what else can it be other than indirect taxation?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment here? Let us call a spade a spade. This is an indirect tax. The government has been engaged in indirect taxing for years. The answer, as I see it, as a layman, is that the gasoline companies in the very well established precedent have not seen fit

to challenge it in the courts. Therefore, while even a layman, I think I could agree with a lawyer that there appears to be a fairly strong case for this being an indirect tax. The fact of the matter is that it likely will be proceeded with, because it is administratively so much more efficient than having each retailer collect the tax. So until the hon. member for Downsview, in his professional capacity, finds a client to take it to the courts and challenge it, it is likely to continue.

Mr. Singer: Well, my friend cavalierly brushes aside the BNA Act.

Mr. MacDonald: I did not brush it aside. I am just dealing with the reality.

Mr. Singer: I am told—let me put it to the hon. Provincial Treasurer this way—that very strong representations have been made to you, sir, that you are doing something that constitutionally you are not allowed to do.

An hon. member: We do not agree.

Mr. Singer: No such representations have been made to you? Well, sir, somebody is misinforming me. The person who approached me on this, indicated that very strong representations had been made to the government and that he was of the opinion that you were doing something that constitutionally you are not allowed to do.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, the one thing that I would never wish to do in this House would be to mislead the hon. member for Downsview. I would be very frank to admit that I did have a deputation from the wholesalers, but they came principally to endeavour to find out how this was going to work.

Mr. Singer: Just a searching party.

Hon. Mr. Allan: They came to see how it was going to work and I informed the person who requested the appointment, I felt it would have been better to wait until we had the regulations ready; however, due to the fact that he came from the town of Simcoe, I saw the deputation. We had a very pleasant discussion and they are coming back. I do not anticipate—

Mr. MacDonald: Is he a member of the Tory association?

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, he is not.

Sections 4 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 144 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,
the moneys required for the purposes of The Commuter Services Act, 1965, during the fiscal year 1965-66, shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 147, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): In this regard, I understand it is an amendment to Bill No. 146?

Clerk of the House: No, we are on the resolution of Bill 147.

Mr. Sargent: Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my opposition to this bill, as outlined before.

Mr. Chairman: Wait until we get to the bill, please.

COMMUTER SERVICES

House in committee on Bill No. 147, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, in effect, this bill as outlined by the hon. Prime Minister, will give a capital gift of \$7 million this year.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is out of order. The principle of the bill is decided on second reading. If he is addressing remarks to any specific section he would be in order, but he simply cannot talk about the principle of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the government has not told the House how it will give the rest of Ontario a like amount. The hon. Prime Minister told the House that this would unleash funds for the rest of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Order! You are out of order. This should have been on second reading, unless you can point out one section on which you would like to speak.

Mr. Sargent: The bill is out of order, too. You are giving \$14 million less to the rest of Ontario than you are giving to Toronto in this bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

On section 4:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That subsection 2 of section 4 of the bill be amended by striking out the word "acquired" in the third line and inserting, in lieu thereof, the word "sign."

This amendment is only to correct a typographical error.

The word "acquired" will be replaced by the word "sign" in subsection 2 of section 4. This deals with the plan. The plan must be signed in the registry office. It is purely technical.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I am in order on this; I am sure if I am not you will so rule. Since the introduction of this bill I have been having a look at other commuter services in the States and I was interested in the commuter service in Boston. The federal government had to finance it, I think, to the tune of \$10 million a year. I understand, and I raise this question, that Metro Toronto was doing a study concerning the feasibility of people using public transportation. This study as yet, I understand, has not come out. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he was aware that such a study was being done and whether it has come out, and what the findings were if it has come out.

It is a very important factor to the bill, the fact that you have the capacity for 6,000 people every half hour. I am sure we were all concerned, at the time we talked on the principle of the bill, that we educate people to use the public facilities. This study by Metro was going to be done to see the reaction of people to using public over private transportation. Am I correct that there has been such a study, and has this been taken into consideration?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware of the detail of this. The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is, because the studies that were made resulting in this bill, were made in a committee of which he was chairman, and I am quite sure that he will be able to answer the hon. leader of the Opposition's questions. I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. Thompson: Could I repeat, sir; do you want me to repeat it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I wish you would.

Mr. Thompson: My question was really that having looked at other cities, I had noticed that in Boston the federal government had come in to the tune of \$10 million a year to subsidize public transportation. I think it encouraged a greater use of this kind of transportation. The problem had been the factor of trying to get the public to use public transportation. I understand that there is in Metro a study being done of this and I could not get the information as to whether the study had actually been finalized. My question was whether the hon. Minister had seen this study to determine the acceptance of commuter services by people in outlying Metro areas.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, Metropolitan Toronto did undertake a transportation study on its own. The parts of that study that could be incorporated into the study being undertaken by the provincial government. There has been a pooling of information—I think this has been mentioned here before—a pooling of the information that developed in the course of Metropolitan Toronto's transportation study, with the information available from the departments of government, such as Transport, Municipal Affairs and Highways. Again, if you examine the personnel of the technical and advisory committee, you will find that it is made up of representatives of those government departments and representatives from Metro Toronto in the persons of Mr. George Grant, the Toronto roads commissioner and Mr. E. Comay, the Toronto planning commissioner.

We have taken full advantage of those portions of the Metropolitan Toronto study that lend themselves to the broader nature of study that we are undertaking at our level. I cannot speak with any degree of accuracy about the extent to which the findings of Metropolitan Toronto's own study have been made public, but certainly the complete information within that study has been available to the province.

The reference of the hon. leader of the Opposition, if I may say so, to the study of Boston, is just as he says—the principal amount, if not all the funds for that study, have been put up by the federal government. As I understand it, this takes place in all those urban areas of the United States where similar mass transportation studies are under way. I think it relates to a percentage, something like 1.5 per cent of another budget for overall transportation. It must be directed to these mass transportation studies. Whether that percentage is accurate or not, I cannot

say, but it is a percentage and in Boston it works out to a very considerable amount of money. The same is taking place in New York, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Philadelphia—across the continent. Great quantities of federal funds are employed for that purpose, whereas here, of course, they are all local or provincial funds.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that, but my third question was really: Had the hon. Minister the opportunity of seeing the Metro study?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very much so.

Mr. Thompson: And that you worked closely with them.

As far as referring to Boston, I was not referring to a subsidy for study; I was referring to a subsidy to keep the commuter service going. I mentioned on the figures I got they were losing \$10 million annually, and this is why it caused me some concern.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, yes. On that point, Mr. Chairman, I might just qualify that. They have, in Boston and other areas, undertaken some demonstration and trial projects as well. They have done it in New York. The Long Island railroad is undertaking that; it is a trial situation, and the same in Boston. They have worked with the Boston and Maine railroad there. They have not got into it on as full-blown a scale probably as we propose to do it here, but they call them demonstration projects over there.

Mr. Thompson: They are \$2.8 million in the red—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly, I think you are right.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister this. Clause 3 says that "services to any one or more areas of Ontario." Would the hon. Prime Minister inform me if the same ratio is available to the rest of Ontario that has been given to Metro Toronto? In other words, if you are going to make \$7 million capital available for commuter services in the Toronto area, will \$14 million be available to the rest of Ontario on the same basis, and also \$4 million a year subsidy on other commuter services like Ottawa, Sudbury, Windsor, all over the province? Is the same ratio available to the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, this question has been debated in this House many times. We do not do things on ratios in our allocation of provincial funds for any purpose

—highways, education, and so on. Many times the allocation of funds is done on the basis of need, so if we spend X number of dollars in the Metro area, we do not necessarily say because we have spent X number of dollars here, we therefore will spend X number of dollars somewhere else. The hon. member might be interested in knowing, for instance, that when we were doing a study concerning highway financing and toll roads in the province, it was proven to us—and the hon. member for York South will recall this—that on the 401 bypass, as it was known then, around the northern part of Toronto, the gasoline tax consumed on that road alone—nothing other than gasoline tax—would pay for it in six years. Now the hon. member is always trying to point out that we spend too much money in the Toronto area. I recognize exactly what he is getting at. I would like to point out to him that the Toronto area produces an enormous amount of tax revenue. It is not necessarily all spent in the Toronto area.

As an example, I am pointing out to the hon. member that on Highway 401 running north of Toronto, if you simply took the gasoline tax collected by the government and the cars using that highway, in six years it would be completely paid for. That is the original highway, as it was constructed. Of course, we will continue collecting gasoline tax on that highway for years and that revenue will be spent in other parts of the province which never have any hope of generating enough tax money to pay for the cost of the roads there. But this is the way you operate a province. You do not simply say: "We are going to spend in any one area precisely what that area produces and no more." Much of the money that is put into roads—for instance, development roads in northern Ontario—is generated on the Queen Elizabeth Way, which has been there for 30 or 35 years, and was long since paid for. But it is still generating tax revenue used in other parts of the province.

So it is impossible for me to say to the hon. member that because we are going to spend \$7 million in the Toronto area, we are then going to allocate a precise number of dollars based on any form to be spent elsewhere. We make our grants to municipalities on a basis of need. The lower the assessment, the higher the grant in many instances. We follow a formula of need, and not any strict form such as the hon. member suggested.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. I do know that the hon. Prime Minister can make his figures justify what he is saying. The devil can quote scripture to cite his purpose, too. But

we are concerned about the fact that you are flying a kite here with \$7 million of money belonging to all of all Ontario to look after the Golden Horseshoe area. I think it behooves the hon. Prime Minister and his government to tell the rest of the province what moneys they have available along the same line, without leaving it out in left field or some place for them to pick up if they go after it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Just look at the estimates of The Department of Highways and the hon. member will see what money is available. I am quite sure if the hon. member wants the exact figures as to how much money is going into any particular area in grants for road purposes, we would be delighted to give it to him.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in intervening here for a moment to say I am 100 per cent on the side of the hon. Prime Minister. I will not share in any attempt to create an internecine warfare between various parts of the province, as my genial friend from Owen Sound is always engaged in. I can remember—

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are not concerned about Metro Toronto getting mobility in commuter service; we are in favour of that. But we are opposed to this give-away all the time to Metro Toronto at the expense of the rest of the province. This has to stop some time, and this is a good point to pin it down.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): That is the chief plank of the Liberal Party.

Mr. MacDonald: The point I was going to make, Mr. Chairman, really follows from a comment of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrobe) yesterday, when he said that he had difficulty in explaining to the people in the north who always say they are not getting enough roads.

I can understand their feeling, when they have waited for two generations to get a road, such as from Atikokan to Fort Frances; I can understand their feeling. I remember back on the toll roads committee—and this illustrates the point, we were given figures—and these are now ten years out of date—that the amount of traffic on the Queen Elizabeth Way between Hamilton and Toronto on Labour Day weekend exceeded the annual traffic on the old Trans-Canada highway—No. 11—exceeded the annual traffic in one weekend! Now when you translate that into gasoline tax, there is no mystery as to the fact

that a highway with the traffic that you have on 400 or 401 pays for itself in six or eight years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: All I am saying is: let us not set one off against another. We are generating down in this area revenues which are used to build highways, in some instances in northern Ontario, which will never pay for themselves in terms of gasoline tax. Now I am not saying that the highways should not be built, because there are reasons why they should be built. Indeed, I would say to the hon. Minister of Highways, now that he has finally succeeded in getting the Atikokan to Fort Frances highway, he should get off his stationary position and start building a highway from Atikokan north to the Trans-Canada, instead of having to run around such a distance. However, that is getting out of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one little observation here. I do not think the hon. member for Grey North was in the House when we debated this bill on second reading, and I just want to make one important suggestion to him, that emanated from the comments that were made. I am quite sure the House was in full agreement with the principle of what is being done here in Metropolitan Toronto. This is not a give-away, it is not a kite-fly, it is nothing of the sort as far as Metropolitan Toronto is concerned.

These expenditures are experimental in nature, they are designed to prove the extent to which we can attract people to use another form of travel that may effect very great economies in our capital expenditures. If this is the case, and it was stated in the House, there may very well be more capital money to spend in Owen Sound and around the province. On that basis alone we think it is a sensible thing to do, but it is not a give-away, it is not a kite-fly, or anything of that nature, and I think the hon. member is aware of that, certainly his hon. leader is.

Mr. MacDonald: You might even be able to finance the traffic lights at Meaford.

Mr. Thompson: I fully understand the sentiments of my hon. colleague behind me. His interest is for an equality of service throughout the province. We have endorsed the principle of this bill, but he naturally is a fighter for regional developments throughout the province, and I think it is a cause well worth fighting for when I see a great deal—

Section 4, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 5 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 147 reported.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1947

House in committee on Bill No. 148, An Act to amend The University of Toronto Act, 1947.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 148 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the property vested in York University and any lands and premises leased to and occupied by York University shall not be liable to taxation for provincial, municipal or school purposes, and shall be exempt from every description of taxation so long as the same are actually used and occupied for the purposes of York University,

as provided in Bill No. 149, The York University Act, 1965.

Resolution concurred in.

THE YORK UNIVERSITY ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 149, The York University Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 22, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 23:

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if I might ask for one point of clarification on section 23. I am rather interested as to the relationships between the board of governors and the senate. It says here that the board can take action after "consultation with the senate," and in the previous section, I was just trying to put my finger on it, it says "with the concurrence of the senate." I hope we can resolve, to some degree, this relationship between senate and board of governors, and I think this bill does. It has been an area of some conflict within the institution, and I am wondering why there is the apparent contradiction here, that generally it is "with the concurrence of the senate, and yet in this specific Act it says "only after consultation."

Hon. Mr. Roberts: May I ask what specific section? I cannot find it.

Mr. MacDonald: Section 23.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: "Consultation" is used in the sense of capacity to affiliate. As to "concurrence," what section is that? I can tell the hon. member this, that this bill was very carefully drawn up to deal with the relationship between the board of governors and the senate of the university, and the provisions of the bill as set out were concurred in by the senate and the board of governors. I can perhaps understand that consultations might take place if you were to do an affiliation which really has perhaps nothing to do with the normal functions of the senate of the university, that is, if you are going to affiliate with another body, but I do not see the section.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have found it. Can I draw it specifically to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister? On page 4 of the bill, subsection K of section 10 spells out the powers of the board, and it, in effect, says "to establish faculties, schools and institutes with the concurrence of the senate." When you get to 23, you have in effect an affiliation which in general is the same kind of area, and yet here it is only "consultation."

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think that these matters were agreed upon by the parties as to where the senate was to be consulted and then where its concurrence would be necessary. I can see some difference between the two areas. The establishment of a faculty or a school in the university really affects the academic function of the university pretty closely. If you are going to affiliate, this gets to be a mechanical task, and in my view might fall to the board of governors. However, the consultation would mean, I suppose, that the academic aspects of even the affiliation would have to be considered before the board of governors could act upon it. My only answer is that this bill was agreed upon by the parties involved before it was brought into the House.

Sections 23 to 28, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 149 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the property vested in the board of governors of Lakehead University and any lands and premises leased to and occupied by the board of governors of Lakehead University or the university are not liable

to taxation for provincial, municipal or school purposes, and are exempt from every description of taxation so long as the same are actually used and occupied for the purposes of Lakehead University,

as provided in Bill No. 150, An Act respecting Lakehead University.

Resolution concurred in.

LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY

House in committee on Bill No. 150, An Act respecting Lakehead University.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, with regard to section 7 particularly, the Lakehead University, as it will be known from July 1, is supported in part by contributions from the people in the Lakehead area. There has been some criticism in the Lakehead area with regard to the people who go to make up the board of governors and it has been felt that some consideration should be given to the idea of adding representatives from women's organizations; women should be represented on the board and possibly the working group at the Lakehead.

There is a great deal of commendation expressed in the Lakehead area with regard to the choice of some of these people and I think that much credit could be given to such people as Mr. R. J. Flatt of Fort William, E. Lorne Goodall of Port Arthur and William G. Tambllyn of Fort William, who have served on the board for a number of years. Mr. Tambllyn, in particular, has given extremely fine service and a great deal of time to the affairs of the college, and now that he has been named as the leader of the new university, I believe that the choice has been well made. I think that he will make an excellent president and I am sure that the people at the Lakehead will join together with the board and work in bringing out extended activities.

One of the things that the people at the Lakehead are particularly appreciative about—as is the whole Lakehead area, as a matter of fact—is that extension courses have been set up to take care of such places as Atikokan, Dryden, Kenora, Nipigon and Geraldton. I believe that next year the university has in mind extending this service to Fort Frances and other communities. The summer school, too, is growing splendidly.

All of these things, I think, are due in part

to the fact that the people such as I mentioned—Mr. Flatt, Mr. Goodall and Mr. Tambllyn—have worked very hard in connection with this university setup. I know there are a number of points that people have raised with regard to such things as, when the president is not available who takes over, and so on. There is no real understanding in the university at the present time as to what the process will be. I hope that The Department of Education will clarify this with the Lakehead people so that they will have some formula upon which to base their future actions.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I should like to underline one point that my hon. colleague has raised. One of the most encouraging things about the Lakehead University development is, as I have said before, that after having got off to what I felt was a slow start, I think they are now succeeding in integrating their activities with the whole of the northwest. It is really quite exciting to watch in operation.

As hon. members will know this all started out with a fairly heavy technological basis and up in this area, with the mining and the forest industries, and so on, it is understandable and, I think, desirable. So there is all the more reason then why, sir, in setting up the directing body of an institution that this new university should have done what York and Brock have done—conceivably others, but I know for certain in those two instances—that is, given representation to organized labour in the area. I think you are going to get participation of organized labour in the kind of retraining, in the extension programmes and in the direction of the young people to the Lakehead University—instead of being lured down to Toronto and to some of the longer established universities—by having organized labour represented on the board of governors and I regret that it is not there. Conceivably it cannot be done now without consultation, but I think that in The Department of University Affairs' continuing review of the Acts that we have for our various universities, this should be considered as a general principle, particularly in the northwest.

I have a second point, and this may not be the appropriate section in which to raise it, but I raise it for the hon. Prime Minister's consideration so that he can come back into the picture, if he will. There is this anomaly that the students who graduated six weeks ago, graduated from Lakehead University, which will not come into being until July 1, so technically this was an illegal act. The

hon. Prime Minister intervened in what I thought was a very wise intervention when we raised this earlier, and said that perhaps there could be an amendment to the Act which perhaps could be retroactive and cover this year's graduates. I am wondering if that cannot be done either on second reading now, or conceivably, if the rules permit, on third reading.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: My assumption, Mr. Chairman, is that this has been taken care of. However, I will check with the deputy Minister of The Department of University Affairs and if it has not been, then we can do it either here or on third reading.

In regard to the points made by the hon. member for Fort William and the hon. member for York South, I am in full agreement with them. I think the board of governors of this university should be completely representative. I recognize some of these names and some of them I do not; I assume that they are representative. However, I do notice that there are three persons to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which gives the government some control even yet, and I would be very pleased to see that the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis) is made aware of the comments that the hon. members have made here this morning.

In regard to the replacements for these people, you will notice that their terms of office are staggered and there will be replacements from time to time. Those appointments do not rest with the government; they rest with the board of governors itself. Therefore, I would think that as time goes by, this board will be, I would hope—and I am sure the men who compose it would want it to be—completely representative of the community which it serves. I will see that the remarks made by the hon. members are given consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: One final word, if I might, Mr. Chairman—final as far as I am concerned—and that is that I hope the government will give serious consideration in its appointments through the Lieutenant-Governor. One of the problems—and I want to say this without necessarily specific reference to this university because it applies to all—is that there has been a tendency for the board of governors of universities to be self-perpetuating bodies and to make appointments so that it does not become more representative, it becomes even narrower in its representation in the community. Again I think this is another feature of all our universities that we have to take a look at in the future. One way to avoid that happening here is for the government

to exercise its right through the appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of three members of the board to make certain that the broadening takes place immediately.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Before the bill is reported I should like to say that no amendment is necessary to look after this year's graduates.

Sections 7 to 31, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 150 reported.

THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF ONTARIO ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill No. 151, An Act to amend The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 151 reported.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH ACT, 1964

House in committee on Bill No. 152, An Act to amend The University of Guelph Act, 1964.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 152 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the cost of the establishment, maintenance and conduct of a college of applied arts and technology shall be payable until March 31, 1966, out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 153, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 153, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, under section 1, I would just like to raise, really for emphasis, the point of section 1 (f), about the granting of certificates and diplomas of

standing following successful completion of any programme of instruction. I would hope again that universities would give consideration to the diplomas and certificates so that there will be recognition of standards by universities. This is something which has been discussed. The hon. Minister is away at the moment but from our point of view I would say that we feel it is very important that the community colleges should have the stimulus of academic training and study and I am thinking of the liberal arts particularly.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, I can only say that in the government we are well aware of the apprehension that has been expressed by many people in the press publicly. We are aware of it. I think the hon. Minister, in introducing the bill and on second reading, made it very clear what his policy was and I will convey to him the comments the hon. leader of the Opposition has made this morning. I would try to allay his apprehension because I think we are at one on this. Perhaps in a year or two years from now we will examine this situation and see what happens, but I would say that we agree with the point he makes.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 153 reported.

THE CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill No. 154, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 154 reported.

THE HOMES FOR RETARDED CHILDREN ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill No. 155, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 155 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the moneys required for the payment to counties and district welfare administration boards of subsidies for the cost of administration of welfare services under section 7 of The Department of Public Welfare

Act may, until March 31, 1966, be paid, in accordance with the regulations, out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided in Bill No. 156, An Act to amend The Department of Public Welfare Act.

Resolution concurred in.

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 156, An Act to amend The Department of Public Welfare Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 156 reported.

THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 157, The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 18:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on section 18 I would move that subsection 4 of section 18 of Bill 157 be amended by adding thereto the following:

and any employee covered by a pension plan, or any duly authorized representative of a trade union representing employees covered by a pension plan, shall be entitled to inspect such information return, and to abstract information from it during the regular office hours of the commission.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. Renwick that subsection 4 of section 18 of Bill 157 be amended by adding thereto the following:

and any employee covered by a pension plan, or any duly authorized representative of a trade union representing employees covered by a pension plan, shall be entitled to inspect such information return, and to abstract information from it during the regular office hours of the commission.

Mr. Renwick: The purpose of moving the amendment, I think, is self-explanatory. It is that the employees, or the unions representing them, should have an opportunity to obtain information from the return which is required to be filed with the commission annually.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Speaking to the motion, I would have to oppose it. The whole pur-

pose of the commission as it is set up is to ensure that the pension funds are dealt with properly and this, as I say, is the function of the commission itself. It is a government-appointed body that has established certain standards, and it deals with and ensures the proper investment and the proper looking after of the pension funds, and I do not think that this is necessary in any way in order to protect the interests of those who will in due course become entitled to the pensions. The question has been debated in this House before and I believe a similar amendment was offered. I am of the opinion, in the terms of this bill, this amendment is not necessary for the protection of those who will in due course be the beneficiaries of the pensions that must be filed and must comply with the regulations and standards established by the pension commission.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

I declare the motion lost.

Section 18 agreed to.

Sections 19 to 20, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 21:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 21, I would move:

That clause (a) of subsection 1 of section 21 of Bill No. 157, be amended by striking out the words "ten years" in the second line, and substituting the words "one year"; (b) by striking out the words "and who has attained the age of 45 years" in the fourth and fifth lines.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Renwick moves:

That clause (a) subsection 1 of section 21 of Bill No. 157 be amended (a) by striking out the words "ten years" in the second line and substituting the words "one year"; (b) by striking out the words "and who has attained the age of 45 years" in the fourth and fifth lines.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is simply to provide for a vesting of the employee's interest in the pension plan at the expiration of one year of the employment, rather than at age 45 and after ten years of service.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would have to oppose this amendment, and in so doing, I would say, as I have said before, that this legislation is new. I think perhaps over a period of time, as it develops and as

the administration of this Act goes on, there may very well be amendments which will lead to, and in the direction of, the amendment offered by my hon. friend. However, at the moment, we have some form of agreement, for instance, with the other provinces.

The government of the province of Quebec has introduced a bill into their Legislature. It has not yet been processed, but since the last time I spoke on this matter in this House, the government of the province of Quebec has introduced a bill which is similar to this. We are seeking to establish uniformity across the country, and in order to achieve this uniformity, this bill provides—as does the bill in Quebec—for a national organization of pension commissions.

Such matters as are raised in my hon. friend's amendment, will be dealt with by that national body, and it would be our hope that we would then be able to achieve complete uniformity, so that when these amendments such as you suggested, are made, they will be made on a national basis.

What we are seeking at the moment, is national agreement, so that we can establish the portability we seek.

The other point I would make is that there are two aspects to this. There are both the vesting of the amount that may be contributed by the employer, there is also the question of locking in the contribution of the employee. If such an amendment were to be dealt with, I would think you would have to deal with the two aspects of it; one, the vesting in the employee of the contributions of the employer, and secondly, the locking in to the fund of the contribution of the employee.

However, at this stage of the development of the concept of this bill, I would think that this amendment would be an obstruction rather than a benefit, and, therefore, I would oppose it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, from our side, we would support this amendment, because I think one of the principal aspects of this bill is to permit mobility of labour, which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) in his many moments of eloquence, has emphasized, and I think the hon. Prime Minister recognizes this.

I am not going back through debate, as was expressed on second reading and which we have expressed, but it seems to me that when you put on the limitation of 45 years of age that this is not really permitting mobility. I will not go on into the fact of younger people wanting to move, and so on.

The point of building up a fund? I did not catch the hon. member's point that at one year, did he say, he would rule out the—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Vesting!

Mr. Thompson:—vesting after one year. I would say what appeals to me particularly is the abolition of the age of 45, and it is on that principle—in order to encourage mobility of labour—that we endorse the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion, please say "nay."

I declare the motion lost.

Section 21 agreed to.

On section 22:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr Chairman, I have an amendment to subsection 3 of section 22:

That subsection 3 of section 22 be amended by striking out the word "benefits" in the third line and substituting, therefor, "benefit credits," and by inserting after "in respect of" in the third line, the words "remuneration and."

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the section will then read:

No amendment of a pension plan, consequent upon the coming into force of the Canada Pension Plan, shall adversely affect the pension benefit credit of any member in respect of remuneration and service or membership in the plan prior to the first day of January 1966.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to clarify how this subsection will apply in the case of final earnings pension plans, and also it makes this bill conform with the bill presently before the Legislature of the province of Quebec in our endeavour to create at least portability between these two provinces at the present time.

Section 22, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 23 to 29, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 157 reported.

UNIVERSITE D'OTTAWA

House in committee on Bill No. 158, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Sections 1 to 35, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister a

question on this. It is more for information. I am rather curious about the procedure here—four members of the board being appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor, and in this particular instance they have been named. Is this at the request of the university that they seek the Lieutenant-Governor's appointment of four; is the appointment made on the university's recommendation and, if so, from whom, or does the decision rest with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Chairman, it all depends upon the circumstances. In the previous bill we discussed dealing with the Lakehead University there is a provision for naming three but they are not named. This was done in consultation with the various groups that this bill pulls together, so to speak, and forms into the university.

As you can well understand, this bill is the result of many years of negotiation and naturally it was handled with some delicacy. The people named here were named because they were the people whom the parties concerned wanted to hold these posts and to serve on the board of governors.

In the case of the Lakehead University, of course, that is an entirely different situation and the same circumstances did not obtain, therefore we were able to proceed and we will name those three men in due course. Once again it will be done by consultation with the local people. But in this case all these loose ends were tied up before the bill was introduced.

Bill No. 158 reported.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

House in committee on Bill No. 160, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 160 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

the real and personal property, business and income of the Clarke institute of psychiatry are not subject to taxation for municipal or provincial purposes,

as provided in Bill No. 161, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Resolution concurred in.

THE ONTARIO MENTAL HEALTH FOUNDATION ACT, 1960-1961

House in committee on Bill No. 161, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 161 reported.

THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 162, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

On section 1:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask clarification from the hon. Provincial Secretary? I notice on section 1 (3) (i) he refers to wines from grapes, cherries, apples or other fruits grown in Ontario, the concentrated juice thereof, and to which are added herbs, water, honey sugar or distillate of Ontario wine. Has he covered dandelion wine, which is quite a popular drink?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Actually, these only cover the commercial varieties of wine, and that would be wine produced in the home. It does not come within the term of the wine produced commercially. I know of no commercial producer of dandelion wine, although I understand from those who enjoy it that it has a great medicinal value.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the explanatory note says this amendment will allow Ontario wine to be made from apples or other fruits as well. Why should you not allow it to be made, and then if they want to sell it commercially that could be dealt with? Personally, as I understand the meaning of the explanatory note, it is not allowed to be made for commercial sale.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: These are the wines that come within the definition of The Food and Drug Act.

Mr. Singer: That is no answer.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): It is not intoxicating.

Section 1 agreed to.

Sections 2 to 20, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 21:

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, there is one section here, I have looked through this bill and I cannot find

where I should bring it up. I am concerned with the municipality I come from. Last February they had a vote regarding the bringing in of lounge licences, and as of January 1, 1966, they are annexing another two townships. What our local council is concerned with is whether the liquor licence board has done anything about bringing the municipalities that are annexed in under the provisions of this Act.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: That is under The Liquor Licence Act.

Mr. Worton: Is there no way that this can be—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The next bill.

Sections 21 to 80, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 162 reported.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 163, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Worton: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I have section 8 or 21.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will make mention of it when we come to it.

Mr. Worton: All right!

Sections 8 to 20, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 21:

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, if there had been any amendment to take care of the matter which the hon. member referred to, it would have required the repeal of section 84 of the Act itself. Just for the information of the hon. members of the House I would read the section as it now stands:

No amalgamation of a municipality with another municipality and no annexation of the whole or a part of a municipality to another municipality, affects the operation of this Act at the time of the amalgamation or annexation, in the municipality amalgamated or municipality or part annexed or elsewhere, until such operation is affected pursuant to a vote under this Act in the municipality amalgamated or municipality or part annexed, as the case may be.

Now if Guelph, having voted to permit sales in dining lounges and lounges, were to annex any portion of the surrounding territory—for example, Puslinch, which I think is now a dry township—there will subsequently have to be a vote of those people in the annexed area to determine what they want by way of the law in their respect. I gave a full explanation of this at the time of second reading.

Very often people think in terms of a wet annexing a dry area, but there are municipalities where the annexing municipality is dry and the annexed is a wet municipality and such a principle would really cause a disturbance. There is a procedure by which this can be worked out.

Mr. Worton: The thing I am raising, Mr. Chairman, is in connection with the University of Guelph. In acquiring the township of Puslinch in this new annexation, Guelph has acquired one or two large motels with dining facilities. The city went to the expense of some \$10,000, and I might say that the association which put on the drive for becoming wet spent another \$12,000, in fact you would have thought the city was going out of business with the advertising that they did in order to make it wet. It seems to me foolish, when an area such as this is annexed into the city with the facilities there, that they have to go through another vote within a year.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to section 22, it is really a minor amendment—

Section 21 agreed to.

On section 22:

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I move that section 22 be amended by adding the following subsections:

(2) Clause (k) of the said section 85 is amended by striking out “banquet entertainment” in the first and second lines and inserting in lieu thereof “special occasion” so that the clause shall read as follows:

(k) governing the issuance and cancellation of special occasion or military mess permits and prescribing the fees payable in respect of the issue of such permit.

Subsection 3: Clause (r) of the said section 85 is repealed.

That clause, Mr. Chairman, refers to prescribing the official seal of the board, and so on.

Section 22, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 23 and 24 agreed to.
Bill No. 163 reported.

REGIONAL DETENTION CENTRES

House in committee on Bill No. 142, An Act to provide for the establishment of regional detention centres.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.
Bill No. 142 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,
the moneys required for the purposes of The Milk Act, 1965, shall, until March 31, 1966, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided by Bill No. 135, The Milk Act, 1965.

Resolution concurred in.

THE MILK ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 135, The Milk Act, 1965.

Sections 1 to 17, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 18:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I move that the following be inserted as paragraph 64:

Designating milk as grade A milk, industrial milk or reconstituted milk,
and that the present paragraph 64 be re-numbered as paragraph 65.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?
Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the section as amended stand as part of the bill?

Section 18 agreed to.

On section 19:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here. I move:

That section 19 of the bill be amended by deleting subsection 4 and substituting the following therefor:

And notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, no council or municipality shall by bylaw require that food

milk products sold in the municipality be produced or processed in the municipality or in any other designated area.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?
Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the section as amended carry?

Section 19 agreed to.

Sections 20 to 26, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 27:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to section 27. I move:

That section 27 of the bill be amended by inserting after the word "force" where it occurs the second time in the seventh line, the words "insofar as they are not inconsistent with this Act."

This is another technical amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?
Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 27, as amended, stand as part of the bill?

Section 27 agreed to.

On section 28:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment here, too. I move:

That sections 28, 29 and 30 of the bill be renumbered as sections 29, 30 and 31, respectively, and that the bill be amended by adding thereto the following section:

Moneys. 28. The moneys required for the purposes of this Act shall, until March 31, 1966, be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund and thereafter shall be paid out of moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the new section 28 stand as part of the bill?

Section 28 agreed to.

Sections 29 to 31, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask a question which I hope is not going to be out of order or too complicated in the absence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart). There is one aspect of the existing structure of the milk industry that is now going to be rather fundamentally altered which, as I understand it, is likely to disappear. I am curious to

know why the government is apparently deliberately seeking to do this. I am referring to the milk co-ordinating board. This Act envisages the cheese marketing board and the cream marketing board continuing as separate entities. The other two—fluid and concentrated milk—will gradually come together, so it would seem to me that there is still a function for a co-ordinating body. It has been my impression that in recent years this body has played a very useful role in bringing the various wings of the industry together.

In addition, I am told that the board has moved into other areas, such as the provision of group insurance for producers and presumably in all of the various sections of the industry. My question is, why is the Act in its reorganization of the milk industry apparently going to jettison completely the milk co-ordinating board, which I believe I am correct in stating had some legislative status in the previous Act?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I am in no position to answer the hon. member's question and I would suggest that we leave the reporting of this bill until the hon. Minister of Agriculture is in the House. We will be in committee of the whole again and before we move that the bill be reported I think it would be preferable to wait for the hon. Minister to answer the question.

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 135 will be held.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 9:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I move: that section 9 be amended by adding thereto the following item:

5. \$50,000 to the Sisters of St. Joseph's toward the cost for operating the Providence Villa home for the aged.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I might say that this has been requested by Metropolitan Toronto. It is a grant formerly made by the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 9, as amended, carry?

Section 9 agreed to.

Sections 10 and 11 agreed to.

Bill No. 137 reported.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions, and certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions, certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if you would recognize 12.30, this afternoon we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare.

It being 12.30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile	4319
On notice of motion No. 14, Mr. Worton, Mr. W. B. Lewis, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Eagleson	4349
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Eagleson, agreed to	4357
Recess, 6 o'clock	4357

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature this afternoon, in the west gallery, students from Colborne Street senior public school, and in the east gallery, Holy Rosary separate school, Milton.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I would ask your indulgence and the indulgence of the hon. members of this House to make note of a very happy occasion.

Today marks the completion of 25 years in the public service of the province of Ontario by Miss Connie Potten.

In a week or so, she will also have completed some seven years as secretary to Mr. Speaker. In the years past, she has not only been the right hand of Mr. Speaker, but she has been the guiding light of many of the hon. members of this House. I know that we all wish her well as she begins another 25 years of service to the people of the province of Ontario.

Clerk of the House: The 56th order. House in committee of supply. Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, we are entering another fiscal year in which welfare expenditures will reach a new high. The estimates of The Department of Public Welfare, which we have before us today, call for a disbursement of \$105,552,000. We can add to that, nearly \$33 million in refunds from the federal government. Thus, the total amount to be expended through my department is \$138,393,000. This is \$23,448,358 more than we spent in the fiscal year just ending—approximately a 20 per cent increase in total. We are all aware of the trend in which government accepts public responsibility for an ever wider scope of difficulties encountered by the citizens of Ontario, and is expected to provide the social services to resolve them.

The number of individuals and families in financial need fluctuates, of course, according

to the economic health of the country. In the last 12 months, the economy of Ontario has operated in high gear, with employment at the highest level in the nation and, I might add, in Ontario's history. The job situation is better than last year and much improved over several years ago. In March, the peak month of unemployment, 3.1 per cent of the labour force in the province was out of work, as compared with 4.2 per cent in March of 1964.

These more prosperous conditions are reflected in our welfare programmes. This is particularly true of emergency and short-term relief. The general welfare assistance programme has declined in caseloads and costs over the last year, and over the past few years. But some time ago, relief ceased to be the one major factor in public welfare. The long-term allowances programmes are now established as one of the characteristic features of our services.

If we compare one month with another, it is apparent how a decrease in unemployment, and so a decrease in general welfare assistance, is partly offset by increases in the long-term allowances. In March, 1965, there were 8,500 fewer persons on general welfare assistance than in March, 1964. The relief load had been reduced by that number. But in the meantime, 6,800 persons had been added to the regular long-term allowance programmes. Other causes are operating, besides employment, to add weight to the public welfare budget. The continuing growth of the population of Ontario accounts for a great deal; so also does the rise in living costs and standards of living. But one reason immediately apparent to us is that each year, public welfare accepts new responsibilities while, at the same time, elaborating, extending and refining the programmes which we have.

Evidence of this growth, of this taking on of wider obligations, is the fact that I can think of at least ten new allowance programmes that have been inaugurated since 1952. This is welfare in the form of direct continuing payments to families and individuals.

There has been an even greater development in supportive service programmes. I am referring to provisions in legislation for some specific type of service or facility available

to a family or individual, other than a cash allowance. Homemakers and nurses services, rehabilitation and homes for the aged are examples. I am sure we could name another ten of these supportive service programmes also introduced or radically expanded in the last decade.

The recent past, in our welfare services is a story of progress, and I am confident the future will see a similar advance. Events and plans broached in 1964, in the area of social security, will have a broad bearing in forthcoming provincial legislation. The introduction of the Canada pension plan is certain to have a notable influence on public welfare. Eventually it should reduce the number of cases solely dependent upon welfare allowances, and its benefits will be enjoyed by a much broader section of the population. But there will inevitably be a need to supplement with welfare payments, the income of many persons who qualify for a basic pension under the social security plan as it now stands.

The federal government also proposes to introduce a Canada Assistance Act. This would have more direct and immediate significance for my department. When the Ottawa proposals are translated into legislation, their effect on provincial welfare will be widespread and fundamental. It will mean a redesign and transformation of welfare services in Ontario.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that during the last session of this Legislature, I said that I would be meeting the federal authorities and other provincial Ministers at a conference on shared-cost programmes last spring. At that preliminary meeting, Ontario made a number of firm proposals in regard to federal-provincial relations in welfare. A further conference was held on April 8 and 9 of this year. I was pleased indeed to learn that the Ottawa government had adopted the main principles we had put forward. I am glad to say, too, that they were generous enough to give credit for the suggestions on which the new policy is to be based.

I shall take the liberty, Mr. Chairman, of quoting the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the hon. Judy LaMarsh. These were her opening remarks at the conference held last month:

I think I am right in saying that during the talks last May a clear consensus emerged in the area. Broad objectives in terms of the form of a new public assistance programme were stated by several provincial representatives. Mr. Cecile of Ontario, for example, expressed the view that: "It is timely for the federal and provincial

governments to proceed with all-inclusive legislation which will bring into reality a proper basis for the cost-sharing arrangements in relation to the various welfare programmes that are essential to Canadians as a whole."

He went on to suggest that "a new approach must be taken in serving those persons who have eligibility for public aid on a continuing basis," indicating the desire of his province to "be in a position to develop a budgetary approach" to public assistance which would promote "suitable standards of assistance, as well as improved administrative practices toward meeting individual case requirements."

In requesting that the federal government introduce legislation without delay which would "form the basis for the redesign of provincial welfare programmes," he expressed the view that this would "serve to supplement and augment the national social security maintenance scheme which is now in the offing."

That is Miss LaMarsh's recognition that the proposals of the federal government follow closely the revisions long advocated by Ontario. We have, on many occasions, expressed some dissatisfaction with the restrictive features of the federal-provincial agreement under which we must administer the categorical programmes, old age assistance, blind and disabled persons' allowances. We have said that a bold step must be taken by the federal government to permit provinces to operate their shared welfare programmes under conditions peculiar to the province, and according to the character of the population. It is understood that standards must be maintained at an acceptable level, yet there should be room to move beyond this level, and to vary the service to obtain the greatest value and benefit to the recipients.

We have, for a long time, advocated the budgetary needs basis for maintenance allowances instead of a flat rate. In our own provincial programmes, such as mothers' allowances, or in general welfare assistance, where federal regulations permit, a budget calculated on the basis of individual need determines the amount of grant. We shall be happy to extend this method to the other services.

You will be aware that The Canada Assistance Act plan has not yet been written into law. Discussions are continuing between provincial and federal authorities during the development of this legislation. We expect that the proposed Canada Assistance Act might be in operation as of April 1, 1966.

In view of this enlightened development, we intend to design a comprehensive Act that will collect all the maintenance assistance into one piece of legislation. Perhaps a distinction will have to be made between the programmes administered by the provincial Department of Public Welfare, and those in which municipalities take part. It may be that some of the supportive service programmes, through private organizations, will remain separate legislation.

But I assure you that a new design will emerge after the federal government passes The Canada Assistance Act and concludes an agreement with this province. That design will aim at maximum flexibility to cover all needful situations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the federal government and the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare, in proposing this new assistance plan, and to say that Ontario will take full advantage of all the features that it offers.

With all these prospects in the future, we have, nevertheless, not forgotten the current requirements of our recipients. You will have noticed within the past month or so, important revisions in the regulations to both The Mothers' Allowances Act and The General Welfare Assistance Act. By far the greater number of persons on welfare depend upon these two as beneficiaries. The nearly identical dependent fathers' allowances cover more than 15,000 persons, while general welfare assistance in March of this year, had about 100,000 on the rolls. In all, 135,000 persons are benefited by the amendments to the regulations.

For these people, we have raised the amounts allowed. This adds up to a considerable increase in the average monthly grant which will, in most cases, be about 15 per cent higher than before. We are anxious that the gain should be a real one in terms of dollars and cents, in the hands of the recipient. So we have removed the ceilings which, up to now, prevented the total grant from rising beyond a certain maximum, according to family size. We have set one maximum for all cases, on general welfare assistance and mothers' allowances; namely, \$300 a month. Under the prior rates, it had been possible for the larger family to receive a grant in the neighbourhood of \$255 monthly. Now they may get up to \$300 per month. This indeed permits up to \$3,600 yearly, if the family continues to require aid. But, more than that, they also receive medical assistance, hospital insurance and some dental benefits.

Family allowances are, of course, received by these families, and a portion of any other income they may earn is exempted from deduction.

The recent amendments include a number of other acceptable improvements. But I need not stop to review them, as the regulations are, or will be, readily available to you. I should say that the advance in the maintenance allowances has been matched by some progressive steps in the supportive service programmes also.

These supporting programmes are various and different, but they all have a similar pattern in relation to my department. In this dimension of welfare, the province provides advice, supervision and a substantial percentage of funds to municipalities and to private organizations who have the administrative structure, the staff and the facilities to offer a certain specialized service.

Under the heading of supportive service programmes, there is institutional care of several kinds. You will recall The Children's Institutions Act of 1963, which placed these group homes for children under separate legislation. After two years experience, we consider it advisable to increase our financial participation.

Accordingly, the Act has been amended in several respects most favourable to the private organizations who operate these centres of group care. The provincial subsidy for construction of buildings and additions was 50 per cent of the cost, with a maximum of \$2,500 per bed. The grant will now be up to \$5,000 for each bed established. If the organization purchases an existing building, the grant may be up to a maximum of \$1,200 a bed.

Our financial support for the day-to-day maintenance and treatment of children has also been greatly extended. In the beginning, we tentatively introduced certain maximums. After further examination of the programmes, we removed the maximums and offered to share 50 per cent of the actual net expenditures. We will now raise this to 75 per cent of the gross cost of maintaining a child who needs this type of special attention.

We have taken similar action in regard to group care for the retarded children. The Homes for Retarded Children Act, two years ago introduced an entirely new programme into the circle of public welfare services. This year, the provincial grant for the capital cost for new buildings is up to \$5,000 a bed and \$1,200 for acquired buildings. We are also raising the maintenance grant to 75 per cent of the gross cost. I

am confident that this will encourage new construction, and a general expansion of service to the disturbed and the retarded child.

These are comparatively small groups among a total of more than two million children in Ontario. Yet, their needs are urgent, and they present a real challenge in methods of therapy and training. Ample public funds are now placed at the disposal of the people devoted to this work. The two Acts, with successive amendments, are surely examples of rapid forward strides in a supporting service programme.

All in all, I think you will agree that this has been a significant year for child welfare services. The new Child Welfare Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation we have ever drafted. Since it has already been introduced and discussed in this House, you will be familiar with its terms.

I can add a pleasant footnote on the results of our on-going adoption campaign. My department, so far as I am aware, was the first to use the novel method of advertising on behalf of children, in newspapers and on radio and television. We began to seek permanent homes in this way, in 1959. In the five years prior to that date, the number of adoptions through children's aid societies was at a stable rate of about 2,500 boys and girls placed annually. From 1959 on, there has been a consistently higher figure of 3,500—that is 1,000 more adoptions a year. In more precise terms, we have reason to assume that 4,246 children have found permanent homes due to the stimulus of the adoption advertising.

Here, I want to pay a well earned tribute to the Toronto *Telegram* and to Miss Helen Allen of their staff. During the past year, this newspaper has run a regular feature called "Today's Child." Each day, Miss Allen has presented a photograph and a description of a child available for adoption. This has been done with the best intentions and good taste. The response has been excellent. An average of 20 letters daily come in from prospective parents, and more than half the children advertised have now found permanent homes. These children were boys and girls hard to place for some reason or other, but 133 have been adopted in this way.

This advertising has been at the full expense of the newspaper. There is no cost to the public, except in the help we give in getting information and in co-operation with the children's aid societies who have the children in care.

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to say that an

official reception was held for Miss Allen and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) presented a scroll as a token of gratitude for her services.

Child welfare, like every other phase of welfare, has many aspects. We are dealing with human personality in all its complexity, and must consider a variety of approaches. With The Children's Institutions Act and the new Child Welfare Act coming into operation, it is timely to explore new methods of treating the problems of emotionally disturbed children.

For this reason, my department has agreed to the broad terms of a plan put forward by the children's centre known as Boys' Village, which is located on Sheppard Avenue in Downsview. Boys' Village will undertake—over the next five years—a series of programmes which collectively might be called the child services project.

The general purpose is to test and demonstrate methods of helping boys and girls whose social and emotional problems are of the kind that are commonly looked upon as matters of public concern. This is to be a practical undertaking, working directly with the children, a course of treatment as well as an experiment. These children may be living with their parents, or they could be residents of an institution or in the care of a children's aid society.

The range of activities planned is quite extensive. Besides direct services to children and families, there is included, training of staff, research as to the special needs of children, consultation with such advisory bodies as the child welfare league of America, and a demonstration to all children's organizations of the methods and results of the total project.

Under the general heading "direct services to children and families" there is a list of six different programmes. One of these offers case-work counselling to families and special classes, if the child is unable to adjust to the regular school programme. Another involves the placement of children in foster homes after special training for the foster parents. There is also to be group home care for children who cannot live in a family setting, and for more severe cases of disturbance, intensive residential treatment. Experienced child case workers will visit homes to assist directly in child management, and groups of parents and children would voluntarily attend counselling courses and receive psychiatric consultation.

You will note that all this is an effort to discover the ways and means that are most

beneficial for the child, whether in a family home, foster home, group home or in an institution or school. The board of directors of Boys' Village will administer and operate the child treatment project, in co-ordination with my department, and in consultation with other organizations.

This project will get underway during the summer, and we expect it to be a valuable experience in the continuing improvement of child welfare services.

The day nurseries programme is also developing well. Ten new nurseries have been added to last year's total of 348, so that 358 are now licensed and in operation. The day nurseries legislation was extended a year ago by an amendment, and the advantages are readily apparent. Formerly, the nurseries had mainly received children of less than seven years of age, not attending school. Now the aim is to help the working mother with child-minding difficulties. The age limit has been raised to nine years, regardless of the school attendance of the child, if the mother is employed.

This has proved to be of immediate benefit, and in the past year several hundred more children have registered in day nurseries and nursery schools. One instance is outstanding. You will recall that Riverdale hospital in Toronto, some time ago was seeking nurses to increase their staff. They established a day care centre for children, on the hospital grounds, and in this way, I am advised, gained 40 qualified nurses—mothers who could leave their children at the centre, took advantage of the opportunity. This plan of nurseries near the job is becoming more of a necessity as more mothers follow the trend and go out to work.

In many cases, the mother is the sole support of her children, and certainly deserves social aid whether she chooses to earn a living or requires welfare assistance. There are a great variety of reasons why women find themselves alone with a family to support. One reason is the desertion of the husband. This abandonment of wives and children is a continuing social problem. It is a question of great magnitude. Although I cannot vouch for the figure, I have seen an estimate that there are 20,000 deserted wives in Ontario. We do know that there are over 3,000 families on the mothers' allowances and general welfare assistance rolls, due to the desertion and non-support of the father. The annual cost to the public for these cases is over \$4 million.

We are naturally concerned in this matter, both from the point of view of the well-

being of the family and the cost to the public. In 1961, we established a special investigation unit, which deals with about 2,500 cases annually. Although North America is a large area and the population is mobile, our unit does locate 40 per cent of the deserting husbands. We attempt to effect reconciliations where possible, but at least we ensure that a legal arrangement is made, whereby the man accepts some part of his financial responsibility.

The family courts set a fixed sum, and the usual method is to have the man pay the money into the court to pass it on to the wife. But, unfortunately, these court orders are not always obeyed. There is a considerable amount of delay and default in payments. The amount the husband is supposed to be contributing is deducted each month from the welfare allowance. If the contribution fails to appear there often has to be an emergency adjustment in the welfare cheque, with a certain degree of difficulty and extra effort on the part of both the wife and the welfare officials.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I was impressed by the suggestion made on an earlier occasion by the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden). He proposed that, if a deserted family is receiving welfare, the welfare authorities should collect the husband's payments from the family court. In this way, the monthly income of the family would remain at a steady level, and the authorities would be immediately aware of any default in payment and take steps to rectify the matter. Towards that end, we have and we are still consulting with the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) to explore the legal aspects and see how a system as such might be established in Ontario.

Turning from the well-being of the family and the young to that of the elderly, I want to point out that the homes for the aged continue to develop at an unprecedented rate. Although no striking changes have been made in the legislation recently, homes for the aged is one of the most prominent and successful of the services operated by close co-operation between my department and the municipalities. We have contributed over \$30 million in capital grants, yet last year the volume of building was greater than ever before.

Prior to 1950, municipal homes sheltered the indigent and the name "Houses of Refuge" described their limited and outmoded function. In 14 years, The Homes for the Aged Act has transformed an almost dormant system of 35 municipal establishments into an array of 60 homes, most of them among the finest

and best to be found anywhere. This advance began when the province offered to match the municipalities dollar for dollar in the construction and remodelling of their buildings. The excellent response of municipal authorities, and the promotion and guidance of my homes for the aged branch did the rest. The new model home has proved to be highly acceptable to people who need that type of care, and there is a steadily rising demand for more of this accommodation.

While I am on this topic of care for elderly persons, I want to commend the establishment of the select committee on aging. I am in accord with the thorough and perceptive way the members of the committee have gone about their work since last spring. The social conditions of the elderly is right now a subject of widespread interest. We welcome the committee's inquiry into the facilities and services that now exist, and we look forward to their report.

Let me now ask you to turn your attention to the problems of adults who are handicapped in some way, but are prospects for rehabilitation. Rehabilitation in some form or another—whether as restoration to health or to activity or to economic independence—that is the constant ideal of welfare administration.

Rehabilitation presents itself to us in two contexts. In a broad sense, it is a method of handling chronically dependent cases to restore them to self-support and independence. In a more distinctive context, it is the treatment, training and placement of the physically handicapped.

When persons are granted one of the long-term allowances, it is evident that there are some sound objective reasons why they will require maintenance into the foreseeable future. On the other hand, general welfare assistance or relief, is essentially short-term aid. Yet we find a fairly small percentage who continue on relief rolls for many months, sometimes for years. These are people with what we might call social disabilities. We have felt that, given special help and attention, they are prospects for rehabilitation.

Towards this end, we have undertaken exploratory projects in order to find and demonstrate the effective methods of re-establishing such persons. Three years ago, in co-operation with the city of Toronto, we set up an assessment and rehabilitation unit for men over 50 years of age, who were continuing on relief. Each month, from 60 to 100 men are medically examined, vocationally assessed and, if possible, placed in employment. The unit has consistently been able to find jobs for more than half of these older

men who had so much difficulty on their own.

In addition, we have carried out demonstration projects with long-term assistance families. These have been well publicized; reports have been issued on the first project completed in Toronto in 1963, and a second in Hamilton, finishing in May of 1964. In the past few months, members of the department have been assigned to work on similar projects in other cities. The results have been encouraging and enlightening to the municipalities, and we hope to extend the methods even farther.

In the second context of rehabilitation, our rehabilitation services branch is the organization which has the function of helping persons who are severely handicapped through illness, accident and congenital defects. The branch aims to establish or restore the working capacity of the individual, and it has a comprehensive range of services, including medical, social and vocational assessment, counselling and guidance, vocational training and employment placement.

This service, which began in 1957 with a trickle of 400 handicapped persons, has broadened into a flow of approximately 2,500 presently receiving services. Thousands of persons today enjoy the fullness of life only because of what vocational rehabilitation has done for them.

This is a programme that shows a profit not only in terms of human happiness, but also as an economic gain. It costs on the average \$900 to train a person, yet the contribution they make through future employment far surpasses this expense. We find that for each dollar expended in training, the rehabilitated individual earns \$2.75 in the first year—that is not for the year, but as he goes along.

I am convinced that rehabilitation is one of Ontario's most potent weapons in the unending battle of many fine people to achieve a personal victory over their handicaps. To this end, I am happy to announce that our estimates provide for an increase of over 50 per cent in staff to carry out this programme during the coming year.

In order to ensure that we obtain as many rehabilitation counsellors as possible, we are taking full advantage of the federal-provincial agreement for the training of such staff. Unlike other professionals, as in medicine, law or teaching, rehabilitation officers cannot be found on the open labour market. There is no academy or graduate school for them; they must be specially trained. In co-operation with the University of Toronto school of

social work, we have developed a special training course, whereby a steady flow of professional rehabilitation counsellors will become available to serve Ontario's handicapped.

Continuing this review of recent progress in supportive service programmes, I should like to make several clarifying remarks on the subject of nursing homes.

As you know, since 1958, the province, in agreement with the federal government, subsidizes municipalities for expenditures on behalf of certain residents in private commercial nursing homes. There are regulations under The General Welfare Assistance Act to govern this procedure and to assure acceptable standards in those nursing homes that are used.

As of January 1, 1965, an entirely new set of regulations went into effect. You have had the opportunity to study these regulations and will note that they accomplish three main purposes. First, the amount of subsidy is raised substantially. Formerly the maximum shareable payment to the municipality for one month of nursing home care was \$100. Now, the maximum is \$175—that is a 75 per cent increase. Second: experience has shown that there are two distinct levels of care, according to the residents' needs and the qualifications of the staff in attendance. We have thus recognized a differential between "sheltered care" and "nursing care."

These titles are descriptive, for there is a contrast between the resident who requires little more than a home with a measure of personal assistance in daily routines under the general supervision of a registered nurse, and the other person who needs not only this, but also the close individual attention of a registered nurse exercising the skills of her profession. The difference in degree of care obviously means a difference in cost. For this reason, we have set the subsidizable amount for sheltered care at \$148 a month, and for nursing care at \$175 monthly. This we believe adequately covers current rates.

The third major effect of the new regulations is to maintain high standards of care for the health, safety and well-being of the residents and the efficiency of the nursing home.

Another programme, which also has this triangle-shaped relationship between the province, the municipalities and private organizations, is homemakers and nurses services. This, too, was introduced only a few years ago, and we are one of the few jurisdictions in North America who support such services with public funds.

That support has been strengthened through new regulations, effective from April 1. In regard to homemakers, the shareable cost has been raised from \$8 to \$12 a day. This means that a municipality can pay \$12 to provide a household with a homemaker on a daily basis and recover 50 per cent of the expenditure from the province. The increase was the result of our review of actual costs which indicated that homemaker organizations are now usually charging from \$10 to \$12 for a day's service.

In regard to nursing services, the provincial contribution of 50 per cent of cost has also been favourably adjusted. As you know, organizations such as the Victorian Order of Nurses and the Red Cross, visit the homes of convalescent and elderly people, in fact, anyone who needs this type of occasional nursing attendance. The organizations have agreements to charge a fee for each call, where the municipality has accepted financial responsibility for a person unable to afford the service. The shareable fee had been \$2.50 a visit; we have increased it to \$4.50. In fact, none of the nursing organizations as yet find it necessary to charge that much, so that the new maximum rate is well ahead of actual cost.

Here I might take a moment to point out a difference in principle, between a supporting service programme, such as homemakers and nurses services, and older conceptions of public welfare. Welfare has traditionally been for the indigent, at least for cases where no member of the family could earn an adequate livelihood. These were not cases of low income, but of practically no income, and welfare was granted to persons who would otherwise go short of such basic items as food, clothing and shelter.

Now, the manner in which our legislation is written for supportive service programmes does permit subsidies in cases of low income, even where the family head is fully employed. In these programmes, we have left our regulations as flexible as possible, based on the reasonable question: "If the resources of the family or individual are compared with their needs, can they afford this extra service?" If they cannot, we are ready to assist. But we have entered this very indeterminate area with discretion. In homemakers and nurses services, as in similar programmes, we have thought it best to leave the answer to the judgment of municipal authorities who are on the spot, who know local conditions at first hand and can judge each case on its merits.

Mr. Chairman, I have outlined the recent

improvements in both the maintenance programmes and the supporting service programmes. These, of course, are reflected in the increased expenditure of the estimates before us now. Before closing these remarks, I wish to refer to several special areas of current interest.

I would like to mention a project which, though small, is significant for the future, in consolidating the variety of health and welfare services of local areas. We suggested to the social planning council of the city of Hamilton, that they join us in establishing an information and referral office in a representative Ontario community. The town of Burlington was the location chosen. We have consulted the town and the adjacent municipalities, and I understand that they will co-operate in support of this venture.

The purpose is to set up a central office, acting as a clearing house for the individual queries and cases that arise in welfare matters. Most communities have a number of different organizations providing service. There are the welfare administrations of three levels of government, as well as various private agencies. A central office should prove useful in answering preliminary inquiries and in directing people to the right places to receive the help they need. It should be a co-ordinating factor among the social services of an area, leading to a higher degree of understanding and efficiency.

The Burlington all-purpose welfare centre will be a pilot project. A staff of social workers and a research worker is to be engaged and operations to begin shortly. We look forward to great value being obtained this way, with a view to extending the development to other communities.

The major purpose, of course, in this development is to assess and determine the benefits that can be gained in local communities in answering the inquiries and treating the problems of any person who is in need of advice and assistance. The representatives of my department will collaborate fully with the information and referral centre.

In the matter of securing staff for future developments, we have made available opportunities and funds to enable personnel to obtain education and training.

This past year, we have had 38 people on bursaries and leave of absence with pay at the schools of social work. In the coming year, there will likely be 50 or more. These persons are committed to work in public welfare services in addition to other professional graduates we are recruiting.

Last September, we noted with satisfac-

tion, the opening of a new course for welfare workers. I refer to the welfare services course at the Ryerson polytechnical institute in Toronto. I might say that my advisory council on public welfare training originated the idea of a two-year vocational course, and with The Department of Education and the Ryerson institute, have seen it off to an auspicious start. Seventeen of the 24 students enrolled are receiving bursaries through my department. Added to those at the schools of social work, this makes 55 persons we are supporting through their period of long-term education. There are also staff members on other short-term courses, as well as a programme of in-service training. In these various ways, we are securing a high proportion of persons well prepared to carry out the functions of the department.

At the same time, I must pay tribute to the dedication, hard work and competence of my staff throughout the department. I know they would compare favourably with any group in public or private welfare services. Through experience and through formal training, they are well qualified for the work they do. The staff has increased by nearly 100 per cent as our programmes have grown through the last ten years. There are now about 630 persons employed, more than half of these are, as one would expect, in clerical and stenographic work. Out of that 300, 80 persons hold university degrees; most at the post-graduate professional level.

It should be remembered, however, that public welfare services on this continent were built from the ground up, mostly by the common sense and hard work of non-professional people. Many of those persons are still around, contributing greatly from a wealth of experience and self-acquired knowledge.

Yet, it is true that one out of every four of the administrative and field staff has a university education relative to their duties. This is a comparatively good ratio, and in a year or two at the present rate of intake, it will be one in three.

The staff of the department works efficiently and in excellent harmony. One evidence for this is that the turnover of staff is only 12 per cent annually. This is exactly on the average for the total civil service, but quite low for a welfare organization. I have heard of some agencies where 40 per cent or even 50 per cent of the staff leave within the year.

I should add that the child welfare branch of the department has now a larger number of professional social workers than at any

previous time. I am convinced we have here, a group of senior people who are a credit to a fine profession.

I believe that the employees of the department generally fulfil their heavy duties in a most obliging way. One proof of their capabilities is the manner in which thousands of cases are treated through the year with skill and kindness, and without disturbance or complaint. It is apparent that we can meet this multitude of requests for aid, or in some way satisfy the applicant, that he has received fair and sympathetic consideration. This is due as much to the courtesy and diligence of the staff as to the comprehensive nature of the services.

Should there be exceptions or any special case of need, we welcome the requests of any citizen of the province. We have every reason to appreciate the understanding and assistance of the hon. members of the House in maintaining the services of the department.

Mr. Chairman, I would add this note, that I am very pleased to announce to the hon. members of this House that my Deputy Minister who, as you know, has been very sick for the past few days, is now on the way to full recovery, and I thought the hon. members would like to hear that.

Mr. Chairman, I have also here a statement, if you will allow me later on when we come to that particular phase of the estimates, on Indians, and I would like to release it and bring it back when that part of the estimates comes along.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Before starting my remarks, I was a little hurt when the hon. Minister did not send me a copy of his remarks. I did not want to go upstairs and steal one of his copies, but to show him that I do not hold it against him I am going to send him a copy of my remarks beforehand.

Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this year's estimates for The Department of Public Welfare, I would like to take as my theme the concept of action. It is becoming ever more apparent that we in the Opposition must keep emphasizing action and planning, since The Department of Public Welfare seems to have so much trouble realizing what these concepts imply. We hope, sir, that by continual repetition of what is wrong with welfare in Ontario, and of what should be done for the people of our province who need welfare, we will eventually force some action out of this department.

I will give you an example of the kind of thing I am talking about. For many years the Liberal Party has been urging the adoption of

a new comprehensive Child Welfare Act. The hon. Minister finally appointed a committee to study the question of child welfare in May, 1961, and this committee issued their report in May, 1964, three years later. They made a thorough and complete study of the problems of child welfare of Ontario and I would like to read to you from their report. In their comments on page 45 the commissioners write:

The findings and recommendations of the Minister's committee on child care and adoption services reporting in 1953 are still valid, and many of the principal recommendations are repeated in the present report.

Thus, 12 years after the hon. Minister appoints a committee to report to him he appoints another committee which makes substantially the same recommendation. This, Mr. Chairman, is real progress. In the same report, and on the same page, if I can quote further, we find:

In 1954 the advisory committee on field services of the child welfare branch reported that the government had responsibility to help children's aid societies develop higher standards of services. A minimum of ten qualified child welfare supervisors and a full-time field service supervisor in the branch was recommended as necessary to fulfill this responsibility. The child welfare branch has been attempting to function with less than half this recommended minimum.

So, Mr. Chairman, 11 years after this committee's report we see that nothing has been done; that the child welfare branch has been attempting for the past 11 years to work with less than half the staff it should have as a minimum requirement. Finally the government brought in a child welfare bill, yet even it completely ignored the whole question of staff requirements and of inadequate welfare staffs in Ontario.

I will return to this question of staff in a few moments, but right now the point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is the great inaction of this department. It waited 12 years before bringing in an Act of this type, though it has been recommended before. Even then the department persisted in ignoring some of the most important and pressing problems in child welfare, just as it has consistently ignored them in the general welfare field.

In the same way, we have seen this department present a children's institutions bill during the 1962-63 session—a bill which

blatantly ignored several recommendations made by the hon. Minister's own committee—to examine children's institutional needs. As a further slight to the hon. members of this House and to the people of Ontario, and a further blot upon the concept of public welfare in this province, the hon. Minister refused—perhaps neglected is a better word—neglected for three years to table this report before this Legislature. Of course, this is all old news, but how indicative it is of the lethargy and inaction of this department.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we want is action. We do not want just any kind of action. We want positive, planned, co-ordinated action. We have seen that, during the past year, this department raised relief payments and mothers' allowances; but the fact that these two items were raised, while commendable itself, must be criticized because it is haphazard action, patchwork welfare and completely unrelated to 20th century concepts of welfare and present needs of the people of Ontario.

We saw last year that the welfare estimates increased by some 15 per cent or \$15 million. This year we see that they have further increased by some \$23 million, I think the hon. Minister said. We do not want to criticize these increases—indeed we feel that they are long overdue—but we do have some questions and some very serious doubts as to how this money is being spent. I can assure the hon. Minister that these questions will come out during the individual votes. In my introductory remarks, I would like to concentrate on the general philosophy of welfare services in Ontario in the middle of the 20th century and to point out the backwardness, the lack of co-ordination and the general inadequacy of The Department of Public Welfare in this province.

I remember the story of the psychology professor in a university who, year after year, set exactly the same questions on his final examination. Finally one day the dean of his department came to him and said: "Why do you persist in asking the same questions on all your examinations? Don't you think it is time for a change?" The professor answered: "No, the questions never change but the answers do." So it is, Mr. Chairman, with welfare services. The problems always remain the same; how do we assure equal opportunity to that portion of the population that has difficulty in making ends meet? The question never changes, but the answer does.

In the last century, the answer was relatively simple. It could be best summed up in the old adage: "The best government is

the one that governs least." This was the period of laissez-faire, of laissez-passar, when government had no positive role at all in guaranteeing equality of opportunity. Since that time the answer has been changing. It was demonstrated that the kind of freedom that existed in a laissez-faire society resulted in injustice for many people; not security, but insecurity. Only where justice and security are available to all can we speak with any relevance of equality of opportunity.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, the answer changed. Public welfare was introduced as a positive responsibility of government, necessary to provide the framework within which equality of opportunity could become a reality. A system of social policy and of public welfare was designed. But I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, that the social policy was designed for a particular set of social and economic conditions and is valid only within the framework of those conditions. Social and economic conditions are changing as they always have been changing, but today they are changing more rapidly than they ever have before. This rapid change in the social and economic framework of our society is threatening tremendous dislocation within our economy. Once again the answer to the perennial question of providing equality of opportunity is changing.

Let me quote to you, sir, from a paper by Professor John S. Morgan and Professor Albert Rose, both with the school of social work of the University of Toronto. This paper was presented to a conference on social security sponsored by the Canadian labour congress in March of this year. Professors Morgan and Rose write:

It has become fashionable for politicians, civil servants and even some academicians to dwell upon the remarkable difference between the so-called health and welfare expenditures in 1914, or even before 1930, and those of the 1960s as if this were the difference between social insecurity and social security. It has become fashionable as well to compare and contrast the nature and variety of the public and voluntary programmes in the health and welfare services of the period prior to World War I, with the public and voluntary programmes after World War II, as if this comparison, too, indicated that the millennium had arrived.

It is well to be aware of what we have accomplished in providing services to meet the needs of persons and families in the modern industrial society, but pride must always be tempered by reality. Even if

we were to achieve a national medical care scheme in Canada, within the next five years, we would really have managed to provide the framework for a programme of social security appropriate to the social and economic conditions of the quarter century which commenced in the fall of 1929.

I would like those remarks to stand, Mr. Chairman, as the background before which I lay my criticisms of The Department of Public Welfare and its patchwork hodge-podge of policies which attempt to solve the welfare riddle, but succeed only in further confusing the matter. Of course there are many things for which I could criticize this department, Mr. Chairman, and undoubtedly these will be recorded in the transcript of debate as we proceed with these estimates. At this time I would like to confine my remarks to three very general, and I might add, most revealing failures of The Department of Public Welfare and its Minister; failures which show clearly and unmistakably that the department and this government are using the wrong answers, the wrong approach to the problems of welfare in Ontario today.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I must criticize this department for its attitude toward money. We have heard the hon. Minister in this House in these estimates and in the estimates last year and in other years before that, proudly proclaim that he had increased mothers' allowances, that he had increased relief payments. It seems that every year the hon. Minister decides to increase some aspect of his welfare payments just around estimate time; a little bit here, a little bit there, but never enough.

I would respectfully suggest to the hon. Minister that money is not everything. We in the Liberal Party believe, sir, that the job of welfare cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents, but rather in terms of the quality of life. And in this modern age of rapid social and economic change I submit, sir, that the quality of life, the minimum standard of living which we must ensure for all the people of Ontario, is no longer related to income in the same way it has been. Once again, yesterday's answers are not suitable for today's problems.

We can see this attitude toward the quality of life expressed in the contracts of organized labour. Organized labour is concerned with the standard of life, not the mathematics of income. This can be seen in the new emphasis on fringe benefits in union contracts. We feel that a similarly enlightened approach should be found in welfare, but un-

fortunately it has not been forthcoming from this government. I suppose this is the lot of reactionary government, to be in the rear-guard of social change; but I think, sir, that the hon. members of this government would at least attempt to keep themselves informed by reading something else in the newspapers besides reports of Queen's Park.

In the last few months there have been several articles concerning welfare in the press. I am not going to quote these articles, because I am sure they will be quoted time and again and perhaps have been quoted before during the votes on these estimates, but I would like to read some of the titles of these newspaper reports and editorials for the benefit of the hon. Minister.

First, an editorial from my local paper, the *Ottawa Citizen*, entitled: "Ontario's Haphazard Welfare Services"; an editorial from the *Globe and Mail*, entitled: "Haphazard Welfare Threat to Welfare"; and an article from the *Toronto Daily Star*, entitled: "Ontario's Handling of Relief Blasted by Welfare Council."

There are many more of these articles, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to mention one or two more to support what I am saying about income and the standard of living.

First, an article from the *Globe and Mail* of this week where Mrs. Esther Peterson, Lyndon Johnson's special assistant for consumer affairs was quoted as saying:

The poor not only pay, they pay more, for food, more for clothing, more for shelter and more for credit.

And again, from the *Globe and Mail* of this past week, from an article entitled: "Welfare System Overall But Cuts in Aid to the Aged Urged"; I would like to quote, sir:

A great many aged persons have too much money for their easily satisfied needs and either turn it back to government in taxes or pass it on to relatives, who in the end are really the assisted persons. Yet at the same time there is inadequacy in the provision of housing and health care for the aged.

And this quote was from a talk by the dean of the social services at Laval University, Dr. J. M. Martin.

It serves, Mr. Chairman, to point up the repulsive attitude on the part of the department, that money is the answer for everything. We urge The Department of Public Welfare to take a more human attitude, to think in terms of people, in terms of situations, and not in terms of dollars and cents. We feel that welfare payments should be adjusted to

regions, adjusted to specific situations and not applied on an across-the-board formula which results in injustice and financial insecurity for many of Ontario's residents.

In addition we urge the department to reduce its obsession with dollars and cents. We realize that welfare payments are extremely small and that they should be, they must be, increased if justice is to be done in this province. But at the same time we say concentrate more on services: Concentrate on homemaking services, on housing services, homes for the aged, day nurseries; build up these services and you will be doing a far better job than increasing welfare payments alone.

I did notice that the hon. Minister mentioned something about these services I have mentioned, but I think that we can say in this case, as we have for other things: Too little, too late.

We would recommend, too, that new services be instituted, that something positive be done to try to get people who are on welfare reintegrated into the economy. This, above all, should be the chief goal of any welfare programme, we feel, and this above all, has been an area where the record of this department shows nothing but failure.

Again, the hon. Minister has mentioned that something is being done, but I say there should be a crash programme of rehabilitation of the welfare recipients. We sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that The Department of Public Welfare in Ontario comes to realize soon that the reason it exists is to serve the people and begins to take a more humanistic view of its functions in this province.

The second general criticism I must lay against the hon. Minister and his department, Mr. Chairman, is a charge of discrimination. This is not the blatant, obvious type of discrimination; it is subtle, it is devious; but it is the worst kind of discrimination. It is not easy to see because it is not directed against individuals. It is directed against a group of people, which makes it more despicable and most dangerous.

This is the intolerable attitude so prevalent throughout The Department of Public Welfare that people who accept welfare payments are somehow second-class citizens. Unfortunately, the idea still persists in this province that all those who take assistance are second-class citizens, shiftless or dishonest, to be punished for their poverty. I can cite numerous examples of this discriminatory—for that is the only word which describes it accurately—this discriminatory treatment in Ontario.

For example, at the Ontario welfare council conference this year a delegate from Peterborough charged that residents of this municipality were suffering without payment, and in some cases drugs, because of the abuse they receive from local officials. Mr. Chairman—this is in the official records and I am sure the hon. Minister has a copy of that document—I can cite another, more specific example. David Freeman is a 21-year-old victim of cerebral palsy. He has been carrying on a campaign to educate the public to the fact that cerebral palsy victims are in no way inferior mentally, and should not be treated as if they were retarded. David Freeman wrote an article for *Maclean's* magazine this past year in which he talked frankly about his experiences with The Ontario Department of Public Welfare, and I would like to quote to you from that article. Mr. Freeman writes:

From my own experience, I think these people—

he is referring to the people in The Department of Public Welfare:

—have not realized that the CP—cerebral palsy—is a human being. The first time I quit the CP workshop, I was advised to seek the help of a welfare worker. He told me to go back to the workshop for the time being, which I reluctantly agreed to do. But I went one day a week to him to discuss my problem, thinking that he would eventually find something better for me.

Then, one day, even knowing how much I disliked the workshop, he told me that this was the best thing for me to do because "I learned about people there." A week later, I quit the workshop for good and nothing he could say would make me return. However, he had been trying to get me to accept the government disability pension, so I finally did. Now I was unemployed, disillusioned, and totally fed up with life, but, once I accepted the pension, according to him, life was fine again. He couldn't get me out of his office fast enough.

Out of short-sightedness, or else simple lack of ambition, welfare and social workers are in too much of a hurry to brand us "unemployable" and to make the public pension the final step.

That article was written by Mr. Freeman on July 4, 1964. He was paid \$400 for it by *Maclean's* magazine, and on March 2, 1965, The Ontario Department of Public Welfare took away a great part of David

Freeman's disability pension. Because of the \$400 he was paid by the magazine, David Freeman was rewarded by The Ontario Department of Public Welfare with a cut in his pension of \$32.96 a month.

Mr. Chairman, if this is not an example of discrimination I do not know what is. Where is the encouragement The Department of Public Welfare should be giving to people like David Freeman? Indeed, where is the understanding? I know the hon. Minister will say "That is the law, that is what we have to do. He made more money than he was allowed, and we had to take it back." Well, sir, I say to that, the hon. Minister is responsible for changing the law. Ministers of the Crown are the last ones who should be allowed to throw up their hands and say: "The law's the law, and there is nothing we can do about it."

There are other atrocities in The Department of Public Welfare. There is Jamie, there are the caged boys, but most important, there are the hundreds of thousands of people in this province, ordinary average people, who are subtly and continuously made to feel aware that they are somehow inferior, somehow different. This unjust situation must be remedied, Mr. Chairman, and it calls for a complete reorientation of attitude on the part of the department and the hon. Minister. To illustrate what I mean, I would like to read into the record this editorial from the *Globe and Mail* of February 16, 1965.

Welfare Minister Louis Cecile's continuing ignorance of the work of his department is a wondrous thing.

I am not saying that, Mr. Chairman, this is the *Globe and Mail*.

Thursday, he told the Legislature's committee on health, education and welfare, that very few persons on welfare lists were employable. Apparently he had not seen the report prepared in the office of his Deputy Minister, Mr. James Band, and published last April of a demonstration project concerning 100 long-term welfare families. The gist of the report was that, after counselling, 42 per cent of the families left the welfare rolls, 21 per cent because they had found employment. That is not "very few." Evidently, Mr. Cecile still believes that most persons on welfare are not good for anything else.

This, sir, is a most deplorable attitude, especially on the part of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

The third criticism I must make of this department is a revealing lack of co-ordination in welfare services; a lack of

co-ordination within the various departments concerned; a lack of co-ordination between the province and the municipalities; and a lack of co-ordination even among the various services provided.

In the first place, the fact that welfare services are so broad and include so much, necessitates some interdepartmental division of responsibilities. Some welfare services are under The Department of Health, some under The Department of Labour, some under The Department of Education. Dealing only with child welfare for a moment, we can see that in this one branch of welfare services, no less than four departments are involved. The children's aid societies are the responsibility of The Department of Public Welfare; the Ontario hospitals and the Ontario hospital schools for mentally ill or emotionally disturbed children are under The Department of Health; the training schools for delinquent children are under The Department of Reform Institutions; and the schools for deaf and blind children are under The Department of Education.

The lack of co-ordination in these departments is appalling. We recommend, sir, that a Cabinet committee be set up to co-ordinate the work of these various departments, to prevent unnecessary duplication and to assure justice and equality of treatment to the individual citizen. We feel this is an urgent requirement, and hope that the hon. Minister will keep the best interests of the people foremost in considering the establishment of such a committee.

The second problem of co-ordination is co-ordination between the province and the municipalities. The way I understand it, the system now in force makes the province responsible for setting the maximum payments per month to a family, and then matching the payments of the municipalities up to a maximum of half the ceiling. Thus, if the ceiling set by the province is \$300 a month and the municipality pays \$25, then the province too pays \$25. If the municipality pays \$150, then the province pays \$150. But if the municipality pays \$200, then, as I understand it, and if I am wrong I wish the hon. Minister would correct me, the province still pays only \$150.

If this is the case—and I believe it is—then it is clearly discriminatory. It discriminates against the people who live in the poorer municipalities. We do not believe that welfare payments should be uniform throughout the province. But we certainly feel that this is not the best way of attaining the flexibility that is so necessary to an adequate welfare programme. We would much rather see

welfare grants proportioned to the regional cost of living, not to the wealth or poverty of a particular region of Ontario.

Earlier this year the Ontario welfare council expressed its concern that municipalities have the final say on who receives welfare allowances and how much, yet they contribute the smallest amount of the cost. We feel that this whole area of provincial-municipal co-ordination and sharing of responsibilities should receive serious attention and study in the near future.

The third problem of co-ordination is that of services. There seems to be a trend toward categorizing services and a definite movement away from working within the family framework. We feel this is bad and should be corrected. We find that different members of the same family have to come to different branches, deal with different personnel and go through different red tape to receive welfare services. Even more appalling we find, as the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) pointed out in these estimates last year, that different branches make different payments for the same service. The hon. member pointed out last year and I would just like to re-emphasize what he said—that a mother with six fatherless children, under general welfare assistance, receives less money than does a mother with six fatherless children under mothers' allowance payments. Now surely such an anomaly points to the fact that greater co-ordination of services within this department are necessary.

We would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this problem be attacked immediately, and that the guiding philosophy of the department be to use the family as a unit—working through the family as a unit—wherever possible in providing welfare services.

Before sitting down, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to briefly go over some of the other failures of this department. I will not be too long on these because I can assure the House that they will be coming up again and again as we go through the votes.

The first point, sir, is the actual amount of relief payments. As we are all aware they were recently increased by something like 15 per cent according to the *Globe and Mail*. This means that where a family of six previously received a maximum of \$220.05 monthly in the winter—which included fuel allowance—it can now receive \$253.30. For a family of six this works out to about \$42.21 per person per month; or to about \$1.07 per person per day in the winter. Stop and think about that; \$1.07 a day. We in the Liberal Party are very pleased that these payments

were increased, Mr. Chairman. We feel that this has been long overdue, but \$1.07 a day? Remember, sir, that this is the maximum. In some municipalities, I believe in most municipalities, recipients of welfare will not even get that much. Mr. Chairman, this is not social policy or social justice. If it were not so serious, I would say that the hon. Minister was trying to be funny.

We have many more criticisms and questions to ask of this department during the estimates, Mr. Chairman. We are appalled at the reports in the Toronto papers that the child welfare branch lost four of its expert staff in seven months, and that staff conflicts within the department are becoming the rule rather than the exception. We are appalled at this. We are shocked at the jungle of red tape that faced Mrs. Shirley Hansen and her three children when they tried to receive temporary help this past April.

We are amazed to find that there are 400 to 500 people daily in the waiting rooms of regional welfare offices in Toronto. As I say, sir, these matters will be brought up again during these estimates; and again and again until finally we can get some action on the part of the department to replace its band-aid approach to welfare with a positive, integrated programme of service and assistance to the people of Ontario.

Before sitting down, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some positive suggestions for the improvement of welfare services in this province. During the past week, and especially over the weekend, we heard many rumours and read in the press that it was expected that the hon. Minister of The Department of Public Welfare might be replaced. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that changing the Minister will not change much in this province's administration of welfare. I am glad to see that the fact that welfare is not being handled properly is being acknowledged, if not officially, at least by the press.

But I would like to say that it is not the hon. Minister who is at fault. Rather, it is the philosophy of welfare services of this whole government. This philosophy is outdated, Mr. Chairman. It is an answer to the problem, which was valid once, but is no longer valid. It is, as I said before, a band-aid approach to welfare. The government waits until an emergency develops or until the estimates are about to come up and then rushes in with band-aids, sticking plasters and props. There is no direction, system of priorities or integration in Ontario welfare services.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, that a Royal commission be established to review the whole system of public welfare in Ontario. That this commission be instructed specifically to review the philosophy of public assistance, the regional disparities in living costs and welfare services, the emphasis on providing more services relative to cash payments and the whole problem of co-ordination of services and co-ordination of agencies. I would hope that this commission would be able to clearly define the role of the family, the role of the municipality and the role of the province.

I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that only by such positive action will we make any progress in solving the welfare riddle in this province and find the right answers for the third quarter of the 20th century.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, this is a calm, placid and tranquil atmosphere that prevails in the House this afternoon and I do not intend to drastically upset it. I shall, from time to time, become a little exercised in what I have to say, but not perhaps with the ferocity which was characteristic of these estimates last year.

I must say that I think, in this department at any rate—and it must be said frankly and honestly—we have made some considerable progress since 1964; that in the various fields which the hon. Minister himself has outlined, he must in truth be commended.

Like my hon. friend from Ottawa East, I do not wish to see the hon. Minister necessarily depart with alacrity. I do not think that a shift in Ministers will necessarily solve some of the very difficult problems in public welfare in Ontario. I also suspect that the speculation does nothing other than to undermine some of the morale and some of the stability.

At the outset of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, let me say on behalf of this party that we wish, through the hon. Minister, to extend to his deputy the best possible convalescence. As is well known in this House, the indispensability of Mr. Band to the department is now legendary and one cannot but wish him a speedy recovery and return to this particular office.

A detailed criticism of this department, I think, can justifiably be left to some of the individual branches and the individual items as they arise. The branches as they are laid out leave us an entire spectrum of analysis. Hon. members of this party intend to subject some of those branches to a careful critique. I shall not overdo things now by indulging in unnecessary detail.

I want to relate myself primarily to the hon. Minister's own field. I want to relate my remarks to the first two pages of his manuscript, to the all-embracing nature of the changes imminent in The Department of Public Welfare. I want to agree with him that it is time for a sweeping and total reorganization of welfare services and programmes in the province of Ontario, and that indeed the time is propitious.

The hon. Minister, if I understand it correctly, will be in Ottawa for a conference of welfare Ministers some time in July. As he himself pointed out, the embryonic outline of The Canada Assistance Act is now before the nation. There is obviously a good deal of flexibility within which to work and I should like to suggest, on behalf of my party this afternoon, what the hon. Minister should in fact be saying when he goes to Ottawa next month, and saying in categorical and unequivocal terms.

Indeed, the one aspect of his speech which I found a little disheartening was the reservations and qualifications that couched some of the language where the essence of this department is concerned.

Like my hon. friend from Ottawa East, I have a generalization to make at the outset. Ontario's present welfare pattern is a crumbling mosaic. It is characterized by a good deal of chaos and a large measure of futility. It is guided by principles of budgetary control, rather than by principles of human rehabilitation and self-sufficiency. It is this philosophic rationale which undermines much of the department's work. It is in many ways a series of partitions; in fact partition, I think, is the best word to describe this department. It is a department of arbitrary rules, of competing administrative procedures, of overlapping Acts, of an impossibly complicated network of provincial-municipal authority which cannot be coherently assembled.

In a sense, Mr. Chairman, The Department of Public Welfare is a department of last resort. It is the whipping boy for the rest of this government. After all, The Department of Public Welfare primarily compensates for the deficiencies of all the other departments of government. The extent of involvement of The Department of Public Welfare simply points up the social and economic irresponsibility of the rest of the government, and The Department of Public Welfare then becomes last ditch—

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Nonsense!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, how the neanderthal personalities are pricked by suggestions that all is not well in public welfare, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I may say that public welfare itself is an odious and unpleasant term. It is characteristic of the entire philosophy behind the department, and before I retire to my seat I am going to suggest an alternative name for this department which I think will be rather more meaningful in the public mind.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the attitude which prevails—and I am not going to document all the facets because it has been done time and time again in this House and very effectively—the attitude which prevails need not be. There are entirely new roles open and possible. Some of the most exciting concepts currently in vogue in North America, in the United Kingdom, in Scandinavia, relate to areas of public and social assistance. The guaranteed annual wage, the income maintenance programme, the differential use of social workers and welfare workers and volunteers, the emphasis on planning and research, of which this department is frankly devoid; all of these things give an exciting substance to the department which it presently now lacks but may one day acquire.

I listened to my hon. friend in the Liberal Party and I listened to the hon. Minister when he talked about research; and I have to smile, because the research projects that we discuss in this House, are a series of much trumpeted pilot schemes which are just another costume in the welfare masquerade.

Imagine coming into this House and saying that there was something of great significance in having provided special counselling services to 100 long-term chronic cases, and that because of those special counselling services great things were achieved. Some people, 42 per cent, were taken off the welfare roles. And then we think that we have stumbled on a revelation in the year 1965, that if you give people a little more counselling the possibilities of rehabilitation is somehow greater. That was an accomplished fact 100 years ago. It does not take a Conservative government in the middle of the 1960s to prove that obvious truth. And that does not pass for research in the province of Ontario in The Department of Public Welfare. It passes as a substitute, as a façade—in a sense as a method of diverting attention—but it is not of itself sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, not only is the welfare fabric inadequate, but in terms of a nation

as a whole it is probably the worst in Canada. Ontario spends the lowest percentage of its provincial budget on public welfare of any province in Canada. Let me read the figures into the record:

Quebec, 10.6 per cent; Newfoundland, 10.5 per cent; Manitoba, 10.4 per cent; Alberta, 10 per cent; Prince Edward Island, 10.4 per cent; Saskatchewan, 7.9 per cent; British Columbia, 7.9 per cent; Nova Scotia, 6.8 per cent; New Brunswick, 6.8 per cent.

Mr. McKeough: It does not prove a thing!

Mr. S. Lewis: An average across the country, Mr. Chairman, of eight per cent expended on welfare and social assistance, and in the province of Ontario five per cent. Now, the hon. members of the Conservative Party would wish to delude themselves into thinking that this was somehow a manifestation of prosperity in Ontario.

Mr. McKeough: Why do you not read the unemployment figures?

Mr. S. Lewis: It is not at all, Mr. Chairman. It is a manifestation only of arbitrary categories and of the hopeless level of allowances and of the desperate areas of need; of nothing more. To pretend that it is because there are differential unemployment statistics is frankly irrelevant.

Mr. McKeough: Nonsense!

Mr. S. Lewis: Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Kent West becomes more animated during the welfare estimates than during any other estimates of this House, but we will forgive him that, Mr. Chairman. The mien of the country yeoman gentleman farmer does not fit very well with welfare, one can understand a certain gap in values.

However, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that another interesting aspect in comparison with Canada as a whole should also be noted. It is simply this: that Ontario forces its municipalities to pay a greater proportion of the social assistance costs than any other province in Canada. And let me tell you, Mr. Chairman—that is not only discriminatory, it is profoundly unfair. It results in gross inequality, and in a total emasculation of services in one part of the province after another.

Again, what is the percentage? Across the board in the province of Ontario, fully 30.5 per cent of the welfare costs are assumed by the municipalities. The closest to that is New Brunswick at 19.1 per cent, and the average across Canada is 13 per cent. Indeed, Mr.

Chairman, the disparity in understanding, the lack of comprehension in this province, is nowhere better dramatized than in the onus of responsibility it puts on municipalities whose backs are presently so laden that you have to have special one-man commissions to re-evaluate entire municipal structures. If anyone wants to know, incidentally, where some of these figures are coming from, they the coming from this authoritative document, *Provincial Finances, 1965*, from the Canadian tax foundation. They are figures, of course, which the hon. Minister's department has itself submitted.

Now, let me take another point, Mr. Chairman, because it conflicts rather strongly and, I think, importantly, with some of the things the hon. Minister has said. In all of the supplementary assistance programmes in Canada, in those provinces which are in any way comparable to Ontario, Ontario gives less, and is more arbitrary and restrictive in its patterns of giving. More is given by Quebec, more is given by British Columbia, by Manitoba, by Alberta, by Saskatchewan than by the province of Ontario in all the supplementary allowances.

And who does the supplementary allowance affect, Mr. Chairman? It affects those on old age assistance; it affects disabled persons; it affects blind persons. These are the people that the province of Ontario discriminates against. Then the hon. Minister comes into this House and has the effrontery—I know no other word for it—to read into the record the following, and I will quote him:

We have, on many occasions, expressed dissatisfaction with the restrictive features of the federal-provincial agreement under which we must administer the categorical programmes, old-age assistance, blind and disabled persons' allowances.

What does he mean, "the restrictive features"? In these areas of allowance, in the western provinces a supplementary assistance related to need is given without any maximum whatsoever. In the province of Ontario, supplementary assistance is given by municipal administrators to a maximum of \$20 a month, of which the province assumes \$16 in its overwhelming sense of largesse, plenitude and benevolence. Mr. Chairman, social assistance in its meaningful sense; social assistance which overcomes the abhorrent categories; social assistance which rehabilitates people and gives them a sense of self-sufficiency rather than maintaining them in a state of social deprivation; that kind of social assistance is available to all provinces now. It is not restricted by the present category; it is restricted only by

the truancy of the Conservative government opposite.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to note also that this is the only province in Canada which, to this day, has yet to indicate that it will not participate in the federal Department of Health and Welfare's total survey of manpower training. It is the only province which did not participate in the 1951 to 1954 survey, the only province which has not given its OK as yet. The reason, Mr. Chairman, is patently obvious.

The humiliation that Ontario would feel when the nature of our staff allocations were revealed would barely justify taking the survey at all. But let it be said that the survey must be taken, and we must some day—indeed, before these estimates are over—know what the manpower requirements are.

Now because I was goaded into some vigorous statements by some of the hon. members to the left of me—it hurts me to use that term in that way—I shall retreat to a more reasoned and sober evaluation.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that the attitude which prevails in Ontario, and which is comparable in certain of the other provinces, but is rather more pronounced here than in any of the other provinces in Canada, is an attitude which is both insensitive and self-centred. It is essentially an attitude of a parochial potentate handing out alms to the undeserving poor. It is far too prevalent in our welfare administration. We in this party are desperately afraid that you will miss the great opportunity which the Canada assistance plan presents, so let this party suggest, Mr. Chairman, what this government should now do.

The fundamental measure in the major reorganization which is necessary, is to abolish, all the cost-sharing programmes, all the categorical aid programmes with their invidious means tests, and substitute one general social assistance Act based on a needs test formula. Do not merely contemplate it, as the hon. Minister does in his speech; do not discuss it in generalities, but state it categorically. Tell us that you are going to the conference in July, 1965, and that that is what you are going to ask for. And stand on the floor of this House and say, as I am about to say now, Mr. Chairman, that the Legislature should repeal at its earliest possible opportunity the assistance to dependent fathers, the assistance to widows and unmarried women, the general welfare assistance, the supplementary aid, the mothers' allowance programme, old age assistance, blind persons' agreement, disabled persons' agreement, and

substitute a comprehensive, all-embracing, general social assistance Act based on a needs test formula.

Let me add, because I think it is important to put this on the record, that there would be every wisdom and justification for old age assistance and blind persons' agreements and disabled persons' agreements to be provided at the point of eligibility without any means test whatsoever at the rate of \$75 a month; that those three programmes can continue on that basis and over and above that, the general social assistance plan will prevail. But the welter of other confused cost-sharing programmes should go out the window and we should have this one general social assistance project.

Like the hon. Minister I have been rather interested in discussions with the federal government, and I am reminded that the stage is set. I am reminded of the speech of the hon. federal Minister of Health and Welfare, Judy LaMarsh, when she spoke in Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown on May 20 of this year, and said, and I quote:

The idea of the Canada assistance plan is that assistance will be provided on the basis of real need. This means that both the size of an individual family, and the costs in a particular area, will be taken into account.

She goes on to say:

The Canada assistance plan, intended to be available across the country, will supplant eventually present means test assistance programmes with one general new needs approach. And the target date for implementation is April 1, 1966.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that if the target date for implementation is on the basis which the hon. Minister described in his opening remarks, then I hope that target date never comes. If we are to have a comprehensive statute based on the budgetary provisions presently prevailing, then we are to have a comprehensive statute for sustained subsistence living, and nothing more. We are to have a comprehensive statute for maintaining people in a state of economic penury, and no more, and I intend to demonstrate rather concretely in a short time, with comparisons from material available.

First, Mr. Chairman, let me deal for a moment with this vexing subject of categories again. We have tolerated categories for far too long in this province. I suspect the instincts of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare are honourable ones. I suspect that his trouble is with his Treasury board, and if so, I do not know what animates that kind

of mentality, because it was within the right of the province to alter the categorical features of several of the programmes they presently administer. They have refused to do so, and if they did not alter the categorical features then it was perfectly within their rights to extend supplementary assistance, and they have not done so. Something is profoundly wrong in that conscienceless crew of the Treasury bench. I hope that this general assistance proposition will somehow provide a remedial measure.

Let me point out to you that Saskatchewan abolished the means test categories in its social aid programmes two decades ago for a great many areas. Let me point out to you that British Columbia, Alberta and Manitoba have abolished the invidious and odious categorical features of several plans over the last several years, but that in Ontario we remain reactionary and inflexible. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, even in the province of Quebec—I do not mean that in a denigrating way—incredible strides have been made.

The finest document on social assistance I have ever read in this country has just come out of the province of Quebec, and it is called "Reports of the Study Committee on Public Assistance"—the Boucher report. It is probably the best provincial analysis that has been provided. The Minister and the hon. member for Ottawa East have doubtless read it in the original. I had to read it in translation. It loses much of its flavour, but the flavour that is there is expressed with vigour and without hesitation. One cannot commend this report sufficiently.

It agrees and recommends to government—and it does not couch it in all kinds of qualifying verbiage—on the scrapping of all these other programmes. It agrees on the reorganization of regional welfare units. It agrees on the differential social work, welfare worker pattern; and it presents concrete recommendations to government.

I do not want to fall into the paths of the Ontario welfare council and the hon. member for Ottawa East and say we should have another Royal commission. We have a plenitude of commissions in this government already as we go from one commission to another. We have enough evidence available now on which to base a concrete programme. But listen, for a moment, to what the Boucher committee report said about categories; and I have never seen it said this way in a public document before, so I want to put it on the floor of this House.

Until now, categorization has been practised chiefly for administrative convenience, and not with possible rehabilita-

tion in mind. The category is based on the immediate cause of the recipient's present situation and not on a testament of his potential self sufficiency. He is administratively established in a situation which should be modified at all costs, yet nothing indicates to the staff of the department whether this or that case in a certain category is likely to make progress.

Well, it certainly could not indicate it to the staff of this department, a department addicted as it is to categories, and a field staff with a case load of 396 per worker. I do not know what could possibly commend itself to such a staff, except a year-long vacation. I go on to quote from the Boucher report:

As conceived and applied at present, categories lead to excessive rigidity and unrealistic stringency between groups who are thereby often permanently labelled. Consequently, it becomes difficult to incite some of these recipients to live by their own resources, when a whole vast, administrative structure condemns them to permanent social deprivation, by not trying to rehabilitate them on the one hand, and by quasi-final categorization on the other hand. When a change is made from one category to the other, it is for reasons of classification and not because of a successful attempt to guide a person toward ultimate independence from public funds.

Now a more apt summary of the prevailing welfare pattern in Ontario could not have been written.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Has this been adopted by the Quebec government?

Mr. S. Lewis: It most certainly has been adopted. Much to my chagrin it is a Liberal government that is adopting it, but I assume that ultimately it will commend itself even to a Conservative government.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): What is wrong with that?

Mr. S. Lewis: I just said, "much to my chagrin"; do not become excited, gentlemen. Mr. Chairman, one of the interesting things about the—

Mr. Bukator: What does "chagrin" mean?

Mr. S. Lewis: It is in a dictionary, my hon. friend, it is easily accessible. One of the interesting things, Mr. Chairman, is that the categories to which the department assigns

people, with which the hon. members of this House are familiar, relate not at all to needs. We watch cases—I am sure I speak for every hon. member of this House—come across our desks in that inimitable fashion of letters from the Deputy Minister, and they are moved from disabled persons' allowance to dependent fathers' allowance to general welfare assistance, and from mothers' allowance to general welfare assistance; from one category to another category, and they never relate whatsoever to the rehabilitative factors involved.

They relate only to the administrative facility. We cart people around from category to category, giving them a few dollars more here or a few dollars less there, never once approximating the needs for self-sufficiency. We are obsessed in this province, Mr. Chairman, with questions of eligibility, of permissible income, of amounts to be paid and of enforcement procedure. The entire emphasis is on the stark financial control rather than the rehabilitation of people, and it is time that ended.

Now let me simply remind the House of a few of the features that the hon. member for Ottawa East mentioned. I, too, would like to mention a couple. The widows and unmarried women's allowance, a special category created at the age of 60. At the age of 59, a widow finds herself on general welfare assistance; then, by some miraculous transformation, at the age of 60, the same woman finds herself in the widows and unmarried women's allowance. No logic whatsoever, no relationship to need whatsoever.

Or take the supplementary assistance for such indispensable things as drugs. For the aged and the blind and the disabled, not a penny more than \$20 a month. If the drugs cost \$40 or \$50, not a penny more. An arbitrary ceiling and, again, no relationship to need. Or take the maximum allowable income for a blind person who is married. To get an allowance, he can have a maximum allowable income of \$2,580 a year. The maximum allowable income for a totally disabled person who is married is \$2,220 a year. A difference of \$330. Why, Mr. Chairman? I challenge the hon. Minister to rise and tell us why. Where is the sanity in that kind of arbitrary division of maximum allowable income?

Further, if you are blind or disabled, no allowable liquid assets are given when requiring some kind of assistance. No doubt that is to discourage affluence. You would not want disabled people to be opulent in this society—after all, it would be inconsistent with

the Tory concept of disability. But for unmarried women, whose plight may be more severe or less severe, we have a maximum allowable liquid asset of \$1,000. Again, totally irrational. No judgment whatsoever. No analysis whatsoever. No justification whatsoever. Just arbitrary figures.

As far as disabled persons and dependent fathers are concerned, the definitions which are given in the statutes in this province make it incomprehensible to place a person in either one or the other. Indeed, to shift a person from dependent father's allowance to general welfare assistance is often an incomprehensible feature, again subject to these absurd and irrelevant categories.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that if an unemployable unemployed man has a wife and a family, he gets a dependent father's allowance. If he is an employable unemployed man, with the same wife and family, he gets a general welfare assistance allowance that is considerably less. What makes the needs of his wife and family any different in the one case than in the other? The only thing that makes the needs different is that the Conservative government feels that somehow the employable unemployed are the undeserving poor, the reprobates of society—at the lower end of the social and economic scale. Somehow they should not have the degree of opportunity and self-sufficiency that is given to others.

One of the things which very much interested me when this government handed down—with all the fanfare and pride that was attendant on it—its new scales for general welfare assistance and mother's allowance, was to put them together; and I did so, side by side. I ask the hon. Minister another question, and I assume that when we come to the proper branch, he will answer it. For a mother living alone, with two children, one under the age of three and one over the age of ten: if she is on mother's allowance she gets \$87.15 a month; if she is on general welfare assistance, she gets \$70.15 a month. In other words, a difference of \$17 a month. In the one case she may be a deserted wife who has not heard from her husband and so is eligible for mother's allowance. In the other case she may be a deserted wife who has heard from her husband from time to time, but he is not paying a penny into the family and so she is only eligible for general welfare assistance.

Now, what difference is there in the mother and the children involved that you arbitrarily discriminate to the tune of \$17 a month between these categories? What is wrong

with the mentality over there, Mr. Chairman? How do the Ministers sleep with their conscience at night; or perhaps the collective conscience is precisely what is lacking, because it makes no sense whatsoever. There is exactly the same human need, but a totally different set of allowances; and let it be said that these are deplorable allowances. The hon. Minister should have been ashamed to announce the increases that came into this House not so long ago, and I shall demonstrate very shortly for the record precisely why.

My hon. friend from Ottawa East mentioned the David Freeman case. I do not want to go into that case any further than he did, but it was a dramatic illustration of this government penalizing people for efforts to improve their own self-sufficiency, penalizing them for an effort at self-rehabilitation. This is not a department of public welfare, it is a department of public warfare. Consistently and premeditatedly, human beings are damaged by the callousness that characterizes so much of our categorical aid programme.

Now it is patently evident, Mr. Chairman, that drastic changes are needed. All these programmes involve, according to the analysis of the year 1963, some 170,000 people in the province monthly; no less, 170,000 people a month. So if we can call for a repeal of all existing programmes governed by the means test and establish this general social assistance Act governed by a needs test, I think we will have what can amount to a general social code in the province of Ontario to govern our whole framework of public assistance legislation.

But I want to do something, Mr. Chairman, at this point in the Legislature. That is to spell out just once the essential difference between the means test and the needs test. The two terms are used too often interchangeably and too often in a facile fashion.

The hon. Minister can correct me if I am wrong, but as I understand the means test: We will let *A* equal a predetermined arbitrary income, an absolute sum from which there is no deviation; then *B* will equal the present income of the family involved and whatever will be acceptable by the allowable income, the hours of work and whatever is rejected as non-essentials.

In our means test formulation, Mr. Chairman: Telephones are non-essentials, street car tickets are non-essentials, television set viewing is a non-essential; all the things that the rest of society assume as a matter of convenience, for the undeserving general welfare

assistance recipient is a non-essential, including transportation and telephone. It is another interesting observation on the mentality of the welfare department.

Well, if *A* equals the arbitrary figure and *B* equals the actual income so-called, then *C* is the allowance. It is what we pay, the difference, and it is called the budgetary deficit. It is the difference between the income that people receive and the arbitrary ceiling that is imposed. That is a means test and there is no room for flexibility within it.

Now on a needs test, Mr. Chairman, it is a rather different proposition. *A* is equal to the actual family expenditure based on the actual family need. It is not an arbitrary figure. It is the actual family need. *B* is again the examination of the income which prevails, and it accepts all kinds of things which give a sense of self-worth and self-sufficiency. It does not discriminate against people because they find themselves in difficult economic situations. *C* then becomes the difference again, the budgetary deficit again.

But in this instance it is the difference between what the people presently have and what they really need, rather than an arbitrary maximum figure.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Who decides what they need?

Mr. S. Lewis: I am coming to that, and that difference makes all the difference in the world, because you inject into your public welfare framework an entirely new psychology.

Now let this much be said, Mr. Chairman: In some small degree the hon. Minister agrees, because in his opening remarks he talked about a budgetary method of establishing need. He talked about a pre-added budget. He may not have used those terms, but I am sure he subscribes to them. They operate now within his department, and so in one sense we are on the same wavelength.

I want to make one or two points clear, because one of the things which my hon. friend from Eglinton has hinted in the wings is quite valid. The needs test is not a panacea and no one has ever claimed it is. The needs test does not eliminate the necessity of interviewing people and of establishing certain factors. Obviously we need some frame of reference, obviously we need some formula of standard which will apply. But within that formula, Mr. Chairman, within those standards, the needs test applies far

more equitably than the harsh realities of the means test approach.

The four basic ingredients of the needs test—I shall outline them—are these:

1. The economic and social setting; 2. The characteristics of the persons receiving the assistance; 3. The circumstances which create the state of indigence; 4. The duration of the state of indigence.

It is important, of course, in a needs test, to analyze the duration, because short-term people may require a little less than long term, so these are features that have to be worked in. Now that gives us a compromise, that gives us the compromise which the Ontario government has chosen to call its pre-added budget.

Well, its pre-added budget in this province, Mr. Chairman, I hope will never relate to the general social assistance Act which we have in mind, because that budget imposes a sub-standard scale.

It is harmful in itself. It appears to the recipient to be calculated by a committee of 20th century Scrooges for whom there can be no redemption. Indeed, I am going to give a precise financial comparison to this House so that they grasp the total measure of the disparity.

The most vivid comparison possible is that between the government pre-added budgets and this superb guide for family budgeting put out by the social planning council in Toronto. Mr. Chairman, this guide was drawn up by the best possible people in the field. Every item was scrutinized by a panel of experts. It is broken down into the smallest particles of concern and the definition which precedes this guide may be of interest to the House:

The level provided is sufficiently above the subsistence-survival level as to be consistent with the maintenance of good health and a sense of self-respect, yet considerably below any level of living that could be called luxurious.

The report goes on to say:

The various categories in this report include all consumer goods and services identified as bare or conventional necessities and a selection from those commonplace ones which are so important to the social and emotional well-being of families that they rank with necessities. No luxuries are included.

I suppose that the parting stage is at the level of social and emotional well-being. That is doubtless where we part company, for this guide for budgeting includes in its analysis

the following range: Food, clothing, home furnishings, household operation, personal care, transportation, school, leisure time needs and personal discretionary needs. And, Mr. Chairman, removing the categories of shelter and heating and medical care, which are provided by this government separately and which are provided in this budget separately, let me tell the House what the budget finds. For a mother with two children in the province of Ontario, a girl under three and a boy over ten, under general welfare assistance the province provides \$70.15 or \$841.80 per annum; under mother's allowance, they are provided with \$87.15 a month, or \$905.80 per annum.

According to the guide for family budgeting by the social planning council, an absolute minimum, non-luxury guide, the budget is \$150.91 per month or \$1,810.92 per annum. In other words, in one category after another, the schedules established by this government are fully \$1,000 a year below what is called a subsistence survival level. And I have not made any comparisons with shelter, medical care and heating which would make it even greater. But the schedules are anywhere from \$1,000 at the bottom of the scale, to \$2,200 at the top of the scale, below a subsistence survival level.

That is why the province of Ontario only provides five per cent of its provincial budget for welfare matters. Not because of any plenitude in the rest of this society, but because of the hopelessly inadequate level of payment, and because of the pretensions that accompany those payments.

One other thing should be stressed, Mr. Chairman. When you have established a general social assistance Act, based on a needs test, you can shift from the pre-occupation with money, to an emphasis on services. The social workers, or the welfare workers, or the volunteer workers involved, can begin to provide for the family a spectrum of services in the community. They will not be totally preoccupied with ascertaining eligibility and income levels, and maximum allowances, and all the other paraphernalia and trappings with which we clutter our categorical aid programme. There will be a shift in emphasis to service and away from financial obsession.

Further, Mr. Chairman, as a part of this total programme, we will need in the province of Ontario a board of revision—an appeal board—and I want to quote recommendation 59, from the *Quebec Social Assistance Study*. It says:

The department should institute a re-

vision board where any applicant or beneficiary of assistance who feels that he or she has been wronged, may vindicate his or her rights.

The report goes on to comment in this way, and I thought it a rather interesting comment in view of what happens in the province of Ontario:

The creation of a revision board would cause the elimination of the numerous recourses to third party, such as members of Parliament, political organizers and other so-called persons in authority.

Let me pause at this point to make one point clear. It gives everyone in this party immense satisfaction that when they get an harassed welfare case, or some recipient who has been hard done by, or discriminated against by a myopic and intransigent welfare officer somewhere in some suburb, it does all our hearts good to be able to telephone the Deputy Minister and say, "Can you look after this problem?" and know that something is likely to happen.

But I say without any reservation, Mr. Chairman, that that is not the way to run a welfare apparatus in the province of Ontario. You should remove the discriminatory features at the source; remove the need of intervention of third parties. And if there is some area of discrimination, you provide a regularized board of review or revision, and you do not litter it with political patronage.

There is something to be said for politicians serving their constituents to the best of their ability, and providing the channels and the referrals wherever it is humanly possible. But they should not be the main course of referral. There should be boards of review for those respondents and recipients who are unhappy about their claim.

More important, all these things at source should be provided with a more enlightened regional welfare apparatus so that your municipal administrators are not arbitrarily restricting people because of their own preconceptions of what makes the worth of a man; whether he has done what he should for his family; whether his family falls into such-and-such a category. For far too long in the province of Ontario, countless numbers of people have been arbitrarily abused; have received less than they are entitled to because of the operation of municipal authorities in the far-flung corners of the province.

It is nothing new that I am saying. It has been said again and again by the Ontario welfare council, by the social planning council, by the Canadian welfare council and

by every agency in the field in their call for new units of administration, a greater degree of enlightenment and a greater degree of skill and training amongst the workers involved.

While I congratulate the department on the facility with which it responds to individual requests, I say that that in itself is not an answer. The answer is far more fundamental, and must be taken cognizance of.

So, Mr. Chairman, we should have a general social assistance Act based on a needs test, eliminating all these cost-sharing and categorical programmes. You would have a board review providing a channel of review for the recipients involved. You would have for certain of the programmes like blind persons and disabled persons and old age assistance, a minimum of \$75 a month at point of eligibility and social assistance making up the rest. You could, in fact, move further in The Department of Public Welfare. One could logically bring day nurseries into the whole child welfare apparatus. There should be in this department, a totally separate training branch—we shall come to that later in this estimate—for training is sorely neglected in The Department of Public Welfare. There should be a totally separate branch incorporating all aspects of home care—the homemakers, the visiting nurses and the special home care projects—and also a special branch of planning and research, because nothing can be done in this department of a meaningful kind without a new emphasis on planning and research.

And when the hon. Minister is finished this reorganization, he can remove forever from the statute books of this House the odious and invidious term of public welfare. He can remove the invidious emphasis on individuals as opposed to the family units and the family structure, and the multi-problem aspect of so many of our social and economic problems. He can rename his department "The Department of Family and Social Services," and give to it the substance, the importance and the content which will allow it to be viewed with some respect, rather than with so much concern and despair by such a large number of people.

I say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that we have come—I admit to the hon. Minister again—a considerable way in one year, and that he has before him now The Canada Assistance Act and all that that opens. I profoundly hope that he will take advantage of it. More important perhaps, that his Treasury board colleagues will take advantage of it, because there is no reason what-

soever that the department should have the reputation it has in the public eye.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I believe that perhaps it would be in order for me just to make a few statements. I appreciate the fact that the hon. members who have spoken have done so with sincerity in what they believe, and I suppose, as was stated so well in one good speech that I heard by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) during the Budget debate, that we talk in such a way in trying to bring forward the policies which are expressed, or that we preach apart from political parties, and with that I agree.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would say this to the hon. member for Scarborough West, who spoke last. I must say to him that maybe he had more meat in his speech than in his previous speech, although some of the views he expressed are the views of his party.

On a lot of it I agree with him. A lot of it is possibly a bit on the idealistic side; that is quite all right, I do not take any wrong view of that either. But there is one phase I think we agree with, and I would like him to believe I am very sincere when I say that what is happening in Ottawa today or next year I hope will take the form of law with which we can co-operate and through it have a completely different point of view on the welfare services, not only in this province but across Canada.

I would like him to believe that we have been endeavouring and working on this for many years. I think the other provinces have done so as well. I do not believe the province of Quebec will form part of it, I think they are going to opt out, they have expressed that point of view. I think the report, as the hon. member mentioned, the little bit I have had an opportunity to read, is a very interesting document and I think very worthwhile. If the government itself has accepted it as a whole after studying it, I do not know.

The last time I saw the Minister, when I met with him in May, we discussed it very little; he never made any public expression concerning it, but at the same time he told me that they were getting this report and were studying it very closely.

However, before I resume my seat I would not like the House, Mr. Chairman, and yourself, to have the impression that we are as bad as is sometimes expressed, especially in dealing with public assistance rates as they were outlined across Canada. From what I see here, the maximum payment in Canada is by Ontario. Next to it, as far as I have it here, is Manitoba.

Sometimes we do make comparisons with other provinces, but I always feel that it does not accomplish very much. It is rather odious to make comparisons with other provinces. In the province of Quebec, for instance, in old age assistance, Ontario has 13 per cent of the 65-68 group receiving the allowance. In Quebec this is about 34 per cent and Newfoundland about 67 per cent. The incidence is very different, let us put it that way. That is why I say we do not gain too much by making these comparisons. Sometimes they prove a point and sometimes they disprove it. That is my feeling about it.

However, in listening to the two speeches that I have heard, I must in all sincerity say that in some points I think we are going the right way. How far we shall go, this we shall see. But I would not like to commit myself to any definite pronouncement as far as what I will do until something has been decided elsewhere, which we can look at and discuss it with the hon. members of this House at another time. I am sure that we will then receive, as we have received in the past, some help and some light in these particular matters.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I posed the comparisons with the other provinces, the only comparisons that are really viable comparisons, the only ones that are given in the provincial finances study, because they, like the hon. Minister, accept that certain things are not comparable. For instance, the numbers that he quoted in a certain age category on assistance are not comparable. Unless one studies the evolution of The Public Charities Act as it emerged in Quebec before 1960. I could have come into the House and pointed out that on, I guess it was May 11, 1962, Quebec went off municipal payments towards welfare. Municipalities pay absolutely nothing towards welfare now. The province has assumed the total responsibility. But because that comparison was in truth not justified in certain other respects, I did not use it. I tried to use the comparisons which were justified.

One of the comparisons which was justified was the analysis of the supplementary incomes. You see, Mr. Chairman—I just want to deal with this in slight detail for a moment—what the supplementary assistance does in Canada is to allow provinces to get around the objectionable features of category. So that when the hon. Minister says to this House, "We have to work within the category," he in fact does not, he can put in supplementary assistance which is rather different.

Now let me give him the precise facts. I did not include them in the opening, but perhaps they make sense in view of what he has said. The supplementary income given to old age assistance: In the province of Ontario the government pays 80 per cent of \$20 or \$16, and that is the maximum; Quebec and Alberta give it on a needs test with no maximum; and British Columbia gives it, but the maximum goes up to \$30.

Now take disabled persons: In Ontario again a \$20 maximum; British Columbia \$30; in Quebec no maximum whatsoever.

Take blind persons: In Ontario again a \$20 maximum; in British Columbia \$30; in Quebec, Alberta, Saskatchewan, no maximum whatsoever.

These assistance programmes, these supplementary assistance programmes, are the way in which the governments get around the category, the way in which they bring people to a viable standard of living without humiliating them under the categorical approach. There is no reason in the world why the province of Ontario could not have instituted that.

Now as to not committing himself: That is what really concerns me, Mr. Chairman, the unwillingness of the hon. Minister and the department to commit themselves. Why is it not possible to say that you will abolish these categorical programmes and have a general social assistance Act? You hint at it, we have talked around it in the House; why is it not possible to say that that is what will be argued in July? One of the most ironic things, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I said I do not want to abandon any position that I now have in case I do not get the new programme I was thinking about, and as the hon. member was expressing it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Since the total provincial contribution at the moment is only five per cent, maybe the hon. Minister could make the assertion and make up the rest himself. I could not help but think, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most ironic features of this Boucher report is that the one—if I can put it this way—the one non-Quebec name in this report, referred to in the introduction, is Professor John Morgan of the University of Toronto school of social work. It was Professor Morgan who contributed a lot of material which went into the rationale of this report. Now Professor Morgan is also an advisor to this department, if I understand correctly. Yet it took the government of Quebec to enshrine some of his opinions to

be adopted by policy. I suggest that it would equally behoove the hon. Minister of Public Welfare to take into account many of the views of such people.

Let me ask him rather specifically, Mr. Chairman, who does he intend to take with him in his entourage when he goes to Ottawa next month? Who are the people in the social security part of the welfare field that he is taking with him? I know there will be Treasury officials and I know there will be the Deputy Minister, if he is well. I know that we will work out a good financial deal, but who is he taking to Ottawa with him to work out a good welfare deal? Which of the eminent people in the field will accompany him?

Mr. Chairman: Now that a general discussion has taken place in all these introductory speeches, I think that we should relate our remarks to specific items as we come to them in the budget.

On vote 1701:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, this question falls in 1701.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the questions of the hon. member for Scarborough West, I think it would be prudent and wise to say that the matters that will be discussed in the conference will be especially a matter of establishing policy as between the different governments.

As far as dealing with the other matters I have, as you say, Professor Morgan, who has been one of our advisers in this matter. I suppose we will have a member from the schools of social work, especially we have in mind a gentleman like Professor Hendry and persons of that description.

As far as the conference is concerned, I doubt if there will be the time, in the day or two we will be sitting, with other matters, to discuss all these other items. What we want is an establishment of principle, and I suppose then the matter will be discussed as between the officials of both departments, plus the consultants, persons similar to those two I have named that come to my mind at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: I suppose there will be some of those people along with you at the conference?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I hope to have them with me if they are available at that time. They have already been advised, I think, and I hope they will be available. There may be

others, but these are two who come to my mind at the present time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I am delighted to hear that at least those two are—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks on the first vote, having to do with the hon. Minister of Public Welfare's advisory committee on Indian affairs.

In years past, I know that some of the committee members have attended the session of the Legislature when this matter was going to be brought forward. I would like to say, to begin with, that the hon. Minister is very fortunate in having been able to get Indians, who themselves are so eminently qualified, from various parts of Ontario to serve on this committee.

I would like to draw to his attention, however, that it would be well within the realm of possibility and advisability if the hon. Minister, when the personnel of the committee changes from time to time, would consult with the elected councils of the various reserves from which these people come. I would in no way be critical of their qualifications, but I would be critical of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps, as well, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), in their method of selecting these advisory personnel.

I would like to say just in a congratulatory tone that one of the most useful pamphlets on Indian affairs in Ontario that has come my way in some time is that published by the Ontario human rights commission, entitled, "Human Relations." One of these issues, December 1964, was given over to the discussion of the affairs of Indians in Canada, and specifically in this province. From this source, and from some others, there are some useful recommendations that I am sure have guided the hon. Minister in what he proposes to do with the Indian responsibilities in this province.

However, from my own work with the Indians in my constituency, I have come to the conclusion that they are very much concerned that the retention of their general jurisdiction be kept at the federal level and that the reserve system be kept largely as it now is. Any arguments that are put forward that would tend to, let us say, foster the idea that the government is going to do away with the Indian reserves and integrate these people with the rest of the population are not met with any favour. Certainly anyone who proposes this should do some careful research before they make any public pronouncements,

because it certainly stirs up a good deal of ill-will, in my experience.

They are also very keen, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, in retaining their cultural tradition; and in fact enlarging this. They are proud of it and they have every reason to be proud of it. The government has many methods at its disposal to assist them in this that, I feel, are not being used to the fullest extent. Finally, they are searching—more than anything else—for economic independence. I would say between 25 and 30 per cent of the citizens on the reserve that I am familiar with are in receipt of some form of welfare. I would like to think that our general programme over the years would be to channel this money out of direct welfare and into such projects that would enable these Indians, in their own reservations and in their own areas, to take part in economic projects that would be useful to themselves and advantageous to the community.

As far as this economic independence is concerned, I have often felt that The Department of Economics and Development of this government might take a more definite stand in assisting small projects, small business projects and manufacturing projects, that have been suggested to them in the past. I know that there are many skills among the Indians—manufacturing snowshoes, bows and arrows and certainly many other items—that would be useful in tourist trade, that could be fostered by The Department of Economics and Development. I wish the department would step in and give assistance in this.

There are already various examples in Ontario, and across Canada, where government agencies have made some financing available; but more than that, some managerial assistance so that these projects can be put on a working basis and so that those Indians who want to take part can be properly trained in manufacturing. As I say, there are several examples which serve as excellent models for other projects that could be established in the reserve system.

I have often felt, as well, that we are not assisting the Indians as we should to make good use of their potential tourist attractions. In the reserve in Brant county there have been recent road developments that have assisted tourists to get into the area; but there is much more that could be done there and in other parts of Ontario. Mind you, many of these areas are good for farming, where agriculture has not been as fruitful as it should be or as profitable as it might be. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) might well direct his ARDA officials to go into the Indian reserves and offer them some

assistance in establishing community pastures, with the thought of co-operative farming as something that could well be fostered by the funds available through ARDA, as well as the expert advice that might come from this area.

The point of this, Mr. Chairman, is that the responsibility for the development and assistance of the Indians is far more than a welfare problem, and I hope you will forgive me if I have strayed from that a bit. It really does depend upon the exertions of a co-operative effort of many Cabinet responsibilities. I understand there is a committee of some sort that is attempting to co-ordinate these efforts, but the fruits of the co-ordination are not apparent as yet and I hope that in the hon. Minister's comments a bit later we will see that there are definite steps to be taken in the near future.

In the preservation of the cultural traditions of the Indians, which should be one of our chief responsibilities as far as our assistance is concerned, I am aware—as I am sure the hon. Minister is aware—of the many cultural projects that the Indians have instituted on their own initiative. One thing that we might do to give assistance is this, rather than move in and tell them how these projects should be run, is to assist them with advertising through our ministry of information. We should make a real effort to get the crowds out from the surrounding communities and, as a matter of fact, from areas far distant, that would really give significance to their cultural pageants, fairs or—I suppose you would call them pow-wows—attractors of the type they have in Manitoulin that have already attracted many thousands of interested citizens, both Indians and non-Indians.

The history of these people has never been properly told to the citizens of our own province. A chief complaint, as far as their cultural heritage is concerned, is that our official histories do not deal with this adequately and our young people still have their views of the Indian population and their background shaped by the cowboy-and-Indian movies that they often see on some of the poorer television programmes.

There is really something that can be done here, to see that their background is made readily available to students and to tourists; and that, in fact, their culture becomes a part of our own culture.

In education, I would say that much has been done in recent years to improve Indian education. In the reserves that are in southern Ontario there are already very adequate systems of schools at the primary level. Unfortunately, a good many of the Indian students, having graduated from grade 8 and

left the reserve to go on to secondary school—are subjected, for the first time, not to an attitude that I would call discrimination but to a feeling that they have indeed left home; that although the teachers and the students with which they now work are friendly and co-operative, there is a definite pressure on these young Indian people to withdraw into themselves and into very small groups. This pressure results in, I would say, by far the largest drop-out average from the school system of any other identifiable group.

I am not sure what the answer to this may be. But I believe that in an Indian community of 7,000—of the type that we have in Brant county—it might well be a useful project to set up some continuing education beyond grade 8, perhaps associated with some technical training as well, so that these Indian students can carry on with their education on the reserve in an atmosphere where they will not feel strained and pressured into dropping out of the school system.

I do not know how far this could be continued because eventually we feel that the young Indians, whether or not they eventually decide to stay on the reservation, should get out into the surrounding community and deal with their white brethren in the local towns and cities.

As a matter of fact, many of these Indians do elect to leave the reserve and there are many of them here in the city of Toronto. The hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) frequently refers to them in this House and the problems that they might be assisted with by the action of this Legislature and the hon. Minister whose estimates are before us this afternoon.

My own experience is that these Indian drop-out students realize, just as any other student would, that they have made a mistake in not getting all the education that was available to them and many do return to take part in programme 5 retraining. But once again, the pressures that are exerted on an Indian in a white man's classroom are very apparent and cause him great difficulty in achieving the success that, really, the statistical averages predict for him.

I think there should be more of an effort for these retraining programmes to be made available on the reservations themselves, and in the Indian communities of northern Ontario where the Indians live off the reserve.

As far as the reserve system itself is concerned, I have already said that many of the Indians try their luck off the reserve and many are successful. They have some special skills in working on high construction and on bridges; they have many other abilities that we would go in and see that they are familiar

would fit them for special occupations. But as we know, many do return to the reserve, and sometimes they are not able to get adequate employment there and do find themselves on the welfare rolls. This is where I feel that our attention to the reserves themselves might well bear fruit as far as the welfare department is concerned.

If some of the money that is allocated by the government for Indians affairs—even though this is not our prime responsibility—would be put into economic development, I am sure that this would bear good results in a very short time.

As far as the federal jurisdiction is concerned, we are all familiar with the discussions that have taken place in the province of Quebec that deal with the transference of this responsibility, and we know that there are certain authorities in Quebec who feel that Eskimos and Indians should come under primary provincial responsibility. I feel that our responsibility is to make it very clear to the Indian that he can take part in every programme that this government has for the development of the community without sacrificing his special position in the community by virtue of his residence on the reserve.

I believe that this government is prepared to take this step. My experience is that they have extended programmes in several departments wherever it has been brought to their attention that there was some particular programme that was available to the rest of the citizens, but not available to the Indians because they live on reserves. I have mentioned the fact that The Parks Assistance Act applies on reserves and that certain welfare measures have now been made available there—reforestation, restocking and the list is becoming long and quite impressive. But the fact remains that all too often we find that the Indians are kept out of programmes, and the most recent one that has been brought to my attention is the community programme responsibility of The Department of Education wherein the local recreation councils have not been granted the support of this government simply because they are not organized on a municipal basis.

Now this can be changed readily, and I am sure will be changed. So surely the hon. Minister's committee—the committee that we are asked to vote, is it, \$1,500—might well see that a search is made of the legislation so that all of these community development programmes would be made readily available to the Indian communities. As a matter of fact,

with the opportunity, and go out of our way to see that they will accept this opportunity.

As I say, there are many things that we could do for the Indians on the reservation. The responsibility seems to lie directly with this hon. Minister, and I am looking forward with great expectation to his remarks on Indian affairs so that many of these things may be brought into being.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, as I stated at the opening of my remarks, I had a statement to make on Indian affairs, and this concerns those native Indians in Ontario who are not properly prepared to make their way in contemporary society. Naturally, I am sure that hon. members, and especially the hon. member for Brant, will know what I mean when I sometimes use words that I do not like to use.

During the course of the debates on the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister indicated to the House that I would make a full statement on the policies of this government with regard to the situation. Hon. members will be pleased to know that circumstances of the Indian population of Ontario have been, and are, strictly in the forefront of our attention.

I am aware that hon. members would like to see the Ontario government develop a comprehensive plan which will ensure social and economic betterment for these descendants of the original inhabitants of this land.

I believe a programme is evolving which will place increased responsibility on the province in the treatment and the needs of the Indians.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the most vexing of all the difficulties associated with a proper Indian policy up to now, is the division of responsibility between the provincial and federal governments. The artificial status concept of the treaty Indians resulting from a background of federal legal responsibility and control, has unfortunately set them apart from other citizens. Last year, for example, there were 48,000 registered or treaty Indians living in Ontario. Approximately 14,900 of these resided off the reserves, most of whom were dependent on the province for service and assistance.

In addition, while there are no census figures available, it is estimated that there are 11,000 people of Indian ancestry who are not classified as Indians. The problems encountered by many of this non-treaty group are not unlike those of the treaty Indians. However, they do not qualify for assistance under

federal Indian legislation. The ideal arrangements would be to include all people of Indian culture in one group, eliminate divided responsibility and, in addition to a new programme designed to expand their opportunities, provide for their continuing needs and establish provincial programmes.

Generally speaking, the policy of the federal government to its Indians has not altered appreciably over the years. The great majority of Indians continue to live on reserves assigned to them during the last quarter of the 19th century. At that time, treaties were signed with each band in recognition of the surrender of Indian interests in Canadian soil, and the Crown undertook to set aside reserves and to provide other benefits such as cash payments, annuities, educational and health facilities and other considerations.

For all practical purposes, treaties have now been replaced by the federal Indian Act and accompanying regulations. While the Indian Act does not place restrictions on any of the previous rights contained in the treaties, it does provide some benefits not embodied in these agreements.

The British North America Act, section 91, charged the federal government with responsibility for Indians and Indian lands. The major function of the federal administration has been the management of Indian reserves and surrendered Indian land, tribal and band funds, education, health, relief assistance, housing, descent of property, treaty obligations and enfranchisement of Indians and a variety of minor matters. Beyond this, Indians have continued to live on reserves according to what is considered their traditional custom. There are many complex problems involved in the development process which must be taken into account, and foremost among these are the conflicting values of the Indians that have blocked acceptance of the white man's life. Attitudes, first of hostility and then of dependency, the loss of social roles and social goals and the lack of knowledge and skills required to earn a living in a temporary industrial society.

To be sure, Indians have emulated and accommodated to our life to a degree that indicates some progressive change. On the other hand, privation and disorganization continue among some reservation populations, and they signify that whatever adaptation that has taken place has been accompanied by tremendous mental and physical suffering.

Second in importance among the problems is that psychological and sociological Indian concepts have not been given full recognition.

If the problems are to be overcome, government must come to grips with all aspects of the situation. If the hopes of the federal authority for a more productive and satisfying social adjustment among Indians are to be realized, we believe that certain Indian values such as responsibility for the welfare of the tribe, the importance of satisfying social relationships and pride of heritage have been too long overlooked and opposed. Yet these values persist and must be considered as essential for bringing about a more harmonious adjustment.

What we are dealing with is not the Indian problem that can be solved through the payment of money alone. The personal rehabilitation of the Indians will be a complex task, and will call upon all the insights and skills, social and psychological, as well as educational and economic that can be brought to bear. This implies a series of related problems which necessitate not only the adaptation of existing methods where these have been proven practical, but also the development of entirely new concepts of treatment to the specific needs of one group in our society.

In these remarks, I hope I have indicated that one of the key points which must be appreciated is that the cultural, social, political and economic background of the Indian is entirely different than from the common heritage of other Canadians.

The Algonquin Indian had no visible political organization, he lived in relatively small groups where strong bonds of kinship held the social units together. His subsistence activities involved hunting, fishing, trapping and harvesting of fruits and herbs. Accordingly, mobility was essential.

The religious philosophy of the Algonquin emphasized reverence for the game animals upon which he depended. It might be thought that after several hundred years of contact, the Indian people of Ontario would no longer maintain any of the attitudes, beliefs and behaviour patterns briefly outlined here. To believe that they do not is false. It is therefore inappropriate for us to make value judgments about the living conditions and conduct of Indians based upon the standards which apply to ourselves.

Similarly, to talk about the Indian problem without considering the great difference in cultural level between groups and families living in various parts of Ontario, either on or off reservations, is unrealistic.

Many groups of Indians have resolved social difficulties and are as advanced and comparable to non-Indian communities. I

would say that standards and social conditions at Walpole, Six Nations and Tyandego reserves, for example, are equal to those of non-Indian communities in the vicinity. I am pleased to note that the Walpole band council has taken over full administration of their affairs in the same manner as the municipalities.

Geography in a province as large as Ontario has played, and continues to play, a very significant part in the nature of the problems faced not only by Indians but by other citizens as well.

The government of Ontario recognizes a responsibility for Indians and during the past 10 years it has acted on this premise. As a result, Ontario has instituted many specific measures to assist Indians so far as legal limits permit. In 1955, The Indian Welfare Services Act was passed, which extended to registered or treaty Indians all assistance programmes administered by the province. The Métis and non-treaty Indians, of course, have always been considered in the same manner as other Ontario citizens.

The importance of The Indian Welfare Services Act is that it acknowledged for the first time the Ontario government's responsibility to the treaty Indians. A weakness in the present arrangement is that while Ontario can provide, to Indians who qualify, all the benefits of on-going programmes and services, it has no power to provide a viable form of service designed to acculturate these people. There are at this time several items in which special arrangements have been worked out with the federal authorities to allow the Indian government more direct contact with Indians, and more particularly with the administration on reserves. An example of this is the inspection of Indian day schools on reserves by inspectors of The Department of Education.

Another is the construction and maintenance of roads and bridges on reserves by the Indians under the supervision of The Department of Highways. It is of interest to note that Indian reserves received \$500,000 in provincial grants last year for this item.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has already informed the hon. members of the House of the work done by his department, the resources development agreement with the federal government and the training of individuals for fire protection and silvicultural work, which represent outlays by the province of between \$300,000 or \$400,000. However, it has been recognized for some time that these ad hoc arrangements are less than satisfactory.

Similarly, several practices adopted in other departments have materially assisted the Indian people. The Department of Agriculture has extended The Agricultural Societies Act and The Community Centres Act to apply to Indian reserves. Agricultural representatives and the extension branch of the department work in close co-operation with Indian bands. Last year some 255 Indians from northern Ontario worked on farms in southern Ontario as part of a special action taken to provide these people with both income and training.

The Department of Education has several new policies now under way, I am advised, including special capital assistance grants to boards of trustees in Red Lake and Moosonee, grants to the Indian-Eskimo association, special one-week residential courses for Indian leaders under the community programmes branch and some 15 specialized courses offered by the department to Indians under programme 5 of the federal-provincial technical and vocational training agreement. I know that is what the hon. member had in mind when he spoke a moment ago.

The Department of Health has established seven public health inspection offices which serve 81 communities in northern Ontario, containing 5,500 Indians. In addition, The Department of Health underwrites the full cost of health services provided in a number of predominantly Indian settlements by the seven public health units operating in the territorial district.

The work done by The Department of Public Welfare is, however, the basis for most of the efforts of the provincial government in dealing with needs of the Indians. It is noteworthy to mention that payments on behalf of Indians by the department in the last fiscal year, so far as these can be determined, exceeds some \$2.5 million. It should be noted that the ratio participation by Indians in provincial welfare programmes is three times greater than the provincial average. Public welfare is the only department which has a full-time staff dealing specifically with Indians.

These efforts have been concentrated in three major areas. The first has been the extension of the category of assistance programmes for individual Indians: Old-age assistance, mothers' allowances, dependent fathers' allowances, disabled persons, widows and unmarried women's allowances, blind pensions, rehabilitation services and child welfare services.

The second was the extension of The General Welfare Assistance Act to reserve

Indians on the same basis as though the Indian band council was a municipal council.

The third programme is involved in community development processes.

On other occasions I have described our accomplishments and progress with off-reserve Indians in such centres as Red Lake, Moosonee, Minaki, Hornepayne and Batchawana. Here the department, with the assistance and support of The Department of Education and the Ontario housing corporation, has accomplished major resettlement and re-establishment of a large number of formerly nomadic Indians. The township of Red Lake was the first community with a nomadic Indian population to ask for assistance.

As a result, sir, extraordinary action was taken to provide development officers to serve the municipality for an indefinite period.

In collaboration with the municipal council and local citizens' committees, a major change has taken place in the standard of living among the Indian residents. Recent reports reveal a sharp contrast in the monthly earned income of some 224 local Indians within a two-year period. Where formerly the monthly earnings of this group did not exceed \$6,000, they now show income of in excess of \$45,000 a month.

This has meant that many of the amenities of living are now within reach. Forty-nine families have abandoned their dilapidated primitive shacks and now live in serviced houses that are comparable to other homes in the community. Their children are integrated into the public school system, and regular health check-ups combined with modern hygienic practices have removed many of the discomforts and objectionable features of their former existence.

The accomplishments at Red Lake are largely due to the work of the native Indians employed on the staff of The Department of Public Welfare. It was found that difficulty of communication was one of the chief obstacles to the development of those people. To overcome this handicap the department has recruited five well-informed native Indians who can converse in Ojibway and Cree. They are being trained in a community development programme. The experiences gained at Red Lake, Moosonee and elsewhere have firmly established one principle, which is that government programmes of assistance and the purpose of these will be interpreted to Indians through a medium which they accept, understand and trust. The prospect of further provincial participation in the affairs has been under

discussion with the federal authorities for some time.

Mr. Chairman, I have just about another five or six minutes, but I would not want to interfere with the promise of the hon. Prime Minister yesterday to call these bills, so I am quite willing to continue this when we come back, whichever the House would decide.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Deputy Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, we would now like to turn to a resolution in the name of the hon. member for Wellington South, No. 14 in the grouping Other notices and motions.

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 14

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution in my name, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

I rise to speak on a problem which shames and distresses the people of Ontario. It is a problem involving our sense of justice and humanity, a problem which forms an important part of our continuing attempts to improve the conditions of human life in Ontario.

It is also a problem which, shamefully, has been neglected in the province for far too long. I say shamefully because I can see no serious obstacles standing in the way of its solution—no serious obstacles except, perhaps, the reluctance of the present government to seriously involve itself in meeting human needs and reducing human misery.

The word "misery" is an important one in this context. Because where our outdated divorce laws are concerned, misery—real human misery—is the all-too-common result of our defective legislation.

Before I begin to talk about divorce and our legislation on divorce, I want to make a distinction on the subject of marriage. When we talk about marriage we are talking about one or both of two things. Marriage is a

unique kind of institution in a society like ours, because it is, for most people, both a religious sacrament and a legal contract. As a religious sacrament, it is an institution involving a person's faith, convictions and ethics and morality. As a contract—as a secular institution—it is a legal entity.

We must and do accept the fact that most marriages are in effect two marriages—that most marriages are both a legal and a religious ceremony. Thus, when we speak in this Legislature of dissolving a marriage, of divorce, we are speaking only of the "legal" marriage and the civil rights arising out of this kind of marriage. The religious ceremony or sacrament is not affected by anything we may say or do here and I would emphasize most strongly that we have no right to interfere in any way with marriage in the religious sense, and no court has the right to interfere in this religious ceremony known as marriage. However, I do submit that this Legislature does have the right and the responsibility to examine "legal" marriage.

When my distinguished colleague, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson), first raised in this House the idea that Ontario might take some initiative in re-examining existing legislation on divorce, he was greeted with remarks by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) which can only be interpreted to mean that the present government believes all responsibilities in this field lie in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, as we shall see in a moment from a quick review of the history of divorce legislation in this country, the hon. Prime Minister was, with all due respect, incorrect in his belief that initiative must come from Ottawa.

In Great Britain, the first Royal commission on divorce was appointed in 1850. The commission reported in 1853, and the first Matrimonial Causes Act was passed at Westminster in 1857. That Act was the basis for further English legislation of 1870 governing the dissolution of marriage. And that 1870 legislation, Mr. Speaker, was the model for The Divorce Act (Ontario), passed by Parliament in 1930.

Before 1930, no court in Ontario had jurisdiction to grant a divorce for any reason. Then, in 1930, our courts acquired the right to dissolve marriages on grounds arrived at in England in 1853. The province passed an Act in 1931—The Matrimonial Causes Act—which laid down the practices and procedures to be followed in Ontario for the federal legislation of the previous year.

Thus, by 1931, Ontario had reached the point England was at before 1870. And that

is where we still are today. In the meantime, of course, the British have advanced from their 19th century position. Two more British Royal commissions—the Gorell commission in 1912 and the Morton commission in 1956—have re-examined marriage as a legal institution and have broadened understanding of the causes for the failure of marriage.

Essentially, our law today recognizes only two symptoms of the failure of marriage as being of sufficient importance to allow the dissolution of that legal marriage. The two symptoms—the two legally recognized grounds for divorce—are adultery and, on the part of the husband, sodomy or bestiality.

There is an observation I would like to make on this—an observation that is obvious and familiar to all of you. When the law recognizes only adultery as grounds for divorce then you will have—as we have in Ontario and have had for many years—a deliberate flouting of the law. In fact, in a great many cases, otherwise honest citizens find themselves forced into perjurying themselves in order to obtain a divorce. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that a law is a good law when people are forced to break another law in complying with it.

I mentioned the Gorell commission in the United Kingdom in 1912. This commission recommended that grounds for divorce should be extended to include:

1. Wilful desertion for three years and upwards.
2. Cruelty.
3. Incurable insanity, after five years' confinement.
4. Habitual drunkenness, found incurable after three years from the first order made.
5. Imprisonment under a commuted death sentence.

That, Mr. Speaker, was the progress in responsible thinking about divorce that was made in Great Britain 53 years ago.

In Ontario we have not yet reached the point which was reached in the United Kingdom half a century ago. Our thinking, and the legislation that embodies it, has not advanced from the point reached in 1870. I wonder if there is any other field of social legislation which has remained untouched for a century? I wonder if there is any other area in which we feel that solutions to social problems arrived at in the middle of the 19th century are still the sure guide to our actions today?

For our present practices with regard to the dissolution of marriage are certainly not adequate today. It is not necessary to explore

the shocking facts of disrespect for the law on the part of persons seeking divorce. It is not even necessary to think about the unnecessary amount of human misery caused by our archaic legislation. A few simple facts will be sufficient to show that our laws are not adequate.

For example, it has been estimated that there are 500,000 Canadian men and women living together pretending to be man and wife. And the major reason why that figure is so high is the difficulty of obtaining a divorce. Of 40 common law couples recently studied by the school of social work at the University of Toronto, 38—note that, 38 out of 40—were faced with a legal bar to marriage. The conclusion from this startling fact is obvious. Our law, which was intended to preserve and strengthen the legal institution of marriage has exactly the contrary result. It forces thousands and thousands of our people to bypass and ignore that institution.

Another fact is significant. In Toronto right now there is an average backlog of almost 900 uncontested divorce cases on the waiting list of the courts. At the present rate of trying cases, this means a delay of eight months or more before a particular case is heard. My colleague, the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), has already made comments during this session about the backlog of cases in our courts. For the present, however, I merely want to point out that not only is our divorce law inadequate, but the administration of that law is inadequate as well.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the hon. Prime Minister was mistaken if he felt that initiative in studying and changing our divorce laws must come from Ottawa. This is simply not so. And it is not so because tradition and practice in this country have made divorce legislation a matter primarily of provincial concern. Our Ontario law is substantially the same as that of the prairie provinces. But Nova Scotia law adds cruelty, impotence, and blood relationship to a prohibited degree to the grounds for divorce. And New Brunswick and P.E.I. recognize frigidity, impotence and blood relationship as grounds for divorce. And Newfoundland and Quebec, of course, have no divorce courts at all.

It is therefore apparent, Mr. Speaker, that with the variation in divorce laws throughout Canada we cannot expect Parliament to enact one divorce law for the whole country. Nor can we expect—nor would we want—the Parliament of Canada to take it upon itself

to pass divorce laws for Ontario without our prior request. In short, it is we who must attempt to determine what is best for the people of Ontario and take steps to ensure that proper legislation is passed for the benefit of this province. Thus, if any changes are to be made, the initiative must come from us.

Now, there is one other aspect of this problem which I must bring to the attention of the House. Earlier I made the distinction between marriage as a religious sacrament and marriage as a civil institution, and I pointed out that we have no jurisdiction here over the sacrament of marriage.

There has been, in the past, a great deal of confusion over the attitude of religious denominations towards the dissolution of marriage. As far as I can see, all denominations have taken a stand and spelled out a position on the sacrament of marriage, and on the possibility of its dissolution under certain circumstances. Legislators have, in the past, believed all too often that what the churches said about marriage as a sacrament was identical with their attitudes towards marriage as a civil institution. This, I believe, more than any other single factor, lies behind our failure to improve our laws with regard to divorce.

But it is now plain, for all to see who care to look, that religious leaders of virtually all denominations do not wish to impose their particular view of marriage as a sacrament upon the civil institution of marriage. I could bludgeon this House with authority after authority, from virtually every religious denomination, but I shall let one such authority speak for all.

Richard, Cardinal Cushing of Boston, a distinguished and much respected prelate of the Roman Catholic church, said very recently:

Catholics do not need the support of civil law to be faithful to their own religious convictions and they do not seek to impose by law their moral values on other members of society.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be plainer than this.

Cardinal Cushing was speaking of Catholics, but his words could stand for the views of virtually all enlightened religious leaders in the world today. They do not wish to impose the special beliefs of their denomination on others who may have other sets of beliefs.

I must emphasize this point. I must be specific. I suspect there are a great many

hon. members of this House who have not yet realized just how progressive the thinking of our religious leaders is today, just how far tolerance of a diversity of views has gone. The ecumenical movement is only one evidence of this welcome change. There are others. Cardinal Cushing was speaking for Roman Catholics when he said that good Catholics would not want to impose their beliefs on everyone.

I would like to share with you the views put forward recently by another denomination. In the most recent issue of the *Presbyterian Record* we find the following statements in an editorial:

The church recognizes that the divine intention is that marriage should be a lifetime partnership. Yet it also accepts the unhappy fact that we are sinful creatures, and that in some cases it is unwise to perpetuate a relationship that does not in fact exist.

Obviously, the Presbyterian views is different from that of the Roman Catholic Church.

But the point is simply this: No Roman Catholic would want to prevent a Presbyterian from obtaining a divorce if the Presbyterian's conscience and beliefs led him to take such a step. And, conversely, no Presbyterian would want to force a divorce upon a Roman Catholic if the Catholic's conscience and beliefs led him to reject divorce as a possible solution to marital problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that this House will adopt the resolution that I have placed before it. I expect this to happen because, quite frankly, I do not believe this House could be so out of touch with the present-day needs and wishes of the people of Ontario as to reject it.

Let me quote from editorials from three Toronto newspapers which, although they do not always see eye to eye on matters of public policy, nevertheless they have done so on this occasion.

The Toronto *Daily Star* has said:

If the Ontario government accepts Mr. Thompson's suggestion, there will be at least a chance that Ontario can lead the way toward civilized divorce laws for all of the provinces of Canada that desire it.

The *Globe and Mail* has said:

The current pressure from Ontario Liberals for a provincial initiative to bring about changes in divorce law is one which the government of the Premier, John Robarts, could surely yield gracefully. If the law ever did enjoy popular support in

Ontario, it certainly does not now and every effort should be made to explore ways of changing it. Divorce law is one of the most depressing examples of laws which have fallen so far out of step with public feeling, that dishonourable ways of evading them are constantly sought and practised. Where adultery is the only way of escape, collusion and perjured evidence by desperate people seeking divorce are inevitable.

The *Toronto Telegram* has said:

Virtually the only ground for divorce in Canada is adultery. There are some minor local exceptions, but if a man or woman is declared incurably insane or sentenced to life imprisonment, the spouse remains married and there can be no reunion. The immediate goal of the Liberal resolution would be to add desertion, long-term imprisonment or confinement to mental hospital as grounds for divorce. This is reasonable and sensible.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution does not call for instant revolution in our divorce law; it simply calls for the beginning of discussions which could lead to a study of existing legislation and to revisions of legislation if, after careful study, it was apparent that the people of Ontario did want changes. I am confident that changes are desired and, as my resolution indicates, I believe that we should be very certain before we act. Then when we do act, we will find ourselves in step with the wishes of the people and not, as at present, decades and decades behind the wishes of the people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge acceptance of my resolution by this House as the first major step toward a very desirable social goal.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Speaker, some of the comments I would like to make must be credited to the Right Honourable the Earl of Birkenhead who has made an intensive study on this subject and, after reading them, I thought they were worthy of note as part of my address this afternoon.

I should like to begin my comments on this resolution by discussing the implications that are inherent in the wording of the resolution before the House. In my opinion, the elected representatives of the people of Ontario assembled in this Legislature have a very clear responsibility to speak openly in the interests of their constituents in the matters of public concern. I do not feel that the existence of a constitution which divides

jurisdiction between the provinces and the federal government should, in any way, limit a duly elected member of this House in the expression of his opinion and views on any matters that affect the well-being of his constituents.

Nevertheless, there are obviously limitations imposed on the government of Ontario by The British North America Act. The government of this province must concern itself solely with those matters which lie within its jurisdiction. There are, of course, many areas where there is no clear dividing line between the responsibilities of the federal government and those of the province. In these areas the government of the province has the right and the duty to discuss and negotiate these matters with the federal government.

This is particularly true in the case of financial arrangements; but in areas where there is no question of the constitutional prerogatives of either the province or the federal government, the government of the province has, in my opinion, no right to negotiate, discuss or in any other way interfere with the legislative or administrative responsibilities of the federal government.

Having said that, there are a few thoughts on divorce which I should like to convey to this House. The problem of divorce leads to many differences of opinion; some of the most important of which are irreconcilable. There is, however, one point on which unanimity can be claimed and that is the existing law is anomalous and unsatisfactory. The view is held by many upright and sincere persons that marriage is, or ought to be, indissoluble. They honestly believe that indissolubility of marriage is enjoined by God and, further, that it is essential for the welfare of society.

A basis of this principle based upon the gospel of St. Matthew admits one exception—but one—the case of adultery, and adherents of this belief will not be satisfied by any accommodation or compromise. Any cause of divorce to one party, or any cause except adultery to the other, is absolutely indefensible. These persons cannot be convinced, consistent with their own faith; they must be overborne. For the former it is sufficient, perhaps, to bear in mind that their rule has been definitely rejected and that their reasoning has not been accepted by the vast majority of their fellow creatures.

To answer those who do admit the acceptance of adultery but oppose any extension, it is necessary, perhaps, to examine the principle in more detail. The history of divorce in

this country is of the greatest importance. It is properly supposed that the monogamous marriage is based on the teaching of the Scriptures, but that is not so. The only specific reference to one wife only is the statement that a person who has more than one wife should not be made a bishop. In truth, the law of marriage is derived from many sources, mainly, the pagan law of Rome as purified and revised by Christian teaching. The canon law, as settled in the course of the Middle Ages did, undoubtedly, lay down two great principles: 1. that marriage must be monogamous; and 2. that if a marriage has been validly contracted it remains indissoluble while the parties are still alive.

It is to be regretted that the problem in Britain and in Canada, since our own Canadian law is based on the British law, has been complicated by the fact that matters both ecclesiastical and matrimonial were profoundly affected by the matrimonial eccentricities of Henry VIII. He popularly is said to have desired and obtained a divorce; but in truth he aimed at a declaration that his marriage was null on the grounds of affinity. Divorce puts an end to a marriage; a degree of nullity declares there never was a marriage.

History, however, has shown that in no period has a man of sufficient importance desired in vain to put an end to his union, merely because marriage was indissoluble and the authorities created by ecclesiastical law, to accommodate the unyielding principle of indissolubility to the relief just demanded, has constituted a veritable system of legal fiction whereby a marriage could be declared never to have been a marriage.

From the end of the 17th century, divorce in the sense of putting an end to an existing valid marriage was obtainable in Britain by the procedure of promoting a bill in Parliament founded upon the allegation and proof of adultery. This remedy, judicial in substance though legislative in form was, however, so costly that admittedly none but the wealthy could take recourse to this procedure. Nevertheless, the exercise of such a legislative power put an end in Britain to the principle that marriage was indissoluble.

The Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857 transferred divorce jurisdiction from Parliament to the courts, which meant that the remedy was no longer reserved to people of great means. As our law stands now, since it is based on this Act, a petition may be presented by a husband or wife praying for a dissolution on the ground that the other party has been guilty of adultery. This is beyond all doubt a recognition by our system of jurisprudence

of the principle that marriage is not necessarily indissoluble.

There is, however, a broader principle on which divorce should be justified, for surely the true principle is that marriage ought to be dissoluble on any ground which establishes that in a particular case the fundamental purpose of marriage has been frustrated.

To insist upon the divine origin and nature of marriage in order to keep in existence unions which have ceased to have anything in common with real marriage but the shadow, and in the name of God to refuse redress to society and the individual, is to fall into the error of those who had to be reminded that the Sabbath was made for man.

The conception of marriage which insists on the union of flesh obscures the real issues. Further, by laying undue stress on the physical nature of marriage, it underrates and minimizes the spiritual side of marriage and leads to the curious result that the breach of the spiritual obligations of married life, the highest and most important of all, is rejected as a ground for divorce in favour of one which, admittedly sufficient to justify dissolution, is not on the same plane of morality.

From any point of view, religious or social, how can it be good when a marriage that has ceased to be in everything that really matters, shall remain in being simply because it so happens that adultery cannot be proved? It often happens that the proof is wanting merely through the want of means, and there it is a denial of justice to the poor merely because they are poor. The court must, while adultery is the ground to be alleged, insist that adultery shall be adequately proved where the person is normally domiciled.

It could not for a moment, for instance, listen to a poor woman who says: "My husband is in British Columbia. I am sure he is committing adultery, but my means prevent my obtaining the evidence." A person of means or position can be easily, though sometimes expensively, traced. If there is evidence, it is procured; for expense is not a bar in such a case. But it is for those who cannot afford the expense of ascertaining whether there is evidence, quite apart from producing it, that further relief is necessary.

Insistence upon adultery, and adultery only, as the ground to be proved, may and does, and in an increasing degree, produce the same state of affairs as if an Act of Parliament had to be obtained. The remedy is open to all if they can afford it. This defect cannot be remedied merely by reducing or abolishing the fees paid to the court. The main expense of legal proceedings is the cost of

investigation and the production of evidence, and even if court and council and solicitor are all made free, the expense for a wife who has been deserted by a husband who has vanished, or in any similar case, remains prohibitive.

Broadly speaking, there are two points of view on the subject of divorce. One view is that of those who accept the principle that marriage should be dissoluble when the substratum has wholly disappeared; the other is that held by those who object to divorce for any reason whatsoever, and those who only admit adultery as the cause.

Between these two incompatibles there can be no compromise. One side or the other must prevail and the minority must submit, not because it is convinced of errors but because it is overborne by the majority. There is, naturally, no compulsion to seek divorce, however the law be framed. Those who object to divorce, whether it be altogether or only on certain grounds, need not seek redress unless they choose. The question is whether persons who would, if the law be altered, claim the relief given by the new provisions, are to be allowed to do so or prevented from obtaining a decree in circumstances which the existing laws deem insufficient.

The implication of this resolution now before the House would be to place the government of Ontario in the position of a supplicant before the House of Commons in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, this Legislature can debate the question of the divorce laws and the hon. members can express their opinions on this matter. This Legislature should not, however, ask the government to intervene on behalf of the people of Ontario with a Legislature in which the people of Ontario are represented by another group of elected representatives, who are responsible to the people of Ontario for legislation in the matter of divorce.

Mr. Speaker, of my own volition I have two or three letters here, on which I will not read the names or addresses of people, that may bring this subject clearly into view.

Dear Sir: I have a problem. I have been married 34 years, but for the last 20 years I have not lived with my husband or have been supported by him. Could I get a divorce on these grounds? I have met someone I feel I could live happily with. Would you kindly advise.

Dear Sir: I am very much interested in broadening the divorce laws in Canada. I for one am a victim. I have been living apart from my legal husband for 20 years hoping day by day, year by year, that

something will be done soon. I am a Christian woman and my morals are high, but I also like to live a normal happy life. I think we, in such circumstances deserve a second chance. I do not think anyone wants a divorce unless it is impossible to live with someone, that life is impossible. I would like to see divorce granted after five years of separation.

Dear Sir: Sometime ago a business man in London had a long conversation with me in which he described the enormous cost of obtaining a divorce, which amounted in his case to \$6,000, plus the cost of final settlement. He complained that this situation must lead to justice denied, in many instances where the person affected did not have this type of resources. I told him that I thought there was nothing that the provincial government could do about it, but I would draw the matter to your attention in case you are able to influence your associates in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would say the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is a magnificent example of the Tory desire to be on both sides of the fence at the same time. He is in favour of the substance of the resolution, but against the principle of it, or something like that.

I suggest to him that there is no merit at all in his submission that, because this is predominantly a matter of federal jurisdiction, this House should not take any position on it at all, or alternatively, we should not request the government to initiate discussions with the federal government. I do not see why in this day and age of almost continuous federal-provincial conferences, it could be considered that the fact that one government initiates discussions with another puts it in the position of a supplicant. I do not believe that when Mr. Frost in 1957, I believe it was when he was the Prime Minister of Ontario, advocated that the federal government should assume financial responsibility in the field of hospital insurance, he was thereby becoming a supplicant vis-à-vis the government at Ottawa.

We live in what is now called an era of co-operative federalism, or perhaps joint federalism or consultative federalism would be a more accurate term. Whatever the term, I think the basic import is that this is an era in which fewer and fewer areas can be compartmentalized into one jurisdiction or the other, because most problems affect both jurisdictions.

Therefore, the proposal of the resolution that the government of this province should take the initiative, start the ball rolling in discussions with Ottawa, is in my opinion, a sound proposal and one that in no sense would put this province in the position of a supplicant.

The problem we face, of course, is a difficult one in many ways, not least of all because it has in the past, at any rate, aroused very strong emotions among the people of the community, and conflicting emotions at that. I think, as my hon. friend from Wellington South indicated, some of these strong emotional overtones that used to appear in the past in relation to this subject are now moderating and there is not the same unwillingness to compromise in the community. That being so, I think it is incumbent upon us to regard the matter in what I think is its true context, so far as we as legislators are concerned.

Divorce, of course, is a matter that has both religious overtones and civil overtones. Marriage, to many people—I suppose to the majority of the people in this province—is a religious sacrament. It is also a civil ceremony, carrying with it certain obligations enforceable under the civil law. I think that we, as legislators, can look at the matter only in the second aspect. It is not our function to interfere with religious liberty, and I believe that if we adopted the resolution of the hon. member for Wellington South we would not in any way be interfering in religious liberties. We would merely be facing up to our responsibilities as legislators in the civil field.

Looking at it from that point of view, I think the problem again has two aspects. On the one hand, it is a legal problem. I will not vie with the distinguished constitutional authorities who preceded me in this debate and attempt to outline the law and its history, even from the days of the New Testament. I will profess total incompetence in this field, and say as little about it as I can. I will say this much, however, that as far as I can see it is an extremely complicated and obscure field of the law.

On the other hand, the matter has important social overtones. It is a problem that really arises, as nearly all our problems arise, out of a social context. The difficulty that we are now in is that the obscure complex and difficult laws under which we operate bear very little relationship to the social aspects of the question as they now exist, and as they are now understood by the people. I think the hon. member for Wellington South made

some reference to the fact that the law and the thinking on the matter is out of date. Well, I do not see how the thinking can be out of date. The thinking is as it is at any time. It is the law that is out of date, because it does not correspond with what I think is now the thinking of most people on this subject. It is time, as the resolution proposes, that we should make the law correspond to the social realities of a society of the second half of the 20th century, which it clearly does not at the present time.

We, in this party, support at least the objectives of the resolution. I do not think it is worth quibbling about words. The purpose of the resolution to us is supportable. It is an objective that has always been supported by our party, and the CCF which preceded the New Democratic Party. From the days of J. S. Woodsworth down to—shall we say—the days of Reid Scott, who is now a member of Parliament, our party has advocated a harmonization of the law with the social reality in this important area.

Failure to create that harmonization has resulted in two consequences, both of which in my opinion, are evil. One is that in some cases the inability to get divorce on grounds on which it should be granted leads to collusive arrangements through which the law is in effect evaded. The other is that the rigidity of the divorce law leads to common law relationships. And the problem with common law relationships is that the relationships of the two parties are not very clearly defined as far as the law is concerned. This often leads to grave injustice.

For example, I had a case come to my attention quite recently of a man who was killed in a traffic accident. He had, unbeknown to almost everyone except the parties immediately involved, been living in a common law relationship with a woman, and one that I would consider a stable relationship for about 20 years. The only reason he was living common law was that one of the parties was married in an indissoluble marriage, not only indissoluble religiously but also civilly. He and his common law wife had lived together as man and wife for 20 years. This man unfortunately had not anticipated death; he had not reached that age when people think very seriously about it. He had left no will and this woman had no rights at all.

Surely something should be done to rectify that. Even if we do not try to accomplish what the resolution wishes to accomplish, I think at least we should do something in our law to define the common law relationship and the rights of the parties in such a

relationship. That at least is something that we can put right in this Legislature without any reference to Ottawa at all, and I think while we are waiting for action on the broader question of divorce we should do something about that in this House.

Another problem that I think we should consider, and one about which we may be able to do something in this House, was referred to by the hon. member for Humber, and that is the question of the cost of getting a divorce, even where there are grounds.

Our legal aid system simply does not touch this question. Where the divorce is being obtained collusively, as so many of them are, I would take it that the basic legal cost—apart altogether from any investigatory costs, which may not be very large if the arrangement is collusive—will be at least \$1,000 and, in addition to that, there will be certain court costs. So the effect of that is that divorce under collusive arrangements—and divorce even where it is justified under the law as it now stands—becomes largely a privilege of the rich.

If a marriage has broken down and is irretrievable, the rich usually get a divorce and the poor live common law. There are a large number of people living common law—probably far more than the number who get divorces—because the poor, as we know, are more numerous than the rich. But this is the situation that now exists because of the obsolete laws in effect at the present time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is one other phase of the matter of divorce that I think we should bear in mind when we are discussing this subject at this time. I believe that, traditionally, the term "divorce" referred to two different types of settlement—if I may use that word. There was what was called divorce from the chains of matrimony, which was a complete and absolute divorce; then there was, on the other hand, divorce from bed and board which, in the less picturesque and descriptive language of today, is usually referred to as "legal separation." But it is still a form of divorce, and if we are going to initiate discussions with Ottawa on the subject of divorce as I hope we will, I think we should raise the question of legal separation.

I think this is a matter for which a remedy could be found even more quickly than on the very complicated and hitherto controversial problem of divorce from the chains of matrimony. As I understand it, Ontario is the only province in Canada in which it is not possible to obtain a legal separation.

This is an historical accident and it is time that such a ridiculous anomaly were eliminated. I hate to see Ontario in an inferior position in relation to all the other provinces. The inability of a person to obtain a legal separation in this province, even when the state of the matrimonial relationship clearly indicates that it is desirable, sometimes leads to great injustices.

I would like to refer to another individual case that came to my attention not too long ago. This was the case of a woman with three children, whose husband is a chronic alcoholic; unfortunately under present arrangements in Ontario there is not too much that can be done for him—he is periodically confined to jail. When he is in jail the family leads a fairly peaceful and happy sort of existence, but this woman contacted me because the fatal day—and it is sad to have to call it that, but that is what it was for her—was drawing nigh when he would be released from jail. The entire domestic relationship that she was trying to maintain for the benefit of her children would be again upset; he would come back into the home and, on his previous record, he would be a thoroughly disruptive influence.

Now she cannot, under the law of Ontario, get a legal separation; she cannot, as I understand, deny him access to the home. He can come in and beat her up; if he does, she can probably charge him. He may threaten her, or she may be in fear that he will beat her up. She may have him bound over to keep the peace, but she is not protected in any of those situations. To have him bound over to keep the peace, when one considers the type of person involved and the problem he unfortunately has, is no protection for her at all. Surely in a case like this the only answer is a legal separation—a divorce from bed and board—if total divorce is not to be granted.

This woman was not seeking full divorce, she just wanted to have a separation. She wanted to have it established that she was lawfully entitled to live separately with her children. Everybody that I talked to, every lawyer I talked to, agreed that the sensible thing was legal separation. But there was no way of achieving that. Surely this grave anomaly in our law can be remedied as a first step toward a general reconsideration of the divorce laws as they affect the province at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that this group supports the resolution; we commend the hon. member for having brought it forth; we regret that at least some of the members

on the Conservative side of the House are now taking, shall we say, a "hair-splitting" attitude toward it. They agree that it is good thing, but they do not think that we should do anything about it. We hope that this attitude will be overcome; that this House will in fact go on record as supporting the principle of the resolution and discussions will in fact be initiated between this government and the federal government on the subject. How else are we ever going to make any progress? If we all agree, but do nothing, no progress will ever be made. I suggest it is time we get on with the job.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hear, hear.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, in a Manitoba case some few years ago a supreme court judge at that time indicated that there were two grounds for divorce—adultery and perjury. For those who did not like to commit adultery, he added, and were too honest to commit perjury, there was no relief.

Our law in this province on divorce almost causes our people to use the courts as a dupe. The adversary system is almost completely broken down since most divorce cases are undefended. Adultery often causes cases of blackmail in addition because of the moral implications involved. A wife often dares her husband to step out of line after having caught him in a surreptitious act of adultery. Adultery is also the easiest ground to fabricate. One can scarcely fabricate a long course of cruelty or insanity or desertion. The law at present requires adultery alone as a ground for any divorce proceedings. In some instances, the adultery is ancillary to other actions which might warrant the dissolution of the marriage. In others, however, it is a completely unrelated incident, and yet our laws suggest to the affronted party that a divorce should be sought because adultery is the only ground recognized.

In other situations, a husband could be an alcoholic or a wife-beater and cause his wife and family any amount of stress and sorrow, and yet the wife would have no course of action in the divorce courts.

Similarly, a husband could desert his wife and family and the wife would be obliged to trace him and ascertain whether adultery had in fact been committed. Surely the time has come when the federal government should take steps towards divorce reform. It makes sense that if a marriage has to all intents and purposes ended because of the desertion by the husband, or the insanity of

one of the parties, that there should be legislation that would allow a divorce action to proceed.

It has also become a fact in our present society that divorce is often available only to the wealthier groups. A woman who has been deserted by her husband and has moved to another province or even another country, finds herself faced with a heavy financial burden if she is to undertake a divorce action. The amount required could range from \$500 to \$2,000 in certain circumstances.

If the woman had sufficient funds available for that purpose she might take those steps. However, as is more often the case, the amount is prohibitive and she is more inclined to forget the divorce action and use the funds at her disposal to bring up her family. Often-times this subsequently results in a common law relationship. A similar result occurs if the husband is jailed or committed to a mental institution.

The hon. member for Wellington South refers to difficulties caused on certain occasions by the law of domicile. Perhaps he is referring to a suggestion made by Mr. Elliott Pepper, formerly the Queen's proctor for our province, wherein he stated that perhaps domicile should be national rather than provincial. I cannot agree with his suggestion, since I feel it would be too great a change from the more universally accepted view with regard to domicile. However, on the other hand, I would not be averse to the suggestion that a wife could be given a domicile of her own. As the law presently stands, a woman who is deserted by her husband and the husband turns up, perhaps in British Columbia, the woman would be obliged to sue for divorce in British Columbia because that is the domicile of her husband.

I would comment critically on the phraseology used in the resolution referring to long-term imprisonment. I think this leaves a great deal to be desired and specific wording should replace it. I would suggest that a term of 10 years in prison could be one referred to if a man were convicted of such an offence and sentenced to 10 years in prison. This might not necessarily mean that he would spend the 10 years in prison; because of our present parole system but rather he might be in jail for perhaps four to five years.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Thursday, June 17, 1965

Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, continued	4361
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	4391

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Clerk of the House: The fifty-sixth order, House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

(continued)

On vote 1701:

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, to continue the statement where I had stopped at five o'clock this afternoon, I wish to say that the prospect of further provincial participation in the affairs of Indians has been under discussion with federal authorities for some time. These discussions led to a federal-provincial conference which was convened last fall. The Ontario delegates to this conference were the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) and myself, with senior officials from our two departments.

In effect, the conference was exploratory, to test provincial reactions to direct participation in the affairs of Indians and assumption by the provinces of some financial responsibility for their care. The proposal did not, however, outline satisfactorily the specific area of the provincial authority and it failed to identify specifically federal responsibility for off-reserve Indians.

People of Indian ancestry not registered with Indian authorities were excluded from benefits of the plan, as were certain registered Indians. It was agreed that the possibility of an extension of provincial services to Indians should be studied in each province to consider priorities in the broad field of social and economic development and with a view to concluding agreements acceptable to the Indians and to the federal and provincial governments. Discussions have been taking place between officials of the governments of Ontario and Canada regarding the further extension of provincial welfare services and

extension of community development to Indians.

These discussions have established a consensus as to the manner in which this could be done and on the nature of the agreements that would enable such provincial services to be extended to Indians. However, further progress must await discussions between the federal government and the federal-Ontario Indian advisory council, which comprises Indians representing bands from all parts of the province. This step is in accord with the federal government's policy of requiring that proposed major changes in the method of providing services to Indians must be considered by this council so that both governments may have the benefit of the council's advice and have an opportunity to consider suggestions or recommendations that may emanate from the council.

In short, while there has been a large measure of agreement reached between Ontario and Canada as to how this province's welfare and community development services could be extended to the Indian if it is the desire of the Indian bands of Ontario to receive such services on their reserves, I feel it would be improper for me to elaborate further until the Indian advisory council has been brought into the picture and the members of the council have had time to consider the implications of the discussions that have been taking place.

Within the Ontario government certain steps have been taken with the view to establishing a co-ordinated policy for Indian affairs. In January of this year, a Cabinet committee on Indians was created under my chairmanship. Other members of this committee include the hon. Ministers of Education, Health (Mr. Dymond), Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) and the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Attached to this group is an executive committee of senior civil servants who are directed to review existing programmes and co-ordinate the activities of all departments of government that can render a service where Indians are concerned.

The three basic policy decisions that have now been made and which are not affected in any way by negotiations now under way with the federal government are:

1. The province will ensure that the programmes carried out by the various departments are co-ordinated and that they meet with the approval of the Indians themselves. It is therefore the intention of the government to consult with the Indian advisory council.

2. To ensure the maximum benefits of any provincial plan, Indians must be employed by the government to carry out this programme. The government therefore intends to develop specialized training programmes for Indians to meet current and future needs.

3. A federal-provincial co-ordinating committee on Indians has been appointed, four members from Ontario and four from Ottawa. The committee is composed of senior civil servants representing the four major departments of government primarily involved with programmes designed specifically to assist Indians; that is, Public Welfare, Education, Economics and Development and Lands and Forests. The chairman of this committee will report directly to me and will be responsible for the programmes of development among Ontario Indians.

The advantage of this arrangement is that the federal-provincial committee will be enabled to advise both governments as to the needs of the Indians. It will also report on the appropriate administrative machinery necessary to carry out the programme.

As of now, all provincial departments engaged in rendering services to Indians are required to co-ordinate these activities with the Cabinet co-ordinating committee. The hon. members can be assured of our sincere concern for the problems of these people and that we are moving as rapidly as possible towards a comprehensive plan for their development.

I may add, Mr. Chairman, that we have been negotiating with the Ottawa government, especially with the hon. Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. Nicholson, who, I must say, has taken hold of the matter very well, and we are progressing very favourably. As a matter of fact there has already been an exchange of draft agreements between the two governments. As late as June 9 I have a letter addressed to me by Mr. Nicholson which I think would be worth reading, Mr. Chairman, in which he states:

Dear Mr. Cecile:

I am pleased to hear of the excellent progress being made by members of our

respective governments in reaching agreements on the extension of welfare and community development programmes to Indians.

Agreement formats are being cleared at present with our legal and financial people and will be sent to you shortly for further consideration.

In the interim, I am informed that it may be necessary for you to begin preliminary work in community development with Indian people living on provincial Crown lands immediately. I understand that these Indians live off reserves and that they are unorganized and it would be desirable to include them in any development projects that are introduced now.

The question raised by your people in a recent telephone conversation with my officials was whether these off-reserve Indians could be covered later by general community development agreement when we are ready to sign it. The federal cost-sharing proposals in community development are intended to meet the needs of any group of registered Indians living in Ontario to whom the province wishes to extend its development programme.

The federal government is now accepting project submissions from several provinces which set out the scope and cost of community development work in specific geographic areas. Under our present authority we are able to consider such project submissions before more general and all-embracing agreements in community developments are signed. If you wish, you may want to prepare such a submission with off-reserve Indians to enable you to get an early start in development work with these particular groups.

If these submissions are consistent with the general framework of the federal government as proposed and which has been reviewed with your officials you can expect to recover a share of the cost of this work from this department. When a general agreement in the community development is signed later such projects would be merely incorporated into such an agreement.

This is what has been going on, and we have been working very progressively. We hope that very soon a formal agreement will be signed to take care of all these programmes, and I am assured that the meetings the federal people have had with their own Indian councils have been progressing very well, too, and I can say the same thing as far as

we are concerned. So we are really on the road to progress.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I have listened since I have been in this Legislature to the hopes and the complacency of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare about Indians, in fact about the whole gamut of his organization. I may say it is all very well to read some communication you have had with Ottawa about community development. We have pointed out to you consistently what they are doing in Manitoba, for one. You talk of yourself as the great *avant garde* in human betterment.

As far as I am concerned, the only area that we read about is when we hear from the *Toronto Telegram*, a paper which is usually fairly receptive to you, about the shocking conditions of Indians who have left a reserve and then suddenly, with an hysteria that seems to be part of government when any crisis is exposed by newspapers, you move in a bit.

Frankly, listening to the dry, parchment-like approach of the hon. Minister's readings of some communication from Ottawa, and telling us that we should be satisfied and he hopes things will develop—I am tired of hopes when we think of a minority group in our society which we know has one of the highest mortality rates with respect to child-birth, for example, Kenora. I notice that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) was very quick, when I referred in my Budget speech to the Kenora area. He turned to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and said, this is because of the Indian population.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Is that the speech you read? Are you criticizing us for the speech we are reading?

Mr. Thompson: I am not criticizing him for reading his speech, because otherwise I would spend more of my time criticizing each Cabinet Minister, including yourself, sir.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, you said the dry speech he read.

Mr. Thompson: I am talking about the contents of it, not about the fact he read it.

I would have hoped that by now the hon. Minister would be telling us that he had done something for the Indians. I would hope that the hon. Minister would be talking about the fact that CMHC, as they have in Manitoba, has taken a new approach to housing. Or in connection with the training of Indians, that he could stand up and tell us with some pride: "This is our accomplishment."

But year after year, since I have been in this House, this hon. Minister has stood up and I must say, speaking personally, no one has a higher regard for the dignity, the warmth and the personality of the hon. Minister as a person, but as the Minister of Public Welfare, as far as I am concerned, he is a failure. I do not know if it is the hon. Minister's fault or not, but I say—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Well, as far as we are concerned, you are a failure! That proves nothing.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I say you are a failure because you look at this area of people, and this is what counts, what has been done for people. This is the barometer of a civilized society. What has been done for the Indian?

We now learn that there are going to be further negotiations with Ottawa. In Manitoba they talk about community development. Within their provincial department, they have had a community development programme. To you this is something like talking of astronauts. It is away up in the moon or something.

You are going to arrive at it slowly. You are making negotiations with Ottawa. I think you have got to do better than that. I hope that there will be a day when the hon. Minister of Public Welfare stands up and tells us what he has done, rather than what he hopes to do. In the case of the Indians, I agree that there has been an unimaginative approach through the years from the department in Ottawa, and I do not care which government it was. But they are honest, according to the commission of Indian affairs in the United States, who wrote on the Indians of America.

Mr. White: They are a complete failure in that area.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I will not go to that extent and say it has been a complete failure. I am not talking about today.

Mr. White: Professor William Morris has quit your party because of the inadequacies of the Liberal Indian policy.

Mr. Thompson: Well, there have been some others. I happen to have studied the Indian question across the country, and I would say it is an indictment on the government, no matter Conservative or Liberal. You want to be more partisan and say it is just Liberal. Well, that is your concern.

Mr. White: No, but Professor Morris left—

Mr. Thompson: I am not interested in Professor Morris. I suggest to you as a lecturer—perhaps you have been raised to a professor at the university now—you are an erudite fellow. I suggest you do a little more reading in this area, with all respect.

But I suggest that no government, I do not care which they were, has been imaginative in this approach. But on the provincial level, there is also an area of responsibility, and as you go out west to Saskatchewan—the hon. Prime Minister hates the word Saskatchewan—

An hon. member: He does not think so.

Mr. Thompson: If he went out to see what they have done with the Métis; the advances they have made with the minority groups with co-operatives; of trying to have priests and others work with Indians, it is an awfully inspiring thing. We talk about a peace corps going over to underdeveloped countries!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We do not. It is your group in Ottawa.

Mr. Thompson: All right. Well, I wish you would talk about a peace corps in connection with community development of the people who have left reserves—

Mr. White: If you had listened to Professor Morris—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. The Whip surely must exemplify an attitude of respect and dignity towards the House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, somehow he seems to have lost the sense of decorum I thought he had. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling the House back to the dignity which we always assume it should have.

A peace corps with a minority group who have left the reserves would be an awfully challenging thing. The hon. Prime Minister says this is something Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson suggested.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Chairman. In order to set the record straight, I was thinking that it might be a little more attractive if we developed something of our own, instead of borrowing from our neighbours to the south, and I am referring to the federal government, of course.

Mr. Thompson: May I say that unfortunately in Ontario we never have anything attractive, so we have to borrow from the south. If you could give the example—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: All right. What have you got? We have just got through with the hon. Minister of Health about our mental institutions—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Why, then, do they come up from the United States?

Mr. Thompson: They go back again when they look at the Victorian age that you have developed. You and your adulation of Lord Bennett, or Viscount Bennett, or something. Let me say this, there is a challenge—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He looked at the crystal ball.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I cannot get all these interjections.

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Let me simply say this, that there is a challenge to young Canadians where we see there are pockets of poverty, or missed opportunity, and the hon. Minister of Public Welfare should be inspiring people, young graduates from universities and from other areas. I do not say borrow from the United States with a peace corps, but you could have some other original name for it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): The Company of Young Canadians.

Mr. Thompson: The Company of Young Canadians—a very excellent suggestion. I may say that it was suggested by my hon. friend from Brant before. Let us have some imagination and leadership. All the hon. Minister of Public Welfare offered us when we asked him what he was doing about community development, was to read correspondence. I am not interested in correspondence any more; I am interested in achievement and in what you are doing. That is all I want to make. I want this government to stand up at some time and tell us of the challenging things they are doing with minority groups to help them to raise themselves, rather than your correspondence with Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, my only answer to the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I am sure he is sincere, is that you just cannot deal with Indians like my hon. friend from Brant who spoke a moment ago—you

cannot impose anything on them. They are most difficult to compel to do anything. They have to come into the picture. I think Ottawa has been doing this and so have we, and the matter is now entering a period of fruition.

This correspondence is certainly not useless. It has now come to the point where we shall have a firm agreement with Ottawa, not only in welfare services as I know them, but also in economics and development and housing and education and all the aspects of social services. This has to be done on that federal-provincial level. I am sure all the provinces who were attending the conference agreed with that principle, and I think that the government at Ottawa wants to do this as well as we want to. But at the same time you just cannot rush into such a thing, and you have to be very careful about this. I think some of the developments that we have had at Minaki, at Red Lake especially, and at Batchawana and such places, are proof that it can be done. On that basis, I think we will have a firm agreement within the next month or so which will start this community development rolling.

As a matter of fact there have been studies made and we intend to start a project early this year at Moosonee. This is certainly a place where we will see what we can accomplish with community development. I understand there are in that area 5,000 Indians who will be dealt with. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I cannot make any prediction, all I can hope, when we see what has happened in smaller areas, is that this larger plan will be a success.

This has been a co-ordinated effort. I do not think that we have been wasting our time. I appreciate the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition, but I can assure him that is just where we are going now. I think the correspondence has been very useful, and I might say this: I am not a man who likes to deal with matters swinging from one course to another according to the political situation. I think that Mr. Nicholson has been one of the better Ministers we have had in that department in Ottawa, and I think he has done a good job. We are going to go along with him in this and he has assured us—or so I judge from the tenor of conversation with him—that this agreement will be carried out.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about this Indian problem, because I know a great number of them myself and I do not think that any of us can hold our head up and be too boastful of what has been accomplished for the Indian

population of Canada. The main blame for this should be with the federal government of years gone past. I do not think, no matter what political party was in power in Ottawa, that it has been too successful. There are so many problems, and the hon. Minister certainly has my appreciation of the difficulties under which he works.

I think one, Mr. Minister, is this. The average Indian in the province of Ontario is afraid of the government of Ontario for this reason: Not because you happen to be there, but because of the fact that ever since Confederation they have dealt primarily with the federal government at Ottawa and they have a natural tendency not to want other government bodies in their particular jurisdictions. No one appreciates more than I the fact that provincial governments should move in on Indian problems more than they have. They have not always been welcome, but I think that they should try to liaison with them and become a little more friendly; not that you do not wish to be friendly yourself, but to get them to reciprocate.

Now, how you would do this I am not prepared to say, but I think you should try to sell yourself. A few moments ago you said that Indians will not be pushed around and that you cannot impose your will on them, but the one thing that you could do is give them a selling job on the many advantages that can be derived by the many reservations in the province of Ontario from the various departments in your particular Department of Public Welfare.

After all, there is little similarity between the Indians in British Columbia and the Indians in Alberta and those on reservations in southern Ontario. Then we have the problem of the many Indians who have left the reservation.

I suggest that you have three distinct areas: One, Indians such as those in Moosonee and the outlying districts; two, others in reservations such as the one in Brantford or Cape Croker, Chippewa Hill in my own area; and three, Indians who have left the reservations altogether.

Each of them have their own individual problems. Many of the leaders of the Indians have left the reservations. This is one of the problems, and consequently some of those who are left behind are not too anxious to give the leadership needed on their particular reservations.

I suggest, Mr. Minister, that you should not be afraid to go and see these people yourself, and have officials of the department travel around and tell the various

councils of the opportunities your department will provide. Tell them that you are most willing to co-operate, because in my own experience in talking to them I have found that they are not too willing to have the provincial government move in when the great white father—even though he has been a very poor one in my estimation—namely, the federal government in Ottawa, is still their father in their opinion. They are not too anxious to have other departments of government under provincial jurisdiction move in.

Mr. L. Troy (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, one word about this vote.

I am quite interested in this problem of the Indians, but it seems to me that one of the great weaknesses is that those who are on the reservation would be much better off if they were moved from some of the reservations they are on, some of them the worst land in the country. The government gave them land that was no good for agriculture whatever.

I think these areas should be changed to sections where there are stretches of good land to which they could be transported if they are interested in agriculture. It is absolutely impossible to make a living from the rocky terrain on which some of them are now living. All hon. members know of this, and those who have seen the Indian reservations are astounded at the beneficence of the federal government of the past which gave them this type of land for their reservations.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on another item on this, and I think it would probably come under The Charitable Institutions Act.

This is in connection with unmarried mothers. I suppose the barometer of any government, and of any civilized society, is the compassion with which it looks after the babies that are born, whether they are legitimate or illegitimate. I assume that the writings of Charles Dickens aroused the conscience of the English-speaking world in the 19th century to the mother who would go through the snow and the blizzard and put her baby in a basket before a church and hope that someone would look after it. Of course, today we have a more positive role by government and the assumption, from the recent Act, that the Minister of Public Welfare is the person who sees that no child is abandoned. We have had legislation to see that there is no stigma attached to the child no matter what the background of the parents and so on.

However, I was interested to talk to some

of the directors of children's aid societies and others, and I have permission to use their names in a discussion that I will present to the House here. One of the people was Mr. Gardner of the children's aid society. I am talking about the services for unmarried mothers. He suggests first that the requests for services continue to increase, and yet we have more limitations because of lack of funds and facilities.

He emphasized very strongly the great need for maternity homes and said there was a great shortage of foster homes in the community. By that I mean a girl who becomes pregnant and wants to leave her community, will work as a domestic or something else because there are just not other places for her to go. Another point is that babies have to remain in the hospitals because there are no homes for them. Another thing, which I frankly did not know, was that babies are covered for ten days on medical insurance, only for ten days, on well-baby care.

I raise this question to the hon. Minister and after I have finished I hope he will answer this: The mother has to pay for the baby after the ten days and until a home is found.

Mr. Gardner of the children's aid society says there is a real backlog, a permanent backlog; they just cannot catch up in this. He says that their real limitations are in terms of money; there is no money for foster homes; there is no money for advertising about foster homes—for recruitment and for study to locate the right kind of homes for these babies.

He suggests that the costs of services to unmarried mothers is carried largely by voluntary grants. Then he comes to the point that there are very few mothers, unmarried mothers, who are able to carry the financial burden; yet she has to attempt to carry the burden of the cost of the maternity home and of the baby. About one in three are able to keep their babies and he suggests that, in many cases, the children's aid societies would like to encourage the mother to keep the baby; she wants to, she has the maternal longing to raise her baby, but it is financially impossible. If there was more financial assistance, this would be possible for the mother.

It is the financial situation that causes this separation of the mother and her baby. There are no co-ordinated day nurseries in this community. I remember last year raising, with the hon. Minister, the idea of trying to get married nurses back to hospitals; and asking him how he selects where there should be day nurseries. I got a very vague answer from him that it seemed to me it was

political pressure or some other thing that decided where you would have day nurseries, and there is not a clear-cut idea of whether you agree with day nurseries.

Then the second question is that there are many married couples where both man and wife are working because of economic pressure, but there are not day nurseries for them. I am not sure what the government's policy is on this. I agree that you are not going to have day nurseries in Forest Hill or some other wealthy community so that the wives can go out and curl, or whatever they do. But on the other hand there are mothers who, of the financial necessity to keep the home going, have to get out and work. I am thinking of unmarried mothers who would want to keep a child, but there are no day nurseries for them. I will not go into this aspect of the emotional disservice to a mother of having to part with a child.

In Toronto, of the mostly private day nurseries, there are a few that are operated by the municipality. Could I raise this in the second question to the hon. Minister? Perhaps, and I pray his indulgence, he might be good enough to answer me. My question is about the need for day nurseries operated by the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Might I ask my hon. friend if I could answer that question under the heading of "Day Nurseries"?

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1701:

Mr. Thompson: I am still continuing on this. On the question of whether illegitimacy is increasing; and some may make the point that if we give help to the unmarried mother, we are really trying to encourage more illegitimacy. Again I quote from Mr. Gardner of the children's aid society, where he says that, from the background studies that have been done, it is not increasing in view of the population; there is a slight increase, but it is not anything that is out of all proportion and that the mores and the morale of society have not been completely disrupted.

He argues about social workers, the fact of the pressures on them within his own society from a mixed load, the turnover because of this pressure and the need for more trained staff; and these are quasi-government operations, the children's aid societies. The salaries need to be increased; he said they cannot get the funds from the local community and the provincial government gives very little toward the care of the unwed mother.

I asked about the numbers of homes for unwed mothers. There is a Rosalea Hall, which I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of. It is a Catholic home for unwed mothers and has 30 beds. Apparently it has an enormously long waiting list. We talked to the Mother Superior, or the Sister who is in charge of the home, and she told us she hated to answer the phone because she is so short of room. She said there are girls who have to wait month after month before they can get into this home; often they do not apply soon enough and they become emergency cases.

Frankly, from the conversation on the phone from the person who had phoned for me, it sounded like there was real desperation with the number of young girls who are coming into the city of Toronto with this situation of pregnancy and nowhere to turn to. This Catholic home for unwed mothers just cannot accommodate all of them. Apparently it phones all the other homes in Toronto for referrals, only to find they are all booked up as well. Since January this year there have been 75 girls apply.

They have now decided to tighten up a lot in the home. They have a very tough, as well as a very efficient, administrative set-up. The girl who comes into the city now has to be referred by her priest and she has to write out an application form, she has to have a signed medical form, and then she will be accepted. Of course they have to be well in advance before they will even be considered. That is the Catholic home for unwed mothers. In talking to them it was a plea of desperation, a plea of enormous pressure and an inability to fulfil the need of looking after the unwed mother.

The Anglican home for unwed mothers, Homewood Home, has 26 beds; ten double and six single. They try to have the girls there ten to twelve weeks before birth and they provide some after-care. Last year they had 142 girls. They turned down, and I want to emphasize this, this one home turned down 250 girls. They are completely booked up until the end of July and they have bookings for August and September. Now what is the province doing in all this situation? After all, the children that are born are going to be citizens of Ontario. The province per diem grant is \$4 per day for those who cannot afford it, and only for those girls who have a year's residence in Ontario. In 1964, in this Anglican home for unwed mothers, the total budget was \$48,587. The provincial grant was \$9,723.

The other was the Salvation Army home for unwed mothers, which has 30 beds. Only in the seventh month are pregnant cases

allowed to come in to it. School girls are allowed to come in on their fifth month. There were 225 last year; some 25 were referred to other homes. Operating costs were \$34,000 last year. At this point they are booked up until August.

The Salvation Army home for unwed mothers in Hamilton has 23 beds; stipulation—you have to be seven months pregnant. There were 160 girls last year; 87 so far this year. It has refused 20 so far this year. Per diem grants; they pay up to 25 per cent.

United Church home for unwed mothers, the Victor Home, has 27 girls. They are taken in during their seventh month, except in an emergency. At least 200 girls have been turned down since January—it could be at least 300—but they say it is definitely 200. They are booked up until September. The provincial grants per diem rate for unpaid bills add up to about \$10,000 out of a total operating cost of \$50,000. Church funds have to pay the rest.

There are no provincial homes for unwed mothers in Ontario. The only assistance that the provincial government gives is through grants and, as I have listed here, they are far from sufficient. There are only six homes in the city of Toronto, and they are all sponsored by religious groups.

I would like the hon. Minister to listen to these facts. The Salvation Army alone turned away 181 girls so far this year. Where do these girls go? Are we living in Dickens' time? What happens to these girls in an Ontario which has as its clarion call "human betterment"; what happens to the child? The 181 girls last year turned away from the Salvation Army. As of now the Salvation Army is booked up till mid-September. Because of lack of space, they cannot take the girls until their seventh month; they have only 20 beds, and there is no provision for after-care. However, in serious cases the Army attempts to assist them until they can find a job. They ask the girls to pay if they can afford it but of course there are some who cannot pay any money towards their upkeep.

What should be done? What can be done? Well, I suggest if this government really had a sensitivity towards the welfare of its people, that it would be thinking of the children, whether they are born out of wedlock or not. And I think there should be co-ordination between the welfare, the health and the education departments. The detachment of a child physically should be undertaken in family counselling centres, grouping together all the necessary specialists and services for

guidance and treatment. And we have hit at this matter steadily.

The government had Bessie Touzel do some experiments and write briefs on the needs for preventive services, and for family counselling; and year after year, since I have been in this House, we ask what are you doing about it. Always you are considerate in your answers; always you are very gentlemanly, but we do not get the concrete facts about preventive service around this province.

We turn towards the hon. Minister of Education. He is not quite as polite as far as the local school boards go and so on; he decides he is going to do something and he does it. You keep saying you are moving step by step on the problem; I am talking about the problem of mixed-up kids—girls who get into trouble. Part of the problem is through lack of family counselling and as yet you have no uniform family counselling throughout this province. We need specialists and services for guidance and treatment.

Adoptions should be encouraged, but half these doors are closed to the unwed mother who comes into Toronto. I quoted a number of the homes where they have turned away as many as 160 to 200 people.

In Holland—and I know the hon. Minister resents it when we refer to other countries, and he should resent it because by comparison he looks awfully petty—in Holland, the strength of the personnel can be expressed in the number of children that one staff member has to look after. It varies from 3.7 to 20.6.

In Denmark, the preventive measures are based on the principle that removal of the child is the final resort. And let me say that principle is not found in The Ontario Child Welfare Act; the assumption is that the mother should be separated from the child and get the child out for adoption, and you do that through your supported services as well. I am still not convinced. And I will be eager to hear from the hon. Minister whether he believes in day nurseries. If he believes in it, he is not taking much action to develop it.

Take Denmark for example, and I am talking about child welfare in Denmark. I know this has been discussed but I want to get it on the record so that it can be a comparison with what is done in Ontario. For children up to the age of 14—I am talking about child welfare—they have educational homes for short-term placement, they have educational homes for long-term placement, they have educational homes for short-term placement of children with be-

haviour problems, educational homes for long-term placement for children with behaviour difficulties—including the mentally retarded, educational homes for children with behaviour problems that require more differentiated psychopaediatric treatment than may be provided for.

I could go on with that at some length—but I would like to say to the hon. Minister that it is quite obvious—as it must be to him—that voluntary agencies and religious organizations, which we have to commend for their wonderful charity in providing for the unwed mothers, have tried to keep pace with this and to do a job. But I am sure that it must hurt them enormously, for example, when a Sister of a Catholic order has to turn girls away. She must think what an uncivilized, inhuman society we have that we cannot provide more for these girls. And I am sure that the hon. Minister must himself be awfully sensitive to this. I have been quoting the fact that the institutions we have are not sufficient and that girls are being turned away, and I quoted the figure of 160 and so on, and I ask the hon. Minister, what is he going to do about it? After all, this is the responsibility of the province. I say to the hon. Minister, what is he going to do about this? For these are the facts of the situation.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I suppose this is one of those cases in which, regardless of what is done, it is very difficult to achieve perfection. I do not intend to presume that everything can be done. But at the same time, I hope my hon. friend does not think I am responsible for all the illegitimacy that appears in the province, although I am pleased to say that according to statistics, Ontario has the lowest rate on the continent, which speaks well, I presume, for our young people.

As the hon. member knows full well, there is an Act—The Charitable Institutions Act, which he has mentioned, and which is available to any group of people who wish to enter this field. It is available to them as far as construction grants or other grants, and I am advised that the grant is now at a maximum of \$4 per day as regards maintenance. But when The Children's Institutions Act comes into force there will be an improvement.

The hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned that these particular homes have refused a lot of these girls because of shortage of space. I might say also that many of these girls live in homes with families up to the time of the birth of the baby. I presume it might be more satisfactory if they could live

in a home of that description, where there is not the general care of an institution, but the love and care of the family itself. I suppose in one way that this might be more of a deterrent to future occasions than if they lived in an institution where possibly they do not receive the same kind of treatment.

How to answer that fully, whether you can deal with this problem in a definite way so as to cure this situation that my hon. friend has described—and I know how sincerely he does this—would be a very difficult thing to answer. But I still maintain, Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that there is a definite responsibility, not only for the government, but also for the people of this province generally. Because this is a problem that touches the very roots of our way of living.

I do not know if I would like the idea of solving this on the same basis as all other programmes in this particular respect because I think that a mother has placed herself in the situation. But if it is a case of wanting help, then I think that the people generally in the community have a duty to look after her, just as well as the government has. We must not deal with the situation as if it were a deterrent but only in order to help. If there are not enough of these institutions then I would suggest that I would ask the people of Ontario and the different municipalities if they could form these helping organizations, and I am sure there are many who would be interested. I am sure the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition will have its impact on this situation if we have not got enough of these homes.

We are quite willing to help organizations along and, as I stated, there is The Charitable Institutions Act. It is available for all groups of people who want to take advantage of it. As far as the subsidy is concerned, which is a maximum now of \$4 a day, I note here that we range from \$3.06 a day up to in some cases \$8 a day. I understand that under the new Child Welfare Act there are new rules outlined for the particular purpose of dealing with children born out of wedlock. I suppose lots of unwed mothers from rural areas come to the larger centres, to larger cities. That was one of the reasons that at the time we thought it proper following the recommendation of the committee that sat for two years, that we revise the new Act. They recommended that we should take over the full cost of these children, and I think it was proper to do so.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister did away with the rest of this requirement.

Previously I understood the municipality would be charged.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister did away with this and I congratulate him on that. I think that was a beacon concept.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I appreciate, with my friend, the hon. leader of the Opposition, that that is a problem, and I suppose it was a problem from the beginning of time and it will be forever. If it was possible to arrive at an average of what would happen in a year in this respect I suppose we could set our sights that way, but I do not suppose it would be possible to arrive at any precise figure in that particular respect.

We know how many people reach the age of 60, 70 or 80, or pretty close to it, but this is something we do not know anything about and it would be very difficult to deal with. I am quite sure that the people who are dealing with this particular problem are doing the best they can. Maybe there are not enough, but I am sure, after hearing my hon. friend—and we know this, too—there are not enough of these homes.

The only thing I can say now, Mr. Chairman, and be sincere with myself, is to encourage more people to enter into this field of endeavour and also maybe touch the conscience of the people themselves in the different municipalities. I hope to say something further as the votes go along in the matter of day nurseries and also preventive services. I can appreciate that this may be a slow process, but when you deal with human beings that may be expected. I have had talks with the child welfare league of America and others along this line, but you cannot rush such developments. You do not institutionalize matters of this kind.

Without saying that you play it by ear, you also have to bear in mind this is the responsibility of you and me as citizens of a municipality, of a province, and also as members of this House. It is a joint responsibility, I believe, in that particular sense, and I can assure my hon. friend that I do not think we have been lax in this.

Possibly, as in every other thing, we would like to provide more, but at the same time we have to deal with all the programmes. The apple is just so large and we have to deal with it according to priority. We have to work to the best of our ability and along with the people who are in the field. At the same time we are always willing and ready

to improve. If that means an amendment has to be made in The Charitable Institutions Act along the lines of The Children's Institutions Act to change the subsidy as regards the maintenance factor, then we would be quite willing to look at this and deal with it in the proper sense that it should be dealt with. I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that we have never refused to aid, as far as I know, any organization entering this field, and I hope that my words, along with his words, will be an encouragement along that line.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions to ask on this vote. The first is on the question of staff of this department. If I understood correctly, the hon. Minister told us this afternoon that there were 80 persons on staff with university degrees. I would like to find out from the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, how many of those university graduates hold the title of MSW or BSW in the department.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, if I could just intervene at this moment. The question is an excellent one, and I do not want to deflect it, but I want to know how we are going to handle this estimate. We have been discussing children under the first vote. Where do we discuss staff? How is it properly divided? How closely are we going to hold to, or are we going to roam in, this first vote?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It would be carried on as the vote came along, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: Where would you discuss staff, at least the numbers of graduates, and so on?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That would be under 1705.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine.

Mr. Racine: Well, Mr. Chairman, then I shall ask a question about that under 1705. I would like to make a comment or two on the grant, item No. 11 in 1701. Two of the grants particularly interest me. One is to the Canadian welfare council and the other is to the Ontario welfare council. Both those grants are the same this year as they were last year—\$17,000 apiece. Would it be presumptuous on my part to ask the Minister how these amounts are arrived at? Do they follow the formula that both of those organizations recommend to determine the contribution of each province in this respect?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The Canadian welfare council grant used to be based on population —\$3 per thousand population. The Ontario welfare council was an organization which was for provincial charter and composed of interprovincial federated groups who are interested in public welfare. Their grant, I believe, at one time was much lower than \$17,000 and we felt that when we raised it to \$17,000, the other one was reduced accordingly. We are not using the basis of \$3 per thousand population because we felt that if there was one that should be encouraged it was the Ontario council. This might be arbitrary perhaps. We were working in closer co-ordination with the Ontario welfare council than with the Canadian welfare council and we saw no reason why we should give less to one than to the other. At one time, I know that the formula across Canada, as I understand it, was \$3 per thousand population. But much has changed in Canadian welfare.

Mr. Racine: I would like to thank the Minister for his answer. I have not the figures here, but I believe that Ontario and possibly another province are the only two that do not follow the formula. I have been told that there were some negotiations between officers of the Canadian welfare council and the department with a view to raising the grant to the amount that would come up to the formula, and I think this would be somewhere around possibly \$21,000.

Now, if I may just say a word or two, Mr. Chairman, about the work of the Canadian welfare council, I would like to mention that we could make a lot more use of the facilities of this organization. As a matter of fact the federal government has recognized the capacity to do that kind of work by the Canadian welfare council and has given many jobs to this organization. I think, perhaps The Department of Public Welfare and the hon. Minister could find tremendous advantages in working much more closely with the Canadian welfare council. It has some of the best trained people in the field in Canada, and I am sure that many of the problems that they encounter daily could be solved by the proper use of this organization.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Chairman, for a few moments I would like to touch on that portion of the hon. Minister's responsibility which relates to the senior citizens of our society. In doing so I realize that the suggestion which I wish to place before him affects not only his department but The Department of Municipal Affairs and the hon.

Provincial Treasurer. However, it relates to the welfare of the aged and his department is the one where primary consideration should be given.

My suggestion, sir, is this: Persons over 65, residing in their own homes, be permitted to apply for and receive a deferment of their municipal taxes until termination of their ownership by sale or by death of the owner, or in case of joint or common ownership, by the death of both owners; and that these taxes, which would otherwise be payable, be collected by the municipality, or by the province, following termination of ownership in much the same way as tax arrears are collected.

Now I say "or the province," because it may well be that the burden of financing these deferred payments should be lifted from the municipality to the province.

Mr. Chairman, may I be the first to say that this suggestion involves no sweeping act of public largesse, the province will receive payments of its tax loans and it will cost the municipality nothing. There is obviously no means or needs test involved. It is simply a mechanism for helping a particular group of our older people who might find it of value.

As a first step, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and his research people should assess whether there would be enough older people to warrant its execution.

Certainly in the area of Beaches, which it is my privilege to represent, I know there are a very large number of married senior citizens owning their own homes who all of their lives have been very thrifty, hard-working citizens. However today, because of a small income plus old age pensions, they just cannot maintain their homes and pay the necessary taxes, maintenance, and all the other necessary living expenses. It is only a matter of time, in many of these cases, until their home is lost.

We all know, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate of Canada has been studying aging, and this Legislature's committee on aging is occupied with that subject at this time. Throughout this province and country many groups of the public at large are increasingly directing their attention to the situation of our older citizen. Out of all this many new and comprehensive programmes will evolve. However, in the meantime, I would be grateful if the hon. Minister and his department would assess the value of this suggestion with respect to deferred taxes.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the older people who would be helped would not be those who have squandered their lives. They are couples who have successfully borne the

burdens of two world wars and of one great depression. So as far as I am concerned then, sir, I would not require evidence that a vast number of people would benefit to convince me that this proposal should be accepted. Simply to know that some of the older couples would be helped to live on in their own home for some years longer, would be enough to make me feel that this suggestion is worthy of acceptance.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Would the hon. Minister give an opinion on that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, this matter is now before the select committee on aging, so we will wait for that.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, sometimes that type of committee is handy to pigeon-hole things that should not be pigeon-holed.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think the members of the committee are, in themselves, a guarantee against that happening.

Mr. Trotter: I am one of the members of the committee I know, but that does not give an excuse to delay things.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question on grants as to new and acquired buildings. I am always happy to see a vote made, and in this case it is on item 12 of vote 1701, \$6,535,000, which is a nice figure to see. The trouble is it never looks as good as it appears, because when you go back into the public accounts ending March 31, 1964, we see that previously we voted a slightly larger sum and had \$2,738,000 unexpended. I would like to say something on that, but first I would like to ask the Minister why did we previously vote over \$6.5 million and leave nearly \$3 million unexpended?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It is there for the people if they wish to make application to do the construction work. If they do not complete the stages of construction within the fiscal year the money remains unexpended.

Mr. Trotter: These grants, as I understand it, are dependent upon whether or not some community can raise the funds and therefore get grants from the province. Well, now, here is the situation.

You heard the hon. leader of the Opposition talking about the lack of proper space for unwed mothers. Obviously there is a great need for new buildings throughout the province and it is obvious also, as you look at the tax base—and this affects so many items in

the government of Ontario—as you look at the tax base of municipalities, these municipalities in many cases simply cannot afford to start new projects. They do not have the funds.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, these are for a private organization!

Mr. Trotter: Whether it be a private organization—again you can see the trouble at the sick children's hospital in trying to raise funds from the public. The economy of the country seems such that whether it be for municipalities or private funds the money is just not available, so that you are going to have this unexpended amount remain from year to year. All it amounts to, really, when you allocate a sum of \$6,535,000, is window dressing.

In fact, I think the hon. Minister of Public Welfare should win the title of window dresser of the year, because that amount cannot possibly be spent from what we know is available at the present time. Surely your experts in this field know that that money will not be used as things are now, because usually we know by prior announcement that a building for the aged, or a structure under The Charitable Institutions Act, is going to go up. We have some idea of how many are going up, and obviously, a year ago or two years ago, when this money was voted, you either deliberately overestimated or just did not know what was going on.

Mr. Chairman, here is nearly \$3 million that the government felt it could have spent and felt was available, and yet it just was not used for the purposes for which it could have been used. So again I want to protest through you, Mr. Chairman, to this House, that, glad as I am to see the money voted, I deplore the fact that almost half of it is not used for the purpose that it is really needed for. The truth of the matter is that the province is going to have to take more and more of an economic responsibility for constructing some of these homes whether it comes under The Charitable Institutions Act, or The Children's Institutions Act.

The Department of Public Welfare is going to have to face up to the fact that where it has 100 per cent constitutional responsibility, it is going to come very close to having 100 per cent financial responsibility, and this unexpended amount in the public accounts report is evidence in black and white that the municipalities and private charities are no longer in a position to take advantage of the so-called grants that have been offered. They are being offered something they cannot use

and The Department of Public Welfare knows they cannot use it. It is just window dressing as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Troy: Mr. Chairman, as the House well knows there are two funds that provide assistance to needy veterans of World War I: the soldiers' aid commission and the Ontario canteen fund. There is also another fund from a private source, the Elizabeth Hammond fund, which is only for widows of World War I veterans. Since the number of widows that would be eligible for that fund are dwindling, and there is a fair amount in the fund, are negotiations being undertaken, or is the possibility being considered of making the widows of World War II who might be in straitened circumstances, eligible? Have any negotiations been carried on, with the trustees?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there have been some negotiations and some study, as you know. Some of these matters will have to go before a court of law to get an order. Personally, I would like to see all these moneys handed over to the Canadian Legion to deal with along with the projects they have now, although under the terms of the will of the late Kathleen Hammond, this cannot be accomplished unless we get an order from the court. This matter has been under study and I hope some day that it can be changed, because I think possibly that a better job can be done with that money, which is accumulating more than diminishing, and which should be used for many purposes. Under the terms of the will, the funds are accumulating as you say, and something will have to be done.

Mr. Troy: I am sure if Mrs. Hammond were alive that she would agree that this would be a very worthy position to take.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there is an assortment of grants here among the miscellaneous grants going to various universities. I notice \$10,000 to University of Toronto school of social work, and \$10,000 to St. Patrick's college, Ottawa and then another \$10,000 to St. Patrick's college-Ottawa school of social welfare building fund. I am curious as to why some of these seem to be scattered through this estimate, rather than in The Department of University Affairs. Are they for special projects that relate directly to welfare? I wonder if the hon. Minister would answer this.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes. You will note that the St. Patrick's school and the Toronto

school of social work, each receive \$10,000 for general purposes. Then there is also an additional grant, if you notice, to St. Patrick's school for their building fund. We instituted this payment about six years ago, in recognition of the special needs of this school. Their facilities have been strained to capacity to accommodate more students, in order to relieve the great shortage of social workers. It was evident that a new building was required, yet the college had few financial resources and the school received nothing from any other department of government. As you know, before the passage of the bill that was in committee today, regarding The University of Ottawa, it would be hard, Mr. Chairman, to say this was a completely legal grant; maybe I would not be telling you the exact truth.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this now going towards part of the new university?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, that is right. I understand the new school will be a separate two storey building, costing over \$300,000 and it is to be paid through a 20-year mortgage, costing about \$23,000 yearly. The \$10,000 grant was of material help in getting the construction underway.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, under item No. 12 where the hon. Minister gives, among other things, a grant to the homes for retarded children. Would he consider giving a similar grant for a home for emotionally disturbed children? For example, we know there is a great shortage for the care of emotionally disturbed children and I think it has been kicked around from the health to public welfare department, etcetera, but there are many children who are more of a welfare problem, than they are a health problem. There is an association I know, which is fairly active in Toronto—the association for emotionally disturbed children; they must raise all their funds for a school for these children. Could you not consider helping them, because they now have to go out and raise money on their own, and they would be eligible for grants if there was a law?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, it is available under The Children's Institutions Act.

Mr. Trotter: Under the children's institutions? They do not get it.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, but they have been getting what was allowed before. There was a stated amount, but now, as of this moment, the bill that was passed in committee of the

whole House today, has only to receive Royal assent and we will be able to deal with the people you have in mind. A grant of \$5,000 per bed for construction and the 75 per cent gross cost for maintenance will be paid from that time on.

Mr. Trotter: 75 per cent of the gross cost will be paid, and will they have any grant for operating costs? The gross cost including the building and all?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right. The full cost of the building up to a maximum of \$5,000 per bed.

Mr. Racine: I would like to ask the hon. Minister one more question on this vote. I notice that for 1964-65, there was the sum of \$75,000 allocated for grants and bursaries re training. That is item No. 8, 1701. I notice that this amount has been reduced for 1965-66 to \$70,000. Now I understood that there was a great demand for social workers and that the department really wanted to do something to encourage young people to follow this profession, so I think perhaps that this reduction of \$5,000 requires an explanation on the part of the hon. Minister; item number 8 on 1701.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That would be item 9, would it not?

Mr. Racine: Item 9. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is under "Grants and bursaries re training."

Mr. Chairman, the main expenditure under this item is for bursaries for students attending the University of Toronto school of social work, the St. Patrick's college school of social welfare and the welfare services course at the Ryerson polytechnical institute.

Three years ago we increased greatly the number of bursaries to students at schools of social work who would commit themselves to work in public welfare. Formerly we had offered five or six each year. In 1963, we granted 27; in 1964, we offered 36 and 34 were accepted; in 1964 we also granted 17 more bursaries to persons on the Ryerson course. We gave educational leave with pay to four other staff members, which makes a total of 55 bursaries to support students throughout the academic year of 1964-65.

The total cost of these bursaries for the current fiscal year will be an expenditure of approximately \$114,451; costs for the coming fiscal year will be larger, estimated at \$140,000. The federal government is expected to share 45 per cent of that amount,

hence the present item for \$70,000 in the estimates.

Vote 1701 agreed to.

On vote 1702:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, before we get into the substance of this vote, I have a reasonably serious matter to raise in this House. Several weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, I put an order requesting the tabling of correspondence on the order paper of this Legislature relating to four senior civil servants who had resigned from the department or from the child welfare branch of The Department of Public Welfare between June and October of 1964. The only person mentioned at that point was Mr. Douglas Gardner, whose name has already been brought into this debate earlier this evening by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

I admit that considerable time has passed since the resignation of that group of people, but I suspect the reasons for their resignations continue to prevail. Although I would not pretend to pass judgment on the collective reason, or indeed on the reasons of any other than Mr. Gardner himself, I think that certainly his case, if no other, is exceedingly dramatic and important on the floor of this House.

The hon. Minister, for whatever reason, saw fit to disregard the request for tabling of correspondence. However, I feel that such tabling is necessarily—and I do not say this in an immoderate or unduly animated way—a reflection of the malaise which besets The Department of Public Welfare as a department.

I have received permission from Mr. Douglas Gardner, former child welfare supervisor in the child welfare branch, to read into the record tonight his letters—I use the plural—of resignation. I wish to do so because they are moderate letters; they are thoughtful letters; they are sensitive letters; and they are important letters. Mr. Gardner—as I will go on to show when I have read them into the record—is one of the most esteemed people in the child welfare field in the entire province of Ontario.

His first letter, dated peculiarly enough, exactly one year ago to this day, was sent to Mr. James S. Band, Deputy Minister, The Department of Public Welfare, Government Buildings, Toronto, Ontario:

Dear Mr. Band:

It is only after long and careful thought, and with considerable regret, that I have made the decision to resign from The Department of Public Welfare.

Because of my investment of time and effort in nearly 11 years of service within the department, I feel my reasons for reaching this difficult decision should be made perfectly clear in order that my leave-taking might not be misunderstood, or misinterpreted.

Having been optimistic for a number of years and hopeful of desired change, I find I no longer have confidence in the organization and administration of the department as a whole which, in my opinion, has not developed over the years either policy or sound plans in keeping with contemporary knowledge of social work, the needs of people and the efficient administration of services.

While I have seen much growth and change within the department and the development of some excellent legislation, I am concerned that the attitudes and methods of administration often impede rather than facilitate an improved quality of service to people.

In my view, responsibility is not delegated appropriately nor does the organization as created and used over the years allow orthodox communication, productive co-ordination of effort and the careful planning and assessment required if welfare services in Ontario are to make the best use of qualified personnel and current knowledge and techniques from the field.

The rather superficial recognition given by the department to the profession of social work allows for little or no impact in terms of policy formulation and performance or influence on the quality of service. I am not convinced that the department really understands or accepts social work and the contribution it can make to public welfare, administration and service.

However, I still believe, with real conviction that public welfare at the provincial level can and should provide one of the most stimulating and exciting experiences for the professional social worker.

In all my assignments with the department in the past ten years, I have attempted, to the utmost of my ability and in keeping with the ethics of my profession, to carry out the responsibilities assigned to me in the interests of provincial service.

Mr. Gardner then makes reference to a holiday schedule and ends: "Yours sincerely, Douglas Gardner, child welfare supervisor."

There followed a letter to Mr. D. J. Collins, chairman, civil service commission, Parlia-

ment Buildings, Toronto, Ontario. This was a week later:

Dear Mr. Collins:

Because of our discussion nearly two years ago regarding my concern for The Department of Public Welfare and the role and responsibility of the professional person within the department, I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of my letter of resignation to Mr. James S. Band, Deputy Minister of the department, in which I have worked since November, 1953.

In addition to being a child welfare supervisor in the child welfare branch, I have been for the past three years, executive secretary to the Minister's advisory committee on child welfare. Mr. C. J. Foster, former chairman of the civil service commission, was committee chairman and we have worked very closely together during this period. The committee recently completed its work and the final report has been presented to the Minister. In August I will assume the responsibilities of a branch director with the children's aid society of Metropolitan Toronto.

I am distressed on leaving the civil service and The Department of Public Welfare after nearly 11 years service in a very broad work experience. As I mentioned to you previously and as I have tried to indicate in my resignation, provincial public welfare holds enormous challenge for me professionally. I would willingly and gladly continue to cope, provided I had respect for, and confidence in, the administration of the department, but I have such concern about what is, in my view, a lack of principle and integrity in the administration of the department that I can no longer remain associated with it.

I believe the problems within the department are serious, so serious that the recruitment and retention of competent and qualified staff will remain a problem and Ontario will fall further behind other provinces in the provision and administration of effective and efficient services based on sound professional principles and attitudes. I do not believe the situation will change for the better without some sort of protest and intervention. My resignation is my formal protest.

Yours sincerely,

Douglas Gardner,

Child Welfare Supervisor.

Mr. Chairman, I think those letters are telling documents and I think that Mr. Gardner is

a courageous man. I want to take a moment to tell this House just who Mr. Gardner is.

He has been associated with The Department of Public Welfare, as he said, for 11 years. He was made executive director of the Minister's advisory committee on child welfare. In other words, he was considered perhaps to be the most competent person in the province of Ontario to be secretary to the most important committee on child welfare that this province has ever formed. As executive secretary he obviously played a major role in drafting The Child Welfare Act, that Act which just went through this House.

In his years with The Department of Public Welfare he served in a variety of branches, was in a very large way responsible for the drafting of the excellent homemakers legislation, has been in other areas of equal importance and capacity. He is to my knowledge one of the most esteemed members in the entire child welfare field. I cannot emphasize that strongly enough. There is not a person to whom I have spoken who does not regard Douglas Gardner as a leading member in this entire area of social work experience. He is, if I may put it this way, solid Deputy Minister material in some branch of government and we cannot afford to lose such men.

Mr. Gardner now, as befitting his status in the field, is branch director, Toronto branch of the metropolitan children's aid society, in which position he supervises somewhere between 150 and 200 people directly in the field concerned with child welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say this: I am not going to take exceptional issue over it, I think it is a very sad and yet illuminating thing when men of the capacity of Douglas Gardner feel moved to leave the department for the reasons enunciated.

He did not leave so long ago. Let me emphasize that his criticisms are not criticisms of the child welfare branch; that is obvious. Indeed, in the minds of everyone I have spoken to, the director of that branch is regarded with respect and affection. Mr. Gardner's criticisms are criticisms of the department, of the administration of the department, of its attitude to social work, of its philosophy, of the manner in which it conducts its programme, of the level on which it operates its services, and the relationship in which it stands to other provinces in this country.

I suggest to you, sir, that altogether we have here an unusual former civil servant, unusual in the sense that he put his views, finally, born of a certain desperate frustration, on paper. They are not his views alone.

They may be the only openly expressed views, although if the hon. Minister would have the grace to table at least one other letter of resignation amongst the four people involved, I think he would find that there was at least another who held a similar view. But I shall not press him on that, because I do not think it is necessary to press the others. Certainly Mr. Gardner is eminent enough and worthy enough an individual to stand and to make the case.

It underlines, Mr. Chairman, just to bring this to a close, a feeling of concern which has worried members of the Opposition—for at least my short term of two years in this House—worried us profoundly. There seems to be something profoundly wrong at the core of this department in the animation of its staff and their feeling for the work and the goals it could achieve and the objectives it might reach.

Child welfare supervisors are not easily found. Mr. Gardner is a child welfare supervisor who looked after, at one point, over 40 children's aid societies in the province of Ontario. A more responsible job you might not possibly find. Similarly with some of the others who have found it, for whatever reasons, necessary to leave. These are responsible people, these are indispensable people, these are people with enormous integrity. The words mirrored in this letter, I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, stand as a reflection of other views and other attitudes. I think it important that at least the observations made in this letter and the feelings expressed in the letter somehow move the hon. Minister to revamp his philosophy and revise his administration, and indeed to rebuild his department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, there is a great French Canadian novel which is entitled *Un de perdu; deux de retrouvés*. Where we have lost two men we have gained seven, and two more are coming in as of July 1. The letter, as I stated, I suppose was a sincere one; but it was just one man's opinion.

As I say, we have gained, or we will be gaining, where we lost four. I should also say that another gentleman by the name of Mr. Lumsden wrote along the same lines as this gentleman. I have not brought forth this matter before, because for some reason or another I am a man who has been quite a long while in this world and knows people—I hope I do—and can dissect people and possibly know how they think and what they do.

There was one reason on which I would not elaborate further. The two gentlemen were living together and they worked together. More I would not like to say in this matter, except possibly to read the memorandum to me from Mr. Band in this particular respect after the motion was put through. I think Mr. Band, as far as I am concerned, has a lot of experience with employees and has seen them come and go. This is what he relates to me:

This relates to four employees who resigned from the child welfare branch in the year 1964. Mr. B. Gardner was a child welfare supervisor and also served as secretary to the advisory committee on child welfare during its period of study and review of the legislation and the child welfare programme in Ontario. He accepted a position with the children's aid society in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. R. Lumsden was also a child welfare supervisor and accepted employment with the department of education of the city of Toronto. Both gentlemen indicated that the policies of the department were not in keeping with their views of social work practices. It is considered that they have expressed personal views in relation to their own positions within the child welfare branch. Their opinions in this respect do not coincide with those of the other professional staff in the department. I should say that Mr. Gardner's services on behalf of the advisory committee were found to be capable. Indeed I am sorry that both these men did not remain to assist with the implementation of the new child welfare programme.

Miss C. Johnson served the branch as a supervisor of children's institutions. She received an offer of employment from the York department of education and accepted the position at a higher salary. In this case there was no comment in the resignation.

Miss M. Oomes was employed as a child welfare supervisor on a probationary basis for a period of about seven months. She then left to join the children's aid society of Metropolitan Toronto. Again there was no comment on the resignation.

The professional staff of the branch has increased this year and the services of these additional persons are proving to be of an excellent quality. Further additions to child welfare personnel are anticipated in the near future. I am assured by the director of child welfare, and agree, that the morale of the child welfare branch

is at a high level. It is evident that the staff are operating as an efficient and satisfactory unit. The offices of the branch were moved to the east block where the personnel are now in closer touch with the rest of the department.

I should add by way of further comment that the professional staff within the department, social workers and others, have full scope in carrying out their work to personal satisfaction and professional fulfilment.

I am enclosing a statement which gives statistical data on the staff of the department, as well as those in the child welfare branch and you will note that resignations have indeed been small in relation to the total staff in each case.

This I have related before in my comments made before the House. So again I say, Mr. Chairman—and I am not making any comment one way or another—the gentlemen in question did not work well with the people inside and they gave their personal views. I do not doubt the sincerity of their views, but it does not mean that their views actually describe a situation within the department as the hon. member would like to leave the impression. I do not think it has.

I might say this, in referring back to the novel I was speaking about a moment ago: Where we have lost two, we have gained seven.

Mr. S. Lewis: Four, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Where we have lost four, the other two—

Mr. Trotter: This sounds like a hockey trade, not The Department of Public Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It might be a good trade at that!

Mr. Chairman, the reason I have not mentioned this and produced the letters before was first of all that I did not have permission, as my hon. friend has, from Mr. Gardner. At the same time, I do not like to deal with any personal views that one might have in respect to anybody who has worked in my department. I would be the last one in the world who would speak of them publicly in the fear that I might be the cause of hurting them for any employment they might seek any other place.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I take no serious exception to what the hon. Minister says. I respect what he has said. I, too, made certain I had Mr. Gardner's full permission

before reading these particular letters. I simply point out to him, and I think it is important that this House recognizes it, that however well the branch of child welfare has functioned over the last five or six years, it has functioned with two, three or four child welfare supervisors where there should have been between 12 and 15. This figure of 12 to 15 is corroborated in the advisory committee report to the hon. Minister, and in every estimate of a properly supervised case load that is known. In other words, for whatever reason, in the most important and vital field of child welfare, we have been seriously and sadly undermanned.

I do not say that words are necessarily invincible. I think the observations and the reflections offered in the letter are very serious, and I think the esteem in which the department held Mr. Gardner is a reflection of their seriousness. You do not give a man that much responsibility and importance in a department of government without obviously holding him in very high regard for a period of some 11 years. And whatever the hon. Minister might have meant by his other than pleasing aside, merely to say that perhaps things did not work well in the department is not a sufficient explanation.

I would be happy, as he is, not to dissect the individual. But the idea seems to me to be important, and a branch which has been undernourished and understaffed for so many years is also important. A branch which now pretends to supervise an enlarged Child Welfare Act and a Children's Institutions Act with anything under 15 full-time child welfare supervisors cannot possibly function adequately. Equally, it cannot lose people as important as these men, without suffering serious loss.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. members in this Legislature know what supervising means. The hon. members probably think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members may well feel that supervising children's aid societies and children's institutions mainly involves going to the institutions, assessing their work environment, helping them formulate their budgets and giving them some kind of direction and supervision. It means that, Mr. Chairman; but it also means a great deal more. It means sitting down with all the boards of governors in various communities, it means sitting down with all the elected municipal officials, it means

sitting down with all the working committees as part of that municipality and as branches of that board of governors. It means, in other words, a tremendous spectrum of activity far beyond the mere supervision of individual societies or institutions. In other words, it means a work load which, I suggest, in this branch requires a minimum of 15 graduate social workers. Now, 15 is a minimal number, it is probable that the job could not be done even with 15.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we cannot have this kind of shift. I appreciate the hon. Minister's French aphorisms, I know the novel of which he speaks, I—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The hon. member should read it in the original, in English it is not good.

Mr. S. Lewis: The only thing that the hon. Minister and I have ever struggled through in the original is Simone de Beauvoir, and I do not intend to try any other. But I will say that these things are not brought to the attention of this House to incur the mocking shouts of disarray, but to point out that if this branch and this department is to function effectively, it has to give the appearance of better functioning. I think as these estimates go on it can be demonstrated that that has not always been true, and Mr. Gardner demonstrated that in his letter.

Vote 1702 agreed to.

On vote 1703:

Mr. S. Lewis: May I ask just one or two brief questions about 1702?

An hon. member: It has been carried.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, can we not have this chatter stopped by those who apparently are not interested other than interrupting the procedure of the debate?

An hon. member: If you do not like it, you know what you can do. You do not have to sit here.

Mr. MacDonald: If I do not like it I know what I can do, Mr. Chairman, I can match it, but—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, I have no objection if the hon. member wants to ask a question on the vote. I do not know why his hon. leader is objecting.

Mr. MacDonald: I will explain why. There are four or five people here just chattering all

the time. They do not like the revelations that the hon. member has put on the record.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reilly: Mr. Chairman, in connection with this, I would like to explain that I hope that under our free enterprise system, if a man wants to discontinue employment after 10 or 11 years in a department, he may do so. I have even known members of the NDP who discontinue. I have known members of the press who changed from the *Toronto Daily Star* to the *Telegram*, and from the *Telegram* to the *Globe and Mail*. When we have 35,000 to 40,000 employees in the Ontario provincial government, who may wish to switch into other departments or other places of employment, there is nothing to prevent them, and I, for one, would not attempt to.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, when a man leaves and gives his reason in quite rational fashion, I do not think it is appropriate that his former boss should get up and, in a mildly slanderous way, throw doubts—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Just go back and read what the hon. Minister says.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I will not pursue this, but I refer to the veiled aside, and it does the hon. Minister's honour no good, or his reputation. We had an exchange which could have been conducted in honourable terms, it need not have been denigrated.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: What did I say that was dishonourable?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister made reference to a man which had no relevance to the matter under discussion.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister said he would leave it there with suspicion to grow without any explanation. I suggest either he should not have made those statements, or he should have said what he meant, if he knows.

Mr. Chairman: Discussion on this particular section is concluded.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I would beg the chair's indulgence. I took my seat because I thought that someone else would rise. I would like to ask some other ques-

tions on the vote which are not relevant to what we have been discussing.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in this session we passed The Children's Institutions Act which gives certain amounts of money for per diem costs and construction costs. I want to ask the hon. Minister whether he has any intention of differentiating on the per diem rates for the various schedules involved, the per diem rates on the one hand, let us say, to Warrendale, and on the other hand to Loyal True Blue and Orange. I take the extremes.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Seventy-five per cent of the gross cost, wherever they are.

Mr. S. Lewis: Seventy-five per cent of the gross cost, whatever they are across the—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Wherever they are.

Mr. S. Lewis: And has the hon. Minister worked out any basic formula for computing these gross costs which can be applied to the institutions without engaging in an unhappy exchange over what is relevant and what is not?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think so.

Mr. S. Lewis: And you do not anticipate any further difficulty then, in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I would have never had any difficulty if we could have had good accounting all the way. That is the only thing. Maybe it was our fault, maybe it was their fault, maybe the board's fault. This is something that I am not sure, but I have to account for what I spend to the auditors of the province, and that is why there were delays sometimes in these particular areas. It was because the accounting was not something which could be proven as such.

Mr. S. Lewis: As a matter of fact, Mr. Minister, you have a very valid point. I will not argue with you on accounting procedures. I would simply make this point though. If there is some area of dispute in the accounting procedures, it seems to me inadequate that the entire sum should be denied while we arbitrate over one small facet of it. If you could possibly pay the areas which are mutually agreed upon, and withhold those other smaller areas for arbitration, it would not hurt the institutions involved so profoundly. An institution like Warrendale—there may well be a difference of opinion over accounting procedures; but for an institution to be behind \$40,000 or \$50,000 seems unnecessary, if you could at least pay them the agreed-upon portion.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I might advise my hon. friend that I agree with him and I have given that order. This will be done.

Mr. S. Lewis: And I admire its spirit. I commend the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman, on 1703, I wish to ask the hon. Minister about his policy in regard to day nurseries in this department. His annual report shows that the growth in the number of day nurseries has not been exactly overwhelming. I fear that in the day nursery branch, as in the child welfare branch, the fundamental problem is that we do not have enough people at the centre energetically prosecuting the cause of day nurseries; and because there is so much resistance in one municipality after another to the idea, it takes a fairly high powered and persuasive staff to sell the concept of day nurseries.

Now, I would be interested to hear from the hon. Minister how many people he has in the field for the more than 900 municipalities in the province of Ontario. I would also be interested to hear about specific experiments to be extended into other areas.

His annual report, if I recall, makes reference to the day nursery wing in the Riverdale hospital, which brought 40 nurses back into the active pursuit of their profession. I wish the hon. Minister had somehow conveyed this idea to the hon. Minister of Health.

For a considerable time we on this side of the House have said that, if you want to make up your nursing shortage, then provide day nursery facilities for your nurses in wings of hospitals and allow them the opportunity to return to active work. For whatever reason, that has not been done across the province and the nursing shortage persists. In the one area where it has been tried it has been most successful.

So I ask the hon. Minister first, as to the extent of the staff in the development of day nurseries generally; and second in the day nursery hospital wing expansion that may or may not be contemplated.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, during 1964—I would like to mention this as we go along—a total of 398 day nurseries were supervised at one time or another by this branch of the department. During the year, 50 new nurseries opened and 41 closed, for one reason or another, giving an overall increase of nine day nurseries.

The staff of the day nurseries branch visit as many areas of the province as possible to promote the development of these needed services. We feel the initiative, rightly or

wrongly, in the long run must come from local groups and authorities. The director and four supervisors we have in this service do a great deal in this regard, and we also issue a great deal of advice and other literature to aid local groups.

During the recent months I am happy to report the number of inquiries from local municipalities are gaining and we are doing all we can to stimulate their interest and channel it into concrete action. One of the features, as I have mentioned, is the branch concentration to promote day nurseries adjacent to certain places of employment. That was proven very satisfactory. This was accomplished in September 1964.

I would say that the following areas are where public nurseries are most needed, representing the area that is now Metro Toronto. For instance, I am sure that North York, Etobicoke, Scarborough, Windsor, Chatham, Brantford and Hamilton would be places where they would be very necessary.

Did my hon. friend ask me also the qualifications? I do not recall.

Mr. S. Lewis: No, I was particularly—well let us take it one at a time. What will you do to bring a day nursery to Scarborough? That is a municipality with which I am faintly associated. In this municipality, under the aegis of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, you have a very excellent low rental housing project—Warden Woods. Several score units; presenting a desperate need for day nursery facilities.

You could not possibly find a better opportunity to set up a day nursery environment, and so the mothers in the low rental housing get together and they bring the formidable array of figures and needs before the Scarborough municipal council. The Scarborough municipal council, in its worldly wisdom, sniffs its nose at them and tells them to run on their merry way. They end up with whatever small sort of co-operative, make-shift mechanism they can provide. Now how do you persuade a municipality to do the job, unless in the day nursery branch you provide sufficient personnel to go side by side with the groups interested, make the representations to the various municipal bodies and put pressure on them from the provincial centre?

With the tremendous number of working mothers in this society, Mr. Chairman, we have a social responsibility. It is simply not enough to lapse back into the old mystique about the place of the woman in the world, that old mystique that so bedevilled the equality of the sexes. If you are going to have

working women, then you have a sense of social and moral responsibility. You have a sense of responsibility to the children involved. So you have to obviously exercise some leadership, and just as there has never been any hint of local initiative in the field of adequate low cost housing, so there is not any hint of local initiative in the field of day nurseries, or indeed of homemakers services.

Those are two areas in this department sorely lacking. Now we are now talking about day nurseries and I would like to know what are you going to do in Etobicoke. What are you going to do in Scarborough? Representations have been made. Some of us have endeavoured to do so. Parent groups have come, but never through the department, because the branch simply does not have the personnel to do the job. I tell you that it is profoundly wrong. You do not run society that way, with the needs that these people have.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can see is to continue to press them to try to be involved; because if other municipalities can, I see no reason why they cannot. Now if the local municipality does not want to do it, I do not know what I can do to force them into it, except to try to influence them and show them the right track. We are doing this as much as we can. At the same time, they are hard to influence in that particular respect. I appreciate that. I am sure my hon. friend has tried himself. I know we have tried very hard. I suppose that the people generally in Scarborough would know this.

The new setup that was described to you today should provide an opportunity to do a better job there. Or maybe it should be under the metropolitan authority to do that, I do not know. But at the same time it is another thing to use influence and to use pressure, as my hon. friend suggests could be done. I am sure we have people who can attend with them at any time. I do not feel that we are short in that particular respect.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, may I just follow this up and then I shall subside. I just want to add a point that is really revealing with respect to the balance of values. If the Ontario water resources commission says that there is a certain degree of pollution existing in a municipality, then it becomes a mandatory pressure on that municipality to clean it up; they must respond by Act of this Legislature. But if a hundred thousand mothers need day nursery care for their children, and several thousand of them are

working mothers, then there is no social responsibility connected to it any longer.

Then we use these artful devices of persuasion; we make phone calls; we send out happy pictures on brochures; and we add a sense of urgency to our voice. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, it is simply not sufficient; it does not work. You have a municipality; whether it is a municipality today and a city tomorrow is irrelevant. You have a municipality of a quarter of a million people and the municipality will not grant compensation for homemakers services. What about the whole spectrum of need in this part of society?

I vigorously suggest, Mr. Chairman, that even if the legislation be not mandatory, if that affronts the hon. Minister's conscience too directly, then at least let him send his supervisors into the field to work with the municipalities involved. Let them not merely make phone calls and give urgings and promptings, but let them go on a regular circuit and make strong and insistent representation because you cannot leave this to the desperate voluntary efforts of the mothers who are thus affected.

Mr. Reilly: Leave it to the municipality.

Mr. S. Lewis: Sure and it will never happen.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the remark of the hon. Minister go by—that they are doing everything that they can in this field of nurseries, because when we look over the records of the past year we know there is a great shortage of them in this city. We know in Hamilton, in Ottawa, and a number of these towns and cities across the province of Ontario, especially where there is a number of factories, that there are simply not enough paid nurseries. There are two million working mothers in Canada and the majority of those working mothers are in Ontario and half your working mothers today have children that are sixteen years and under and—

Mr. Reilly: The majority of them do not have to work.

Mr. Trotter: Well there is a ridiculous Tory remark from the hon. member for Eglinton, because this is the very point I want to make. The majority of the working mothers today work because they have to and I think it is a hangover—

Mr. Reilly: They do not. They work because they want to, not because they have to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Trotter: If there is ever a hangover from the Victorian era it is the idea that mothers are leaving their children and going to work just for the fun of it. Two million people in this country do not go to work just for the fun of it. When you think that half of them have children sixteen years and under, it is obvious that this is a social change and an economic change that has gone on in Canada and more particularly in Ontario and even more so in that area between Oshawa and Niagara Falls. This has taken place in the last twenty years and when a government with the wealth of the province of Ontario comes up with an estimate of \$361,000 for day nurseries, and when you even left unexpended for institutions nearly \$3,000,000—mind you in vote 1 you have \$2,700,000 unexpended and yet in another place like this only \$361,000 for the entire vote—it is obvious you have not looked into what is a very serious problem.

This goes right through all our cities and towns; they all seem to have the same viewpoint, but the hon. Minister of Public Welfare is the responsible individual in this province. Toronto, for its protective services for children, spends the same amount as they do on Riverdale zoo and there is no excusing the city of Toronto for that approach. But the approach of the present hon. Minister of Public Welfare is worse and when I hear remarks coming from some of the Tory back-benchers that the women do not have to work it is ridiculous—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He is a front bench.

Mr. Trotter: —because when you see the cost of living that continues to rise, and the wages some of the men are earning, particularly if they are working in the civil service, you know the women have to go to work. We have gone over this wage problem in the province of Ontario with the civil service and with others and it is obvious you cannot keep a family on what thousands of men are earning today.

Mr. Bryden: Listen, what the Ontario government pays—

Mr. Trotter: When one industry in Scarborough made a survey of the working women, they found that only 25 per cent of their children that were in nurseries, or some would-be nurseries, were receiving proper care; only 25 per cent of them. Unless we come to grips with this prob-

lem it means that in the long run you are going to have more of these emotionally disturbed children; you are going to have more health problems and your Minister of Reform Institutions is going to be faced with more expensive problems.

Is it not far more sensible economically and far more humane to get to work and give some leadership in this day nursery problem? Whether the municipalities themselves are at fault, either because of stupidity or lack of funds, is not the question; the leadership is up to you because once these children—either as children, as juveniles or as adults—get into trouble they land up being paid for by the provincial government or by the federal government. It is far better to come to grips with the problem now, and I cannot believe that you are so utterly blind, and so completely stupid, that you have gone so long and done so little and clung so tenaciously to these Victorian tight-fisted ideas which you have. It is a disgrace to this province—the leadership we are getting in welfare—and this vote is typical of what is going on.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am merely an expectant father and I do not speak with the knowledge of many of the members in this House but I want to say that from the remarks coming from the left of me, one sees precisely the root of the problem. The problem is that the Conservatives in this government, in the province of Ontario, still cling to that outworn fetish that the moral place of the woman is in the home and nowhere else.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine, let us get it on the record. It is that old second-sex, *Beautiful Homes and Gardens, Ladies' Home Journal* philosophy of the inequality of the sexes. Well, it does not commend itself, Mr. Chairman, it does not commend itself to those on this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. S. Lewis: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that a great majority of the women who work today do so because they have to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): They also do it through choice. The great trend in the employment of women in the

work force on the North American continent today, and the surveys having to do with those matters proves it is part of the social change, involves a woman's desire to work, whether she is married, a mother with children at home or otherwise, and this is quite different from the impression that you are trying to convey to this House.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I recall a recent survey of working women conducted by the women's special branch in the federal Department of Labour—as always when one wants it the material is never here—but these estimates have some time to go and we can get the precise percentage. The hon. Minister of Labour knowing more about this field than I do probably thinks the term “vast majority” is wrong and if it is then I will withdraw it. I will say that my withdrawal is as irrelevant as his intervention because whether it is a small percentage or a large percentage who have to work, is not important. Whether they work by choice or not, the government has no right to have preconceptions about the place of women in society. Whether a woman wants to work, or has to work, then we as a society must provide the nursery facilities for these women's children.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am very sad, Mr. Chairman, because this is obviously a profound philosophic difference—I will tell you something else, Mr. Chairman—it is not only philosophic, it is the overexaggerated male ego, if I may put it that way.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you some idea of the amount this government has spent on day nurseries. Considering the value of the dollar—we actually spend now less money on nurseries than we did in 1944 and 1945 and in 1953 and 1954. That is going back 20 years; in other words, we are moving back as quickly as we can under this Tory government.

For example, from 1944 to 1945 under this vote, our expenditures were \$365,000 and this year we are actually budgeting in this field for \$361,000. When you think of the decline in value of the dollar, and when you think of the tremendously increased needs, we are actually going backwards. This is how this vote has changed. In view of the decrease of the value of the dollar over the years, even if you had the same amount, it would show that we are falling back. The fact that our population has increased and the fact that more women are working in

industry. Let us face it, some hospitals like Riverdale would have to close down if we did not have women out working or to go into some of these various factories. The women of today must work in order not only to help their families but to sustain industry; but here is a vote that is continually going backwards.

Just to give you some idea—and it does not come from a politician or from somebody making politics out of this. Livia Langford, the executive director of the Humewood house association, in discussing the problem of unwed mothers and the mother's desire to keep the child, mentioned how they had to go to work and they needed these nurseries. She said that in order for women, whether they were unwed mothers keeping their children or whether they were deserted wives who had children and had to work, she said it was necessary that we have day nurseries. Bear in mind that the number of desertions has increased over the years. This involves not only the married women who live at home with their husbands, there is an increasing number of deserted and divorced women who must work; they have no other choice except to go on welfare.

Maybe the hon. Minister would rather keep them on welfare!

Miss Langford pointed out the necessity of having more nurseries because of the tremendous increase in the number of women who must work. Certainly this system has worked in many countries. In Great Britain they had a great extension in day nurseries; and they had a great extension in Sweden. They have proved very successful, both for the family and for industry.

I would like to point out again to the hon. Minister that even 10 or 12 years ago we spent in this department \$322,000, which is still just slightly less than we are spending this year. We are literally, even on the estimates, going backward.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a remark at this particular time. I do not know the exact figures for 1944 or 1945, but I would point out that in those days the federal government was also involved because of wartime services. At that time practically every woman was working and somebody had to do this. The men were not even here; they were fighting or in training. It was really a wartime measure more than anything else in those days, but I would—

Mr. Bryden: Why was their place not in the home then?

Mr. Trotter: Even so, Mr. Minister—sorry, I thought you were sitting down.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The estimates show that there is a \$71,000 increase this year provided from last year in this respect.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, 150 years ago the Tories of this province took the position that the state really had no responsibility with regard to the education of children. They were finally converted on that point after a long time. But even now, in the year of our Lord 1965, they cling to the notion that there is no responsibility on the part of the state for providing for care—or no significant responsibility I think would be the fair way to put it—to provide for care and training of children below the arbitrary age that we select for starting school.

In the mid-thirties, Mr. Chairman, I spent a considerable amount of time off and on in Nazi Germany, and there the slogan with regard to the role of women was summed up with the three words: "Kirche, Kinder, Küche." What I heard in this House tonight revived a long lost memory and brought back to my mind some of the things I used to hear in Germany in those days.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about the Russian system, tell us about that?

Mr. MacDonald: That is a fatuous comment!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think the argument about whether working women have to work or not is really quite beside the point. There is no question that some, and indeed a remarkably large number, have to work. However, this in itself is a matter of opinion. I have no doubt the Tories opposite think that a family with two or three children, where the husband makes \$3,600 a year, is living in the lap of luxury and the wife does not have to work. I am sure they must think that, because they pay 35 per cent of their own employees less money than \$3,600 a year.

But I say, and it is my opinion, that in such a situation the woman of the house has this choice: either to see her family live in a state of penury, or else to go out and work. It is women from families of that kind in many cases, who are out working.

How many is really beside the point, because I take the view that if a woman wishes to work, she should work.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: We are not asking you to look after her children, we are asking you to provide a service which in most civilized countries is considered a desirable service. I think if a woman feels she has a contribution to make to society beyond the home that society should welcome her contribution. In wartime we welcomed the contribution, but as soon as the war was over, apparently the women were supposed to go back into the home.

As one of my hon. friends over here pointed out, if you made it illegal for married women to work you would be hard put to find staffs for your hospitals. Now, I do not know if hospital employment is considered to be a useful contribution to society or not by Tories, but I consider it a useful contribution. I think that it should be made easier for women to make such contributions if they want to.

The only regret I have with regard to women working is that far too many of them are in a position where they are forced by economic necessity to work. I do not think they should be in this position. I do not think that in this society wages should be so low that the mother has to go out to work because of economic necessity. I think if she goes out it should be because she chooses.

The point is that right now we do force them out to work. Indeed I am sure this government itself forces women out to work by the wages it pays. I think as long as we have the conditions where they are forced to go to work, and even when we advance beyond that condition and women go to work purely from choice, I would suggest that a sensible, intelligent and economical way to provide for the day care of the children would be through day nurseries in a co-operative community type of project.

I think the comments made by the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. member for Parkdale are very much to the point. From the kind of comment with which they were barraged from the Tory benches all around in this House, we can see the attitude of the Tory mind.

I do not really think the hon. Minister of Public Welfare himself is as much inflected with that Tory mentality as some of his colleagues. I would suggest to him that he allow his normal humane outlook to prevail. I think he will then see this in a rational light and he will see the need to develop this branch.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, before we lose sight completely and give the impression

there may be none of these in Ontario at all, I would like to point out that there are 354 of these nurseries in Ontario, with 16 coming in the next few months. I have nothing against women working; that is fine, perhaps that is a matter of their choice and sometimes also of necessity. But I simply say that maybe, in the way of philosophy, we differ from you. As far as I am concerned I do not think I should impose this upon municipalities or upon others. They know their needs better than I would, and I have to deal with it that way.

Mr. S. Lewis: We are talking about regional government.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think the members of the municipalities know what they have to do and what they need, and the means are there to do it if they want it. We will not refuse it, we encourage it, we promote it every day. It is a matter of philosophy possibly, but I am not one, and I do not think this is the thinking of the government that we want to force any of these things on anybody. I am sure that the hon. member for Scarborough West has enough influence in his own area that he can sell the idea for this.

Mr. S. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am surprised that he admits this.

Mr. S. Lewis: I do not speak with the arts of government, Mr. Minister. Since the hon. Minister does not believe in imposition, let me ask him a question. How many people does he have situated in the head office of his day nursery branch in non-clerical or stenographic positions?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Five.

Mr. S. Lewis: Five! And if I am right there are something in excess, at the moment at any rate, of 900 municipalities. These are autonomous municipal units about which we hear so much, whose autonomy we value so much that we are moving to regional government. Let us not be specious in our argument.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Nine hundred municipalities surely do not warrant a day nursery in every one of them.

Mr. S. Lewis: Let me assure the hon. Minister it warrants something more than 300, and it warrants something more than a staff of five.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I can assure the hon. member that I live in a town of between 9,000 and 10,000 people and a nursery is not necessary there. Providing such facilities, when it is done, it is done by people in the service clubs and that sort of thing who can do this, but it is not necessary there, and there are many places of that calibre throughout the province of Ontario. It might be revealing if I say that in Algoma county there are two day nurseries; in Brant there are nine; Carleton, 19; Cochrane, two; Dufferin, one; Durham, two; Elgin, two; Essex, 14; Frontenac, eight; Owen Sound, one; Halton, 11; Hastings, four; Huron, one; Kent, two; Lambton, five; Lanark, three; Leeds, one; Lennox-Addington, one; Lincoln, 12; Middlesex, 15; Muskoka, one; Nipissing, one; Norfolk, one; Northumberland, two; Ontario county, two—

Mr. Trotter: How many in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: There are seven in Ontario county. In Toronto, in the county of York, there are 88, plus 48 which is what there are in Toronto, taking in Aurora, East York, Etobicoke, Forest Hill, King, Leaside, Newmarket, North York, Richmond Hill. I see there are some in Scarborough—

Mr. S. Lewis: They are not—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It must be some other place. Stouffville, Toronto city 47, Richmond Hill, North York 30. Scarborough, I have a total of 16 here.

Mr. S. Lewis: That will be a revelation to the people in the municipality.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: York township, eight. Here is what I have: Scarborough, public none, private seven and nine, that is 16, all private.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, all right. The hon. Minister has included in his figures the private agencies which do not have the same kind of public incentive and public sponsorship. Second, Mr. Chairman, just to bring this back into perspective with all the numbers that may be located in Metropolitan Toronto, I would remind the hon. Minister of a very important survey called *The Needs and Resources Survey of Metropolitan Toronto* which was published last year. It went to considerable length to document the desperate need for day nursery care throughout the entire metropolitan area. These were people expert in these fields, some of them from within his own department. So that without

falling into the obvious adage that there will always be a need for more, I do not think that we have overcome the minimum requirements, at least in this field.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, just so the hon. Minister does not get carried away with the idea that he thinks we are being fooled by the list of figures he gives, I just want to give him some idea—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I never tried to fool anybody.

Mr. Trotter:—of what one expert in this field, Lillian Thompson, a well-known social worker here, thinks of our resources in regard particularly to day nurseries. On May 12 of this year she made an address before the annual conference of the Ontario welfare council, and she discussed at that time—and I do not intend to read her remarks, I am just giving a summation—but she discussed at that time how we in Ontario, despite all the economic and industrial changes, cling to the old ideas and that we more or less look upon the man as doing the manly job and the woman stays in the home. She pointed out that despite the fact that many women are working we have not really coped with the problem. And she says this:

Ontario is better equipped than most parts of Canada to cope with these trends.

“These trends” referred to women working and the need to take care of children in nurseries.

Yet day care is said to be one of the underdeveloped services. The failure to provide effectively for this service is identified in reports of the Ontario welfare council, in the needs and resources study in Toronto, and in recent investigations in other Ontario communities such as Ottawa. At the same time there is disturbing evidence—

This is one thing I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman:

At the same time, there is disturbing evidence that private arrangements, or the absence of arrangements for day care, are exposing children to neglect and danger, sometimes resulting in disease and even loss of life. The need is for several forms of day care, kindergartens, day nursery schools, family day care. Such resources need to be in the most useful locations which could be identified by survey methods, and they need flexible time schedules to match the variations in work shifts.

I just want to say this to the hon. Minister. He pointed out that there were a number in Metropolitan Toronto, but when you think of the number of women working in this area, and the number of children, and also the hours, they all do not necessarily work from 8 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the evening. There is this problem of shift work. Our facilities are extremely low, and if this hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, would even face up to the problem of what actually were the needs in the province of Ontario and in these various growing communities, you would at least be doing something worthwhile. But to come in here with the same old estimates! Again I say, despite the fact of what the federal government was doing during the war, we are doing less than we were 20 years ago, despite the tremendous increase in the problems. It is a disgrace that the hon. Minister has allowed this whole matter to become bogged down.

Vote 1703 agreed to.

On vote 1704:

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on 1704, I wonder if the hon. Minister would take a little time to give us some particulars about his field services branch. I take it this is the area of regional offices, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Can the hon. Minister give us some idea, of the number of regional offices and their actual responsibilities? I have never been clear in my own mind from the report just how much responsibility they have, what initiative they have.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I have a statement here, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to make.

The major functions of the field services branch are:

1. To complete applications and report on all persons applying for or receiving allowances or assistance from the province under the six welfare allowances programme. In the 17 regions under the direction of the regional welfare administrator, this function is carried out primarily by welfare field workers through visits to the homes of applicants or recipients. At the present time, there are approximately 170 welfare field workers.

2. To examine and approve all municipal expenditures for general welfare assistance and related programmes to ensure that provincial reimbursement is made within the terms of the legislation.

3. To administer The General Welfare Assistance Act and other public welfare legislation in areas other than that of municipal organization and territorial districts of the province.

4. To investigate and report on any matter relating to the general welfare of any individual or family in the population and to assist them in finding a solution for their difficulties.

Staff responsibilities: Regional welfare administrators are responsible for the immediate direction, discipline, assignment of work and so forth of the staffs employed in their region and for the general operation of their regional offices. They may also examine and approve municipal accounts for provincial subsidy, assist and advise municipal welfare administrators, investigate specific welfare problems in their region and act in a liaison capacity for the department with other social agencies. In areas other than municipal organization, the regional administrators are responsible for the authorization of general welfare assistance and other public welfare services normally administered by municipalities. The salary range is \$6,600 to \$8,600.

Welfare field supervisors: In the two larger regional offices, Toronto and Hamilton, welfare field supervisors assist the regional welfare administrator in the assignment and supervision of the field workers staff. They also carry out special investigations on problem cases as required, and advise municipal welfare administrators and represent the department at community functions. The salary range is \$5,500 to \$6,600.

Welfare allowances officers: The primary duty of welfare allowances officers is to examine and to approve municipal welfare accounts. They also conduct investigations on individuals and families who experience welfare problems and advise the municipal welfare administrators. In areas without municipal organization they carry out extensive investigative and rehabilitative services under the general welfare assistance programme. The salary range there is \$4,600 to \$5,500.

We have the special investigating unit, that is also in the field services branch. A special investigating unit operates within the field services branch providing a service for municipalities and the welfare allowances branch to locate deserting husbands and fathers whose wives and families have applied for and who are receiving public assistance. The services of the unit are being used by an increasing number of municipal welfare departments, although about 50 per cent of

the referrals still originate in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

The unit is now investigating over 250 cases a month and is successful in locating the deserting father or husband in about 42 of every 100 cases referred to it. Of the cases where the deserting father is located, about 80 per cent result in public assistance payments being either suspended or withheld. An analysis of the general welfare assistance cases for a nine-month period, where the husband was located and assistance withheld or suspended, indicated the husband was found living in the home and fully employed in 26.4 per cent of the families. In 20.8 per cent of the cases the mother was found to be living in a common law union with another man. And in another 20.8 per cent she was employed, with her earnings making assistance unnecessary.

When appropriate, the municipalities concerned instituted court action against the applicants or recipients who were receiving assistance by fraudulent means. The above demonstrates the importance of the unit in providing payment of public funds to persons who do not qualify for public aid.

I have further, if I may continue, Mr. Chairman, professional social work and counselling services.

Continuing efforts are being made to improve the quality of service provided to families and individuals on the public assistance rolls, to incorporate counselling services and the routine work of the field staff. During the past nine months particular attention has been given to mothers' allowances and dependent fathers' families by the assignment of competent field workers to serve these families exclusively, with reduced case loads. There are now 14 such specialized workers and more will be assigned as suitable staff is obtained and trained.

The more frequent contact between staff and recipients made possible by these specialized case loads are producing very encouraging results, both in helping some families to become self-supporting and in helping others to utilize the allowances they receive more wisely and thus improve their standard of living. In addition, staff seminars have been conducted by the branch director in 15 of the 17 regions to discuss counselling services and to initiate a programme whereby a small number of cases are selected by each field worker for concentrated attention. This programme appears to have good possibilities for the more rural area of the province where individual field workers cover larger geographical areas.

Within the department, a committee of senior personnel has been established and is meeting regularly to plan and develop professional social work services for the various branches of the department where social work skills are required.

In the field services branch, for example, it is anticipated trained social workers will be deployed across the province to whom cases can be referred when emotional and behavioural problems appear to be the underlying reasons for their dependency. Such a unit is now in the formative stages for the Toronto area.

Mr Chairman, you will appreciate that one of the great difficulties faced by the department, of course, has been the shortage of qualified social workers and non-professional welfare workers. We are aware, I can assure you, of the need for such specialists in the administration of our services, and we intend to accomplish our objectives. Each year the training facilities are improving, stimulated by grants to our educational institutions and financial assistance for students. From these sources we hope to recruit the staff we will require to develop our programme.

I do not know how comprehensive this statement is, but it gives you a picture of what is being carried on, I think, as well as I can do it right now.

Mr. Trotter: Has the hon. Minister any idea what the case load is for a field worker?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It all depends on the part of the province, but I am advised he will have a look at between 300 and 400 cases.

Mr. Trotter: When he has to look after 300 or 400 cases, would that be per year or per month?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: A year!

Mr. Trotter: Per year, all right! How would, let us say, Metropolitan Toronto, compare with the north?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that Toronto's average would be around 425.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question about salaries paid to these field workers. It seems to me that last year the hon. Minister told us that the salary range for that type of work was from \$3,600 to \$5,000. Could the hon. Minister advise this House what the salary has been increased to, as we understood that this was being increased this year?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I thought I mentioned this a moment ago. For welfare administrators, the range is \$6,300 to \$8,600; the welfare field supervisors, \$5,500 to \$6,000; welfare allowances officers, \$4,600 to \$5,500.

Is that what my hon. friend wanted?

Mr. Bryden: What was the last category that carried the range of \$4,600 to \$5,500?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The welfare allowances officers!

Mr. Bryden: Do you not have a classification of field officer or something like that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: We have the regional welfare administrators, the welfare field supervisors and the welfare allowance officers. Their primary duty is to examine and approve municipal welfare accounts, conduct individual investigations and advise welfare administrators.

The field workers are \$3,900 to \$4,600. That is the range.

Mr. Bryden: Are those fully trained, qualified people? As I recall the discussion of last year you had two categories. One was a sort of training category and the other was a fully qualified worker. You are talking now about the fully qualified worker or the trainee?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The \$3,900 to \$4,600 would be called a grade one field worker, and the grade two would start at \$4,600.

Mr. Bryden: And go up to what?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Around \$5,200, I believe.

Mr. Bryden: That represents a small increase over what was reported last year. It sounds to me like about \$300 a year, as I remember the figures from last year.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It is what they call—I often wonder what the word means—but it is a two-step increase in this particular case.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but have the ranges themselves been increased?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes!

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to ask a question or two about these field workers. Could the hon. Minister advise this House how many of those in that branch are trained social workers, with either an MSW or VSW? My question is posed because I think this is important work, and I think this is a field where there should be a larger number of trained social workers.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, there are two graduate social workers here in main office. In the child welfare branch we have seven, and there are two coming in; which will be a total of nine. I am speaking of MSW, for the most part; except the odd one is a BSW. In field services, I have five. Rehabilitation services, 13. They are all MSW's except five; who I believe are known as BSWs.

Mr. S. Lewis: Of the 179 field supervisors that you indicated at the outset of your remarks, can we have a general breakdown as to education and training? You must have them in some educational breakdown?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I have not that with me right now, but I can get it for my hon. friend. You mean the breakdown of the qualifications, schooling and that sort of thing?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes. I was just wondering how many would be out of grade 13; how many would be with some university training. I am curious as to whether this is available in the department.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes. It is available to the department, but I have not got it with me right now.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine. Might I then ask further, what training do the 170 field supervisors have? What kind of course do they undergo to fit them for the work?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Most of them have grade 13, although some have grade 12, and they have a six-week course in the department; in-training, you might call it. Four weeks at school and two weeks in the field.

Mr. S. Lewis: And if I am right, the four-week course that is given in the department relates primarily to the explanation of the Acts and the regulations thereof. Am I right in that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: So that these people are put into the field to administer this range of programme, with six weeks of training. Now, I am sure the hon. Minister will agree that this is not an overwhelming training programme and I do appreciate the difficulties.

I am wondering, given the problems involved, is there any opportunity for a subsequent training programme? Is there any specific pattern of leave? Are there any intensive courses for three- or six-month periods? How many take advantage of them, and what has been the pattern?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I have just been handed something which I have here, which is related to vote 1704. I have another statement which would clarify that, I believe. If my hon. friend would wait until then, I would like to make a statement on vote 1704.

Mr. S. Lewis: This is 1704.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Oh, that is right. I am sorry. I thought I had read this, but apparently I did not.

Mr. S. Lewis: You read a statement, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, it is 1704. But 1705 is what I have about staff training. I thought I was right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Oh, I see. I would appreciate it if the House could spend some little time on this area of education training; it intrigues me. But would you like to hold all of the education and training, even for the field worker people, into vote 1705?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Fine!

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1704?

Mr. Trotter: One short question. What do you normally consider a proper case load for a field worker? I understand it is between 200 and 250 cases. Would that be what would be considered proper for a worker to do a good job?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, in our kind of categorical investigation, as it stands now, I am advised that it would be around 400.

Mr. Trotter: Oh, I know. Each worker has to do around 400, and in the Toronto area—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The case load is about 350 to 450, as I have it here. Specialized cases would be about 150.

Mr. Trotter: That is what you have, or is that what is considered the proper way to run the department?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, that is what we have now.

Mr. Trotter: Yes, well, what I am getting at is, what do your authorities in this field think should be the norm? How many cases? I know it is up in the 400 plus, but is not the optimum situation considered to be between 200 and 250 cases per field worker,

depending on the spread of the geographical area?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, we feel that a field worker can handle that very easily.

Mr. Trotter: Handle 400?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. Trotter: You are one of the few that think so.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, just following up on the question that the hon. member for Parkdale asked. Is it considered that they have any duties other than simply checking on the recipients of assistance in whatever category to make sure that they are not cheating on the regulations? The temptation to cheat on the regulations must be overwhelming in view of the low level of allowances, but I am wondering if the department, when it considers that a 400 case load is satisfactory, envisages anything but a negative role for these people, or does it think at all creatively that they might provide service to the people concerned, as well as checking on them?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that they consider in the department that it is quite in order and it can be handled very easily. It is done; the matter of investigating and reporting. The decision is made by whoever makes the decisions.

Mr. Bryden: In other words, purely a negative function. Just investigating to see what their income is, or whether or not they meet the qualifications.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Specialization is a different thing. The case load there would be about 150.

Mr. Bryden: Well, one other phase of this, Mr. Chairman. I am happy to note that there has been a modest increase in the salaries paid to these field workers—of approximately \$300 a year, I take it, since last year. That works out to a little better than \$5 a week.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Four hundred dollars.

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Four hundred dollars.

Mr. Bryden: Four hundred dollars a year has been the increase. The salaries last year were even worse than I remembered. So it is \$400 a year; it may be \$7.50 per week or something like that. I suggest to the hon. Minister that, if the range for the experienced

people is now \$4,600 to \$5,200, it is still a very low range for the kind of work these people are expected to do. This, I think, is characteristic of salaries all up and down the line in this department. There is an old tradition, which we still have not shaken off, that in this particular field people can be paid low salaries.

I know that the hon. Minister does not have the determination of salaries in his own hands, but I would hope that the pressure will be maintained to push up the level of salaries in his department from the field worker category up. I think if that is done there might be less difficulty in attracting people into this profession and in encouraging them to take not the minimum amount of training that the department thinks it can get away with, but the degree of training that would be desirable for proper discharge of their very important functions.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think the House was inadvertently misled. The case load is 396 cases per month, not per year; 396 cases per month. I have the 32nd annual report of the department in front of me and I point out that 396 cases per month, Mr. Chairman, is a work load of 17 cases a day. You cannot conceivably dispense more than a negative kind of service with that rate of effort.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that they have that amount of cases to look at in one year and they are recorded as such.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I read from your annual report the average monthly case load per worker throughout the year—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is the same—

Mr. S. Lewis: Agreed, but we are dealing, I gather from the figure in the back of the report, with 170,000 people a year in this field.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I understand that for most of these cases it means one check a year and for the others it is two checks a year.

Mr. S. Lewis: What is the difference, Mr. Minister? Which programmes are reviewed once a year and which are reviewed twice?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Old age, disabled, blind once a year, that is by law, others may be twice.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I have been sitting quietly here, but every time I listen to the answers by

the hon. Minister, sir, I hear the most extraordinary explanation come from his philosophy. It takes me back to Oliver Twist. I would not be surprised if a dinosaur marched into the room with the antiquated sort of attitude that develops in his philosophical approach to welfare.

Here we talk about field service. I had hoped that there would be some kind of a progressive attitude, saying that it is preventive, not just an investigation. What a dry, dehydrated effort on the part of the department! I would hope you are going there to bolster morale and help people to help themselves to get on their feet. This routine effort that you are suggesting frankly shows why there are resignations by top people from your department and yet you give us these sly innuendoes as to why people leave. There are a lot of first-class people who would not want to belong to your department because there is no challenge and a clarion call. To suggest that your field service branch has 350, and get muddled about whether you know if it is a month or a year! How long have you been in this job?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: It is the total case load of a worker for a year divided by the 12 months to get an average monthly case load of 350.

Mr. Thompson: All right, we asked you whether it was a month or a year, you say it is 350 a year.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I said 396 to 400 in the first place.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I challenge you on that statement. I would say that if a case worker is doing 350, and according to the job he has to investigate and report, you say once in some cases and twice in others, I say he is not working hard enough. Yet I know from talking to some of your case workers that there are dedicated, hard-working people who are trying to do everything they can, and I know they are visiting more than that.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You say they are not doing enough.

Mr. Thompson: I am saying if he only has 350 that he visits once a year and in some cases twice, I would suggest that it is not enough for a man to be doing. I would suggest that if you could have told us that he is counselling, advising and helping the family situations, and that he has sensitivities to people in order to bolster them, to help them with work and to get them on their feet again, then this would be a worthwhile job. But you stand up and tell us that all he does is gather information and report. I think that is a shocking thing, you should push this department so that they are doing far more.

Vote 1704 agreed to.

On vote 1705:

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before that vote is carried, 1705, I would move that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there are three second readings and a few bills left, and one question raised by the hon. member for York South in the committee of the whole and then we will resume the estimates of this department.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.10 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, June 18, 1965

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Friday, June 18, 1965

Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	4395
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Spooner, second reading	4396
Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	4396
Milk Act, 1965, bill intituled, reported	4399
Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	4399
Seed Potatoes Act, bill to amend, reported	4399
Farm Products Marketing Act, bill to amend, reported	4399
Municipal Act, bill to amend, reported	4404
Assessment Act, bill to amend, reported	4408
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, reported	4408
Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963, bill to amend, reported	4408
Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, continued	4410
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	4417

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: under the Speaker's gallery west, Kearney public school, Kearney; in the east gallery, Listowel public school, Listowel; and in the west gallery, Kensal Park public school, London; and Sunbury public school, Sunbury; also in the east and west galleries, Oneida Central public school, Caledonia.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction to a reply given to the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) on Wednesday, June 16.

The checkerboarding of an area referred to applies only to leases from boring permits for petroleum, gas, coal and salt in that part of Ontario lying north of the transcontinental railway and not to the leases emanating from the exploration licences we were discussing, which are restricted to ten per cent of the area.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves second reading of Bill No. 164, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I would like to make a few comments about some of the sections of this bill. There will be a few amendments presented when the bill is dealt with in committee of the whole. I think I might as well make comments on them in order that there be no misunderstanding, because the bill in its present shape deals with a number of amend-

ments which are desirable to The Assessment Act; since it has been written a number of problems have come about and been made known to us, so we feel that further amendments are required.

For instance, paragraph 1 of the bill, which deals with paragraph 9 of section 4 of The Assessment Act, is to be amended to provide that only the assessment of parking lots on land owned by the harbour commission are to be assessable. As the section now reads, it would indicate that it was the intention of the amendment to assess lands owned by local boards and school boards, and also harbour commissions. It was not our intention to do that, but we presented this amendment on the basis of a representation which had been made by the council of Metropolitan Toronto. Since the bill has been printed and been available, representation has been made to me that it would be desirable at this time to amend the Act, this bill, for the present, and that only lands which are used as parking lots of properties owned by harbour commissions should be assessable.

Section 2 of the bill deals with the matter of institution of assessment manuals and that, I suggest, is desirable.

Section 3 of the bill deals with a provision for the adjustment of the assessment of pipelines by the application of the latest provincial equalization factor. Hon. members will remember that the assessment on pipelines is statutory. We have found in some areas that it has worked to the detriment of the owner of the assessed property because other property in the municipality was assessed at a figure of, shall I say, perhaps 50 per cent of the manual assessment whereas the pipelines were assessed at 100 per cent. With this amendment, the pipeline assessment will be equalized in accordance with the equalization factor in the particular municipality.

Subsection 2 deals with a similar matter.

In connection then with sections 4 and 5, and also, I believe, 6 of this bill, these matters deal with the appointment of assessment commissioners and district assessors, and so on; and these are just to add authority to the Act as it is at the present time.

Another amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I will move in the committee of the whole House, deals with section 9 of the bill. It provides now for eliminating the so-called vacancy allowances, and it is necessary to amend certain other sections of the Act which relate to the same subject in order to make the Act consistent in all of its sections. I will move that amendment in the committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Spooner moves second reading of Bill No. 165, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In explanation, I might say that here again it is my intention to present an amendment to section 1 of the bill by putting a time limit on it, for the time in which this will go into effect. The date will be January 1, 1966, because that is the date, of course, when the Canada pension plan will come into force. It is desirable, in providing for the integration of the Canada pension plan and pension plans which apply in the case of employees of these particular municipal organizations, that this date should be inserted into the Act, into the amendment. Then there is no question as to when it goes into effect.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE EMERGENCY MEASURES ACT, 1962-1963

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 166, An Act to amend The Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the first three sections of the bill are simply making certain changes in organization and titles. What was known as a "commissioner" is to be known as a "director" in title. The appointment of staff is changed to the normal procedures under The Public Service Act.

The emergency measures organization is to be regarded as a branch of The Department of the Attorney General.

Then the particular section providing for the carrying out of the organization is section

4. Under the emergency measures organization, as hon. members are aware, the whole organization is directed primarily from the federal government, which provides plans and delegates certain powers, then down to the provincial government. At the provincial level the organization is carried through to municipal governments. Section 4 provides for that power from the federal area to be delegated or directed to a Minister, and you will note that the section says "the Prime Minister who may send, name or delegate a Minister of the executive council to be responsible."

Provision is made for direction to municipalities to co-ordinate their services, to approve plans which are to be prepared by municipalities, and for the control and the direction of various services where more than one municipality may be involved in an emergency, or disaster area.

I may say that The Emergency Measures Act is designed to cover a situation where either a natural or a national type of disaster may occur. The services which then may be directed by the Minister, where more than one municipality is involved, will be such things as police service, fire fighting services, traffic, welfare services, the use of hospitals and medical services, supply of food, the provision for water, and so on.

This is the general design of the Act. I think it provides a more direct and a more active part for the provincial government to play, in co-operation with the federal government, in preparation for any emergency which might arise.

There is provision in subsection 4 of section 4 to direct one municipality to give assistance to another. Subsection 5 goes so far as to provide that, in an emergency situation, the provisions set forth in the Act would take precedence over other statutes—such as, for instance, The Hospitals Act, The Highway Traffic Act, or any such Act, where the situation requires that there be central direction in a situation of dire or national emergency.

That, generally, is the purpose of the Act.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in reading the Act, I recognize that in section three (1),

Every plan shall be prepared under the supervision and guidance of the director.

I am assuming that there will be a great deal of clear-cut planning ahead. I think one of the real problems about this whole organization has been the fact that there is public lethargy, apathy and indifference.

I notice that in the further sections, in 4, it keeps referring to "where an emergency exists." It seems to me that if the event takes place—the emergency that we hope will never take place—then everything is prepared for after the emergency takes place. Nowhere in this amendment is there an emphasis on trying to work out plans before an emergency takes place.

I was out near Brighton last week and was talking to someone who is working for the emergency measures organization. He was telling me his radio does not cover a lot of the areas, and he just wonders if this whole thing is not an exercise in futility.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I might say to the House that I spent all of yesterday with the hon. Minister of Industry and his group of planners in Ottawa on the matter of emergency measures. It is admitted that there is a good deal of public apathy, and this is bound to be the case, I think, where in the world situation happily, at the moment, there is a rapport or a détente between nations which is a little better than existed some time ago. The apathy exists in matters of defence, and I am speaking of the military defence. It is hard to recruit for what used to be called the militia, or for the armed services in such a situation, and it is particularly difficult when you are speaking of civil defence, of which emergency measures is regarded as a part. There has been, however, a good deal of planning done by the municipal organizations, not as much as we would like to see and not as complete as we would like to see. The purpose of our conference yesterday was not only to clear our thinking, but to relate our plans and have an understanding of where our areas of duty and responsibility lay; to encourage the planning; to have the plans completed; have them approved and to have tests and exercises done, so as to bring these plans up-to-date.

I think with the passage of this Act, and with the very close understanding and liaison which now will exist between the federal and the provincial authorities, that we will be able to improve the situation, to have the planning brought up to date and to have the plans tested and approved, subject always to that difficulty we have of obtaining the interest of the public, to the extent we would like to see. But perhaps it is not an unmixed evil that we have a world situation where the public are not so greatly concerned that an emergency may ever arise—and we would hope it would not—but we have to be prepared for it.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at the mild nature of the comments emanating from the Liberal benches with regard to this bill, in view of the fact that when the bill was given first reading, it was alleged from that quarter that it provided for the establishment of martial law.

We do not take that view of the bill. We do not take an alarmist view of it at all. We think that it could very well be a useful measure. It involves, as I understand it—at any rate it provides the basis for—a considerable administrative reorganization and certain co-ordination of powers under The Emergency Measures Act.

Now, we trust that the additional powers granted under this bill, both for reorganization and for co-ordination, will lead to an intelligent approach to the problem of emergencies. The hon. Attorney General somewhat surprised me when he said, just a minute ago, that it is hard to get people to take an interest in emergency measures, because the world situation, as I understood him, is not such as to create any sense of public alarm.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. I compared it to a situation which existed some years ago and said the détente or rapport between certain nations was better than it was some years ago.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would say that the present situation in Vietnam does not lead one to take, shall we say, a complacent attitude towards the world situation, and I do not think that the public of Canada takes such an attitude. The public of Canada, however, is indifferent to the emergency measures programme, because it is a totally useless and meaningless programme. That is where the difficulty arises.

I think my hon. colleague from Yorkview (Mr. Young), who is out of town at the present time, summed it up very well back on May 13 when he said, and I am just going to quote a few sentences from page 2921 of *Hansard* for that date:

The emergency measures organization has existed for some time in this province and has, it seems to me, in recent years served only one purpose. That purpose has been to disperse certain moneys to municipalities for fire equipment. Perhaps this debate should have taken place earlier in the afternoon, after The Milk Act vote, because this is a sacred cow which gives perhaps no milk, and which is a very expensive item to keep.

This is the problem we are up against. The emergency measures organization is essentially an organization that was set up under federal initiative to give some retired generals the opportunity to continue playing soldiers. It does not provide any meaningful answer to problems that may arise in relation to emergencies.

Certainly it gives no answer to the problem of nuclear warfare. The only protection against the nuclear bomb is to ensure that it does not fall. I think it has been well established everywhere that that is the only protection against it.

There is, nevertheless, a role for some sort of machinery for dealing with emergencies which may arise from natural causes, and even in the course of war, although I think we just rule that out as an impossibility. But it cannot be done by a separate organization sitting off on the side, which is not integrated with the general provision of services for the community. If an emergency arises, and we hope one should not arise, but they do from time to time, it is obvious that the protection of the community is going to be achieved primarily through the existing police and fire forces that are on the job all the time.

There may come a situation where the efforts of those forces may have to be co-ordinated, and where supplementary assistance may have to be given to them, but we will never get any protection against any emergency by having an organization sitting off on the side that is designed to deal only with emergencies, and is not really operative at any other time.

We in this group will support this bill in the hope that its provisions will provide an opportunity to reassess the whole approach to the problem of emergency with a view to disbanding this ridiculous emergency measures organization and providing for the supplementation and co-ordination of the normal protective services of the community in the cases of emergency. We believe that there could indeed arise a situation such as is contemplated in subsection 3 of the proposed new section 6A, and we believe that that power is necessary and should be there. But I think that if the hon. Attorney General is now undertaking a reorganization of the emergency measures system, he should take advantage of the opportunity to make a genuine one, so that we will have genuine protection against emergencies where they arise and not the false protection arising from an organization that obviously could not operate if an emergency did arise.

I suggest to the hon. Attorney General that the public indifference to the present

EMO setup arises from the public realization of the total futility of the whole thing. Let us hope that the hon. Attorney General moves forward under the powers given here to create a meaningful organization. He is an extremely cautious man and moves forward very cautiously, but I found that when he starts moving he moves fairly continuously. So let us hope that, now that he has got started in this field he will carry right through and do a proper job of recasting the whole structure and philosophy of the organization.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I think I should add a word at this stage. First of all I would like to make some reference to the expression "martial law" which the hon. member—

Mr. Bryden: We do not agree with that expression, but I will leave it to the hon. Attorney General to make correction.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, I realize that. It was used by, I think, the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) some time ago in speaking to the press. I would like to make it very clear that this is the civil defence organization. There are no armed services—army, navy or air force—in it. It is purely a civil defence organization for the protection of the public by a public organization, an organization of its own in an emergency situation. Martial law implies the calling in of the army or a military force to take command of government services in a country, which is, of course, a ridiculous thought of which there is no suggestion whatsoever in this legislation.

We, in our whole history, I think, have shown our aversion to any such thing as martial law. Our Emergency Measures Act has no thought of it, no contemplation of it; it is designed as a civil organization. I would just simply say to the hon. member who has spoken that this is intended: the purpose of this whole Act is that there may be a reorganization and a stepping up of the activities in the organization of emergency measures for civilian defence. It does use, and it is intended to use, the normal services: the police, the fire department—that is the local forces—the hospitals, the welfare services, and all the local services in the municipality.

We are seeking to have the municipalities bring their planning forward, to have those plans approved, to get public participation to a much greater extent in them, and to have them activated and encouraged by testing, so that the public will be ready to act, and to act efficiently, in any emergency which might arise. And I think we may look forward, I

am sure, to a considerable increase in interest and efficiency under this emergency measures legislation.

Motion agreed to, second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The sixty-eighth order; the committee of the whole House. On Bill No. 135; Mr. J. F. Edwards in the chair.

THE MILK ACT, 1965

(continued)

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might just repeat the point that I raised when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) was kind enough to leave the matter over because the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart) was not in the House at that time.

The point I made was, briefly, that in the old setup in the milk industry, the milk co-ordinating board played a rather major role in co-ordinating various groups. In the new setup which is envisaged in this bill, we are going to have a separate cream producers' marketing board and a cheese producers' marketing board. The other two branches of the industry will be brought together to whatever extent is possible, and therefore, it seemed to me that there would still be a continuing co-ordinating role. I wonder why, in the new setup, there appears to be a deliberate move on the part of the government to dispense with the milk co-ordinating board.

Not only that, if I may just add one further point with reference to co-ordinating in the milk industry, but I understand that the board has moved into other functions normally associated with a fraternal organization for farmers who are involved in the milk industry, such as the provision of group insurance. My question, briefly, is, what is the government's thinking with regard to the future role of the milk co-ordinating board, and if it is the thinking that this body must be, or should be, disbanded, why?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to answer the hon. member's question in this connection. There has been concern expressed by the co-ordinating board's personnel as to why the Act calls for the dissolution of the co-ordinating board. I would be the first to admit and to commend the co-ordinating board for its activities in the past and for the contribution it has been able to make to the dairy industry.

When the co-ordinating board was first

set up it was intended that it might be the body that would bring together the four groups, and indeed, bring them together in such a way that they might fulfill the purpose that we hope the new Milk Act will fulfill in establishing a single marketing board for milk.

It was not possible for the groups to agree among themselves and to really come to grips with the problem as it existed and continues to exist, but the co-ordinating board did provide a service to the groups whereby they could meet together and perform useful functions, I would like to say, in addition to the "paternal" influence—the term I think was used by the hon. member for York South. They did considerable promotional work. For instance, in the dairy lane at the Royal winter fair we had the butter exhibit that always attracts a good deal of attention.

The co-ordinating boards were influential in the dairy princess competitions held across the province to focus attention on the dairy industry, and were quite influential and participated to a very marked degree in the provincial competition at the Canadian national exhibition, having to do with the dairy princess competition.

There has been no thought that we have not recognized this but we do believe that when we bring together the groups, through the marketing board that will be established, we think that this marketing board will provide the service that has been provided by the co-ordinating board in all of these respects that I have mentioned, but it will go further in establishing a marketing plan, a single marketing agency for milk.

It is true that the cream producers' marketing plan will be left outside because this is something that just does not fit into the other pattern.

The cheese producers marketing board, for the time being, will continue because they are the only export agency that does exist to handle surplus cheddar cheese in the province of Ontario, or indeed in Canada for that matter. So we felt that they could well carry on for the time being, but there is no thought that the producers of cheese milk will be left out of the new marketing plan.

Indeed, a great many letters, requests—and resolutions—have crossed my desk from the various areas of Ontario where cheese milk is produced, asking that cheese milk producers be included in the new milk marketing plan—and, I think, with good reason. There may have been a misunderstanding, due to my remarks in the House here, that the cheese producers marketing board should be

continued, but the cheese board deals only with the sale of cheese—the produced and finished product—and not necessarily with the cheese milk itself.

The milk co-ordinating board will be continued throughout this year, or until the new marketing plan comes into operation. They will carry on as they have always carried on; they will get the same contributions from the various groups that they have always got; but when the new marketing board is set up, we would hope that the present function of the co-ordinating board would be blended into the new marketing plan. I cannot very well see why the producers themselves should be required to contribute toward two plans, which really will be providing the same function. That is the intention.

This has all been explained to the co-ordinating board and I feel that any misunderstanding that may have developed has been corrected. I can assure you that we want to maintain the services of the groups, but I would like to see them in one place—not diversified.

Bill No. 135 reported.

THE MEAT INSPECTION ACT (ONTARIO), 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 138 reported.

THE SEED POTATOES ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 139 reported.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

On sections 5 and 6:

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 140 be amended by renumbering sections 5 and 6 as 6 and 7, respectively,

and by adding, after section 4, the following section:

1. Clause (d) of subsection 2 of section 18 of The Farm Products Marketing Act, as enacted by section 11 of The Farm Products Marketing Amendment Act of 1962-1963, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(d) Providing for the seizing, removing, destroying or otherwise disposing of any growing tobacco plants or tobacco produced or marketed in violation of this Act or the regulations, and the retention or disposition by the local board of any proceeds of sale thereof.

Subsection 2. The said section 18 is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

Notwithstanding section 13, every person who fails to comply with or contravenes any of the provisions of this section, or any of the regulations, orders, or directions of the board, or the local board, made pursuant to this section, is guilty of an offence and, on summary conviction, is liable for a first offence to a fine of not more than \$500 and, for a subsequent offence, to a fine of not less than \$500 and not more than \$5,000.

On section 5, as amended:

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I am a little worried about the broad wording of this. This is section 5, subsection—it is the new section 5, is it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is.

Mr. Singer: Clause (d) of subsection 2 is repealed and the following substituted—and I presume that allows for regulations to be passed, setting up—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Not necessarily. It is spelled out. Mr. Chairman, may I explain why this has been done?

Mr. Singer: Do, please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This was brought about, and it affects only section 18 of The Farm Products Marketing Act. This is a special tobacco section. It provides only for production control, and that is the only commodity that is under production control in Ontario under The Farm Products Marketing Act. That is why it is in a separate section.

The problem is this: The old section provided only for the destruction of any growing tobacco plants; in effect, if the grower grew more tobacco than his rights called for under the Act, the farm products marketing

board would authorize the local board—that is the flue-cured board—to destroy that tobacco. This is a very difficult thing to move in and do because I think most growers plant, in the initial instance, more tobacco than they have the right to grow. They may cut back the plantings, or the acreage which is not as good as the rest of the crop, so that they then conform to what their rights should be. But, you see, there have been some who have not done this.

This went through all the processes of courts of law right up to the Supreme Court of Ontario, and the flue-cured board was upheld. So, instead of leaving the wording of the Act only for the destroying of any plants, we have made this amendment, which provides for “the seizing, removing, destroying or otherwise disposing of any growing tobacco plants, or the tobacco produced or marketed in violation of this Act.” Because we think that this spells it out much more clearly, it strengthens the hand of control that might be exercised by the flue-cured board. I think this is in keeping with the decision which was handed down by the supreme court.

The other section I read—the last one, the penalty clause—simply provides for an increased penalty other than that provided in section 13 of The Farm Products Marketing Act, which is the general penalty clause of that Act. And the fine is so insignificant that it does not mean anything, really, in a commodity that is as valuable as tobacco. So these clauses were both inserted.

I discussed them with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), because I knew he was the member for his party in the area where tobacco is grown extensively. I also discussed it with the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) as well, because I quite recognize that this is an introduction, at committee of the whole House, of a completely new section. But the idea for bringing it in was generated by the problems faced by the flue-cured board in this year, 1965. It was felt, through their solicitor and ours, and all the best legal advice we could get, that we should introduce this amendment to provide for the controls which are really intended in the Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, certainly I am not sufficiently familiar with the whole marketing scheme for tobacco to quarrel with the hon. Minister on principle. It seems to me, in the few words I have had with my hon. colleagues about this, that the principle he espouses is a reasonable one. But I am very concerned with the arbitrary powers that are given now to a local board to descend

upon a man who is growing tobacco and seize it, remove it, destroy it, or otherwise dispose of it, completely on the board's own initiative. It can go in, without any checks, without any balances, and say, “In our opinion you should not be doing this. We are going to take your property and destroy it. We think we are right.” But once it is gone, the individual, if he has been wrongly treated, may have great difficulty establishing any remedy.

To draw a parallel: Suppose the police suspect that X is in possession of stolen goods. They cannot just arbitrarily walk into his house. They have to go to a justice of the peace and get a search warrant. Suppose they come to the conclusion that Y has narcotics that he should not have. They cannot just lightly descend upon him, break down his door and search his place. There are certain legal protections and even though this is a serious problem—and I am not suggesting that this remedy should not be there—I am very concerned about the complete lack of safeguards.

Should there not be some method of proceeding to a justice of the peace and getting a warrant, or establishing somewhere a prima facie case before you go in and destroy a man's property? Should there not be some obligation on the local board to take every possible precaution to make sure that it is not offending an individual's rights? I am very concerned, because here we are extending this pernicious principle of giving to nameless and faceless civil servants—and I have used that phrase often—the power to go in and seize and destroy a person's property, without any safeguards being attached to it all.

I emphasize, Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting that for the proper control of tobacco marketing perhaps this power should not exist, but I am worried about the safeguards. I am worried about the one farmer who might be hurt by the arbitrary exercise of power by the local board, or by the wrongful exercise of good intention, which is just as bad to the farmer who could be affected. I would urge the hon. Minister to take another look at this and see if there cannot be some sort of set of safeguards put in here. I think it is most important, because I think the hon. Minister would be the last one who would want to empower local boards to act in an arbitrary manner.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the amendment as proposed does exactly what my hon. friend suggests. It makes much more flexible the action of the flue-cured

board in control of the growing of tobacco outside of the rights of any individual, than does the present Act, in its present wording.

If my hon. friend would look, he would note that The Farm Products Marketing Act, section 18, item (d), under subsection 2, reads as follows:

—providing for the destroying of any growing tobacco plants or other development in the producing of tobacco or tobacco produced in Ontario by any person.

It goes on to explain the three conditions under which this may be done.

But our amendment provides not only for the destroying, but for the seizing, removing or destroying or otherwise disposing of. This means that if the farmer persists in growing tobacco illegally, the flue-cured board has then the right to seize the tobacco he grows, and say to him, "You cannot market this tobacco that you have illegally grown." So it provides the safeguard that if he has grown the tobacco, it may be decided then by the courts—as it has been decided this last year—right up to the Supreme Court of Canada's decision, that the man was illegally growing the tobacco and he could not market it in the province of Ontario. But he could get it out of the province of Ontario and market it there and pocket the money so obtained.

Then he could come back to the flue-cured board this year and say to it, "I am going to grow tobacco again." And the board, unless it has this clause, is in the same position it was previously. The board is now provided the opportunity to seize the tobacco and the individual has the rights of British common law, through all the courts, to appeal that decision in any way he possibly may do so.

But the flue-cured board has never moved in to destroy anyone's tobacco yet and it feels, and I think for the reasons that my hon. friend has mentioned, that it is not wise for it to do that. The crop having been destroyed, it finds itself in the position that if a mistake was made, then the right does come back on the individual to say, "Well, I was badly done by, and I should not have had this crop destroyed." But if the crop is seized, after having been grown, as the new subsection provides, it puts the individual in a much better position to plead his case and have a decision rendered, than the old Act does.

I feel that my hon. friend has raised a point that has been given consideration: that the individual is protected to a greater degree, in a more flexible position than he was

ever placed in before, and it provides the necessary strength that is so essential to the proper, and I would say effective, control of tobacco growing in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister I do not think has quite grasped my point. I am not arguing the principle of this and I accept the principle. As I say, I am not as familiar with the techniques of tobacco marketing as many other hon. members of the House are, but I have consulted with my hon. colleagues and we accept the hon. Minister's defence of the principle. We think it is reasonable and it is logical.

What do concern me, though, are perhaps what you might want to call the legal niceties of the matter. The problem of placing it in the hands of the local board is what you get down to. This probably means Mr. Smith or somebody on the local board comes to the conclusion that Farmer Jones is doing something improperly and he is going to go in, and on his own initiative, he is going to seize, remove and destroy or otherwise dispose of, any growing tobacco plants.

What I am trying to suggest, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. I think that before Mr. Smith, the administrator of the local board, or the man who makes the decision on the local board, goes this far, that he should have to go before someone and establish at least a *prima facie* case, perhaps go before a justice of the peace and swear out an affidavit saying that, "In my opinion, so and so—" and the justice of the peace will issue him a warrant to allow him to go in. Some legal protection is needed because I am worried that one case could go wrong.

The hon. Minister says he is not aware of any that have gone wrong, but the hon. Minister would agree with me that it could go wrong, and it could go wrong with honest people, and it could go wrong through arbitrariness or through a clash of personalities. I do not care for what reason it might go wrong; there is a possibility that it might and that an individual's rights could be seriously hampered.

Even though a similar power may be in the Act now, that does not make it right. At present, before the House, we have something in the administrative legal niceties that concerns me, as they might affect the rights of an individual citizen. I would think that if the hon. Minister wants this power—and there seems to be no one objecting that he should have the power—there should, however, be some basis on which we can avoid the possibility of a future mistake.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a bit on this. I would agree with the general proposition of the hon. member for Downsview that we should protect the rights of the individual to the fullest extent necessary. But in my view, as I understand what the government is doing, and as I understand the problem that it has moved to tackle, I think it has protected the rights of the individual adequately. I will explain why.

For example, as I understand the representations of the hon. member for Downsview, what he is proposing is that one should have to go before a justice of the peace or some other such official to establish a *prima facie* case before one can move to seize this illegally grown tobacco. In my view this is going to complicate the implementation of the objective of this Act and I think complicate it unnecessarily.

The board is not in the normal sense a nameless and faceless civil servant. The local tobacco board is a board that is elected by the producers. It is a board which is fulfilling the collective desires of the producers. Therefore, if it comes to the conclusion that on the evidence on the books it granted so many acres of rights to a producer, and that he has exceeded those rights, then it seems to me irrelevant and unnecessary that the board should have to go to somebody and prove that they would have the right to go in and seize this illegally grown tobacco. It seems to me an unnecessarily costly thing, because as I understand it, and I think the hon. Minister is correct, that if perchance they move wittingly or otherwise in a malicious fashion, then there are all the other normal procedures that the individual may take within the courts.

On the other side of the coin, the one that I am interested in, farmers have been for years trying to come to grips with the problem of how you control production so you do not get a market which is so swamped with a surplus that you destroy the whole stability of the market. This is a very, very complex problem, so much so that the normally cautious small "c" conservative farmer has been grappling with it without really coming to grips with it for a great number of years.

The tobacco board was forced to come to grips with it, and you had—and this is the point that I think we should not ignore—in the instance of the tobacco growers a few people who were deliberately going to violate the collective decisions of the tobacco growers. In effect, they thumbed their nose at the tobacco board and said, "No matter

what you say, we are going to grow all the tobacco we want." Then when they grew the tobacco, because of the Act which the hon. Minister is now going to amend, they could not market it through the marketing board in Ontario. But all they had to do was go down to Quebec and market it, and they had the money that they could not get directly from marketing here in Ontario.

In other words, the Act was being circumvented, they were destroying and undermining the whole objective that the farmers are seeking to work out in production control, and all the necessary machinery to achieve production control.

As I understand this amendment will mean that the board can move in and, as the amendment says, they can provide for the seizing, removing, destroying or otherwise disposing of any growing tobacco plants or tobacco produced and marketed in violation of this Act. It seems to me that not only is this an objective of the Act which was very controversial, but this controversy has now been resolved through the courts. The Supreme Court of Canada has said that this is a legitimate power of a local marketing board.

Therefore, in keeping with a plea that I have often made to this government, when you give farmers control of their marketing, give them adequate power to enforce it. My complaint has been that so often the government has come in and frustrated the adequate implementation of marketing objectives. Here, for once, they are coming in to give the local marketing board the power to do the job. As I see it, this power at the moment is going to be exercised, if at all, against people who have been deliberately, openly and without hiding their objectives at all, been seeking to frustrate the whole objective and operations of the marketing board.

Therefore, though I concur with the necessity of protecting the rights of the individual as a general proposition, I think in this instance it has been done. The government has given the power to the farmers. They are entitled to run their own business and operate their own marketing, and we will unhesitatingly support it, but watch its implementation in the future, because this is ongoing and continuing and you always have to watch.

Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 6 and 7, formerly sections 5 and 6, agreed to.

Bill No. 140 reported.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 146, an Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 4:

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, on section 4 I would move that subsection 6 be amended by striking out "a town or city" in the second and third lines, and substituting therefor "an urban municipality." This will take care of a village corporation, then.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 4, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 5 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 17:

Mr. Singer: On section 17, Mr. Chairman, could the hon. Minister perhaps tell us when he is going to bring in his licensing arrangements?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I hope to bring that into effect on January 1, 1966. I have had a committee of officials of the department discussing this matter with a certain number of members of the executive of the Ontario association of assessing officers, and we have pretty well discussed the manner and method of licensing. There will probably be more than one kind of licence. We have to deal with the assessor who has been in an assessment department for many years and who will continue, and who has, by and large, performed the responsibilities of that office in an efficient manner, but because of his own personal circumstances or conditions does not wish to undertake the in-service training course which we have now provided with the institute of assessors through Queen's University at Kingston. Then we have the new man coming into the field of assessing, and he will be required to take the course and will be required to engage himself to complete the course within a period of no more than five years. I think it will work out satisfactorily, but I hope to have it into effect by the first of the year.

Mr. Singer: I think what the hon. Minister says makes good sense. You cannot just go in and arbitrarily establish a set of qualifications for all existing ones. All new ones certainly should be, and must be, required to meet certain standards. I am also concerned about whether or not—and I suppose this really is not in the Act—there is any intention

of making these assessors, licensed or otherwise, abide by the new manuals that you have got.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am sure the hon. member realizes that this field of activity is one that requires time. I might tell you, for instance, that last night I was in North Bay and met with the representatives of the district of Nipissing municipalities with a view to instituting a district assessor system in that district. There is general interest in this, and I think that we are making some progress in that area.

Tomorrow, I hope to be in Sault Ste. Marie to meet with the representatives of the municipalities of the district of Algoma, and some time in the near future I think my staff and I are going to somewhere in northwestern Ontario to take up the same matter.

Insofar as instituting the manual as mandatory in municipalities, or districts, or counties, I think we have to attack that problem with a great deal of caution, and we have to be certain of exactly where we are going. We cannot just make a carte-blanche order that would cover the whole of the province, or even the whole of the county. But our manual is meeting with general acceptance. Our own staff people in the assessment branch have all been trained to train others in the use of the manual, and we are, I am quite confident, making progress as fast as one would wish. I think in the days ahead we will make even greater progress, and we have to sell it to certain people who are a little concerned. There is a certain amount of misunderstanding among the local politicians who think that if their assessment is conducted under a county assessment commissioner system or under a district assessor, that they lose local autonomy, while actually, if they look at The Assessment Act, they have no authority to tell the assessor what to do in the first place; but that opinion is expressed from time to time. The assessors, on the other hand, are sometimes afraid to talk to the local politicians—and with very great respect I mention that. However, I think we are making progress, and our objective certainly is to do everything possible to improve assessment practice and assessment generally in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I am amused that the Minister is finding these words "local autonomy" coming back to haunt him.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, they are not haunting me at all. I have lived with them for 35 years.

Mr. Singer: You fellows have ground forth this great idol of local autonomy, and frequently it does come back to haunt you. It occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, at this time when the Minister is going to embark on the system of licensing, which I think is a good one, that he perhaps has an excellent opportunity, which will not occur to him again, to lay down methods by which he and his department advisers think the assessment should be conducted. In other words, while you are licensing them, the licence and the manual can—and should, perhaps—go out together. But use this opportunity, starting on January 1, to begin to promote a uniform system of assessment.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I might say to the hon. member that I have been a salesman all my life, and in this very field I think that one has to do some selling; and I am using every facility at my disposal to reach the objectives we have in mind.

Sections 18 to 27, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 28:

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, in the unavoidable absence of my colleague from Yorkview (Mr. Young), I move that subsection 3 of section 28 of Bill No. 146 be amended by adding thereto the following:

18. The council of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto may pass any of the bylaws referred to in this section with respect to any class or classes of shops in the said municipality, and where such a bylaw is passed it shall supersede any bylaw respecting the same class or classes of shops passed by an area municipality.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the hon. members not support this amendment because, as you know, we have just now received the report of the Goldenberg commission which deals with this very matter of licensing, and other matters allied to it. There is, at the present time, no request from the Metro municipalities to provide this legislation; and, as far as I know, none of the Metro municipalities have early closing bylaws in effect at the present time.

I think this is a matter which should be left for a year, or left until we deal with the whole question of Metro in all of its aspects.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I hope we do not turn the Goldenberg report into an excuse for doing nothing even where action is clearly required and is quite possible. The hon. Minister is well aware, I think, of the

problems with regard to early closing bylaws in an area such as this. I discussed it in this House, and in standing committees of the House, on numerous occasions. Making it a municipal function really makes it meaningless to an important degree, because the official boundaries of municipalities in expanding urban areas no longer relate to the actual trading areas concerned.

This is a problem, as I said on second reading of this bill, in all the major urban areas of the province, but it is a particularly acute problem in the Metropolitan Toronto area. The city of Toronto for years had sensible, coherent, early closing bylaws, which were supported by the overwhelming majority of merchants in the various trades concerned and also, I think, by the public. I think the public is not anxious, or the majority of the public is not anxious, to exploit small merchants, and put them in a "dog-eat-dog" form of competition where they have to stay open for 15 or 16 hours a day. There was protection when the trading area here was embraced mainly within the boundaries of the city of Toronto; but, of course, as we know, the area expanded, and out in the suburbs anything goes.

This is most difficult for the merchants in the suburban areas themselves, and it also kicks back on the merchants in Toronto. They have early closing bylaws in some trades; but they face competition from discount houses, quasi-department stores and so on, which stay open almost all the time, largely on the basis of the lowest possible wages they can get away with. The merchant in the city of Toronto is put in an extremely difficult position, not to speak of the small man in the suburban area. The Goldenberg report, if implemented, might alleviate the problem by reducing the number of area municipalities but it still will not solve it.

I spoke earlier of a case at the corner of Bathurst and St. Clair, where a gasoline station is half in the city of Toronto and half in the township of York. After seven o'clock at night, when the city bylaw comes into effect, it closes down its pumps in the city of Toronto and keeps its pumps in the township of York open all night. That particular anomaly will be eliminated if the Goldenberg report is implemented in its present form, but there will be still other anomalies. It is quite possible that there may be an establishment, half in one of the new municipalities and half in the other which will carry on on that sort of basis.

However, I do not think we have to speak in terms of special cases; much better to speak in terms of the general case, and the

general case is that the small merchant is being ground down steadily. We hear so many noble comments about how we should encourage small business, but when the chips are down it is usually the big guy who is listened to, and I am getting fed up with it. It is only because of Towers, and a few people like that, that we do not have proper regulation of store hours in this city. It seems to me that opening one or at most two evenings per week, is quite sufficient to meet all the legitimate needs of the public; bylaws should be constructed which will prevent opening at any other time, and which will give the merchant an opportunity for some rest and recreation. In fact, I would think, if they are going to be open, say, two evenings a week, it would be desirable to have a compensating afternoon off, or something like that when all the stores will have to close. This will not hurt the public. It will help the merchant.

The problem the small merchant is up against now is that if somebody else stays open, then he has to stay open too, or he will lose business. The net result is that they all end up by staying open. They end up by all working, shall we say, six, eight, or ten more hours per week, but they do not get any more business than they got in the first place because the business is just spread over a longer period of time. They may very well lose money by virtue of the fact that their overhead is increased by the longer hours. But you will always get somebody who thinks he can get an advantage over the others by staying open when the others are closed. Of course, the advantage is temporary because the others are forced to open up if one opens up.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that, when he says there are no early closing bylaws in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, he is not entirely right. There is a certain truth in what he says, and I think we could amend his statement to say, "There are no effective early closing bylaws," because it is impossible to do this job effectively on the basis of the area municipality. The only effective way it can be done is through the Metro municipality. This amendment does not require the metropolitan municipality to do anything, it just empowers them to do it, subject to the general provisions of the Act. So if there is no demand for the Metro municipality to act under the amendment, no harm will be done. But I suspect that as soon as it is discovered that the Metro municipality has this power—if they should get it—then there will be moves on the part of merchants in various places to have Metro bylaws enacted. Then the regular provisions of the Act can

come into operation, and all the conditions that have to be met will be met, otherwise there will be no bylaw.

The hon. Minister is simply evading the issue. There certainly is no reason for delay until after the Goldenberg report. The amendment does not affect the basic reorganization of the area. It is merely an attempt to give meaning to section 379 (a) that now exists in The Municipal Act, with respect to Metro Toronto. That section is close to meaningless now. It is couched in terms of a totally antiquated type of municipal organization, and why should we not make it meaningful? If the section should be in the Act at all, then why should it not be meaningful in Metro Toronto? Why should not the power be given to a council that can act in such a way as to make it effective?

The hon. Minister's objections, I submit to the committee are completely specious, and I would ask some of the hon. private members on the Conservative side to express their views on this matter. I believe that some of them, being a little closer to the people perhaps than the hon. Minister, who is preoccupied with his duties down here, are well aware of the kind of problem I am talking about in this Metro Toronto area.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I cannot find myself in agreement with the remarks of the hon. member for Woodbine. If he is so anxious to draft early closing bylaws, I would suggest that he get himself elected to a municipal council and therein, in that position, he will be able to determine whether there should be Wednesday afternoons, or Saturday nights, or whatever it is.

But this is a very serious problem. It has been talked about for as long as I have been in local politics, and in provincial politics. The city of Toronto, and my friend the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) and my friend, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), over the years must have filled ten cabinets full of briefs arguing for and against early closing bylaws and how they should—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): And I bear scars, too.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is showing the scars that he has suffered from these various battles.

In 1959, Mr. Chairman, the Metropolitan Toronto council, at the urging of a number of merchants who wanted uniform closing bylaws, had a series of hearings, and long and many representations were made by a great

number of people. The city of Toronto had just completed the same thing and they turned over two or three of their filing cabinets full of information. But these hearings went on, and the metropolitan council, in their wisdom at that time, came to the conclusion that they did not want to ask the provincial government for the power to have uniform early closing bylaws. So that request never came forward. It was the decision of the council of that day, that they did not want to get into this.

Now I think the hon. Minister makes a very valid point. The Goldenberg report, when it is implemented—and I presume it is going to be implemented in some way—certainly recommends changes about licensing. That is going to have to be a consideration. There is no point now in attempting to do this, because there is a variety of interests. You cannot compare the small merchants, say, on the Danforth with the small merchants who are in a shopping centre in North York or in Scarborough. You cannot compare the shopping habits of the people who want to take the tour through a shopping centre on a Friday night or a Saturday afternoon, with the shopping habits of the people who might want to shop down at Bay and Richmond on Wednesday afternoon.

There is a very substantial argument, insofar as early closing bylaws are concerned, about doing it by regions. I do not think there is any great magic in drawing the Metro line, either for administrative purposes, certainly for early closing purposes, at Steeles Avenue, because as anyone who is familiar with the area knows, there are several shopping centres located just immediately north of Steeles Avenue. I would suspect one of their considerations in so locating is that they will beat any type of regulation.

North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke, the councils sitting in those municipalities, have, over the years, deliberately refrained from passing early closing bylaws. The city of Toronto council has had different concepts, and I would think that it would be only after very careful consideration, that the system of local determination should be changed. If you are going to change it at all, I do not think you are making any sense by giving it to Metro, when north of Steeles and east towards the Ontario county boundary on one side and the Peel county boundary on the other side, you are going to get people who will deliberately locate there to beat it.

Let me give just one simple illustration, Mr. Chairman, about how easy it is to beat it when you tie it into artificial lines. There

is a gas station in Hogg's Hollow, just north of the city limits on Yonge Street. It has had the greatest gallonage of any gas station in the whole of the metropolitan area for the last great number of years, merely because it was beyond the city of Toronto boundaries and in the North York area. It was not bound by early closing bylaws. It has never once entered into a gas war, and it did, certainly in my time there, and I think still today, pumps more gas than any other station in the whole area.

Now if it can do that there, certainly north of Steeles it can do exactly the same thing. I would have strong criticism about tying North York—or early closing bylaws—into the artificial boundaries of Steeles Avenue. If it is going to be done, then you have to do it regionally, to make any sense.

So for those reasons I cannot support, nor can my colleagues support, the amendment of the hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Bryden: It is nice to see what side the Liberals are on. I thought at one time that they were in favour of trying to get some rationality in this matter. We have had some battles in the past, with particular reference to gasoline stations. In standing committees they took a very strong line, and I always thought they were in favour of rationality. Now the hon. member for Downsview makes a characteristic jibe, one that is characteristic of him, that if I want to draft municipal bylaws, I should get into municipal politics. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that that, of course, is completely irrelevant. The amendment does not draft any municipal bylaws, it merely would give a certain power to the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. The hon. member for Downsview is quite right when he says that the sensible way to deal with this whole problem is on a regional basis. I would think that the province should take responsibility itself and deal with it, probably through The Department of Labour. The only trouble is that a few years ago, the government decided in the exact opposite direction. The whole matter had been under the jurisdiction of The Department of Labour and was moved over to the jurisdiction of The Department of Municipal Affairs. Admittedly, there was no significant change made in the law, but the point is that the whole concept of regional regulations was thrown out at that time. However, Mr. Chairman, it is possible to achieve a certain degree of regional regulation, at least in this Toronto area. There is always going to be a problem of boundaries. If the boundary is not Steeles, you may get a little north

of Steeles, but there will still be somebody beyond that boundary. The point is that the present boundaries of the Metro municipality embrace most of the trading area, and in the face of a firm government determination that it will not deal with this on a regional basis, I would suggest that it should at least be dealt with sensibly, or we should give the power for it to be dealt with sensibly within this area.

I am well aware that the council of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto decided it would be very happy to get out from under the whole problem back in 1959. That is not exactly what you would call a courageous approach to a problem, but that is the attitude they took. They will still be able to get out from under, even if this amendment passes, but they will not be able to get out from under it on the claim that they have no power. They are, at least, going to have to face the question.

I think the service station operators may be in a position to go to them again and make them face up to the question and determine it, not on the basis of a lack of power to act, but on the basis of a policy decision. If they decide in their wisdom they are not going to do anything about it, that is up to them, and they can account to their own electorate when the time comes. I just cannot understand this Liberal approach that perhaps something should be done about the problem, but not now. This is an opportunity to do something about it. It would help to rationalize the problem in the Metro area, failing any possibility of getting a decision by the government to deal with it on a regional basis throughout the province.

One last point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that as far as the merchants in the shopping centres are concerned, many of them are prisoners of the shopping centres. Most shopping centres have one or two big stores; those big stores want to stay open and the small merchants are compelled to do the same. They have no option, the shopping centres dictate the hours when they must stay open. There are people, hon. members of this House, who unfortunately are not present right now, who can tell you about that because they are personally involved in the situation and they resent it very much. A change in the law such as we have proposed would at least create the possibility of remedying that sort of situation.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. Renwick that section 3 of section 28 of Bill No. 146, be amended by adding thereto the following:

The council of the municipality of Metro-

politan Toronto may pass any of the bylaws referred to in this section with respect to any class or classes of shops in the said municipality, and where such a bylaw is passed it shall supersede any bylaw respecting the same class or classes of shops, passed by the council of an area municipality.

All those in favour please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

All those opposed, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 5, the "nays" 51.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 28 agreed to.

On section 29:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I have a slight correction in section 29, page 16, 379 (e) (1). I move that subsection 1 of section 379 (e) be amended by inserting after the word "imposed" in the tenth line, "upon the owners of such building." This is to make it clear that these special charges are to be imposed upon the owners of the buildings that impose a heavy load on the sewer or water systems.

Motion agreed to.

Section 29, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 30 to 39, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 146 reported.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 164, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

On section 1:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, with reference to section 1 of the bill, I move that paragraph 9 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

9. Subject to section 43, the property belonging to any county or municipality or vested in or controlled by any public commission, municipal parking authority or local board, as defined by The Department of Municipal Affairs Act, except property of a harbour commission used for the parking of vehicles for which a fee is

charged, wherever situate and whether occupied for the purposes thereof or unoccupied but not when occupied by a tenant or a lessee.

I gave an explanation of that on second reading.

Mr. Singer: What have you done about the school board?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I have taken it out; I have left only the property of a harbour commission used for the parking of vehicles for which a fee is charged.

Mr. Singer: Okay.

Motion agreed to.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: In section 2, Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection 1 of section 21 be amended by inserting after "guidance of assessors" which is at the end of the third line, the words "in valuating lands"—three words.

Of course, that is what assessors do. If I were an assessor I would consider that that was exactly my responsibility. I might tell you that it was the law branch that brought this matter to my attention in order that we could be very specific.

Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

Sections 6 to 8, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 9:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, I move that section 9 be amended by adding the following as subsection 2:

Subsection 2. Subsections 9, 10, 13 and 14 of the said section 131 are repealed.

These sections have reference to the matter in 9 (a).

Mr. Singer: What is the effect of taking them out?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Wait until I quote from the Act.

This section deals with cancellations, reductions and refunds of taxes. We are deleting all that authority in the Act. Section 9 dealt with limitations and restrictions. The period of vacancy had to be more than four months in any period, and so on. Section 10 was limitations and restrictions re vacancies insofar as pipelines were concerned, section 13 dealt with the fact that an application for a rebate of taxes was not applicable to unimproved lands and real estate that had a

fixed assessment, and section 14 of the said Act was to the effect that a rebate did not apply in respect of taxes levied for local improvement.

Section 9, as amended, agreed to.

Section 10 and 11 agreed to.

Bill No. 164 reported.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT, 1961-1962

House in committee on Bill No. 165, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Hon. Mr. Spooner: There is an amendment there, Mr. Chairman. I move that section 3 be amended by inserting, after the word "Act," in the first line, "except section 1," and by adding thereto the following subsection:

2. Section 1 comes into force on January 1, 1966.

Section 3, as amended, agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill No. 165 reported.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the following:

That,

where an emergency exists in Ontario or any part thereof the president of the executive council, or a member of the executive council designated by him, may require any municipality in Ontario to provide such assistance as is deemed necessary to the emergency area or any part thereof and may authorize the payment of the cost of such assistance out of the consolidated revenue fund,

as provided by Bill No. 166, An Act to amend The Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963.

Resolution concurred in.

THE EMERGENCY MEASURES ACT, 1962-1963

House in committee on Bill No. 166, An Act to amend The Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 166 reported.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendments.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a certain resolution, and certain bills without amendment and certain bills with amendment.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 76th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE (continued)

On vote 1705:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, before we get into this vote there was a little exchange, or excitable altercation, here last night to which I should like to make reference.

We on this side of the House were discussing the numbers of working women in the province, and the reasons for said women working, and the requirements for day nurseries. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) rose to correct the use of a term that I had put forth: of the "vast majority" of working women having to work for economic reasons.

I admit that I was speaking from memory and he was rather decisive in his correction. I want to say to him, and to the House, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is rather important, that I went back last night to the literature which exists. I now have before me the study, in eight Canadian cities, on married women working for pay; the analysis of the available material in "The Family in Canada" by Frederick Elkin; "Women Workers in a Changing World," the UNESCO study; plus the federal material which is available.

Without quoting directly from them, I want to inform this House that on one thing are they agreed; anywhere from 75 per cent to 80 per cent of married women working do so for economic necessity and for economic objectives.

If 75 per cent to 80 per cent is to be considered a misinterpretation of the phrase "vast majority," then I will again withdraw the phrase. But I say to this House that that is precisely the fact that is on record; if there

is any scepticism, let me refer to Elkin's study, "The Family in Canada," and its chapter on "Working Women." He says:

From the point of view of the women themselves, economic motives are of paramount importance in their decision to take a job.

And a further quote:

The Tremblay and Fortin study in Quebec arrived at the same conclusion. In three out of four cases in which wives work, she is forced to do so because the family suffers a serious deficit in the general budget.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would like to point out that, on a point of order, the statement is usually brief. I believe that this is developing into another speech.

Mr. S. Lewis: You are right. I will not proceed further. I simply think, in view of the animation last night, that some of this should be put on the record.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I do not think there was any animation in relation to the point I raised. My observation came from the use of the words "vast majority," and what I took as an inference and an implication that practically all working women worked because of economic need. I do not want to get into a play on words; the hon. member this morning has used the words "economic objectives," even though that phrase opens up a vast area as to whether it is actual need or not. However, we are not going to get into that but, in support of the reason why I took the position I did last evening, it was because as recently as within the last three weeks I have personally discussed this matter with respect to the position of women in the work force on the North American continent with the head of the women's bureau of The US Department of Labour. And the trend and general impression of the remarks I made were those which I had gained from the director of that bureau in the last two to three weeks.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): On vote 1705, sir, I think at the end of the evening, in discussing what the hon. Minister's (Mr. Cecile's) field staff did, he said he preferred to talk about this under finance and administrative branch. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that it might be possible that I misunderstood him. He was saying that there could be a case load of 350 to 400 a year. He reported that

the job which they had, in some cases, would be one interview a year and in other cases it would be two. But surely the hon. Minister must have his staff doing more than this. I am referring to an article that was in the *Globe and Mail* on February 16, 1965, and it said this:

Welfare Minister Louis Cecile's continuing ignorance of the work of his department, is a wondrous thing. Apparently he told the legislative committee on health, education and welfare that very few people on welfare lists were employable. Apparently he had not seen the report prepared in the office of his Deputy Minister, Mr. James Band, and published last April, of a demonstrative project concerning 100 long-term welfare families.

The gist of the report was that after counselling, 42 per cent of the families left the welfare rolls, 21 per cent because they found employment. That is not very few. Evidently Mr. Cecile still believes that most persons on welfare are not good for anything else.

The point I am making is that when we are asking you what your field staff does, you are still coming back to the same old record, that all they do is just go out and make one visit or, in some cases, two visits. Surely the emphasis that you should be making, particularly in view of this project, is one of counselling to help people stand on their feet. I would ask if the hon. Minister would re-clarify that position for us because, frankly, I found it shocking if that is all that he thinks his staff is doing. I am sure the hon. Minister did not mean to give that impression.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I am sure I did not mean to give the impression that my hon. friend has, nor that that the newspaper got. The newspaper reporter, I am sure, did not get the meaning either. But that does not bother me at all. They can think of me what they like.

I might say that the caseload for a person is 400 per year. There might be 100 visits a month, it might be 120 a month, but the statutory visits for all categorical old age assistance and that sort of thing, is at least once a year. Many visits are made more than that. They might make 50 visits in a week for that matter if they were able to do that. They might have seen something there in that particular home which they would like to review again. But the caseload, as such, is about 400 a year. I do not know if I have made myself any clearer.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from the hon. Minister, what is the object of this interview that the case worker will have?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: To clarify myself, this is the information I get. A person makes an application for assistance under the categorical programmes, disabled, blind or old age assistance. The first visit is to investigate the case, to find out, to make the report. That is the statutory visit, the first visit. Then he might go back and visit the same case many times in a week or a month, but 400 of these cases might come up, and that is his load. That is what I mean.

Now, in respect to the mothers' allowances, two visits are necessary per year, one every six months because the cancellations are made on that basis. As far as old age assistance is concerned, it has to be done at least once a year.

But for the new cases, if I may use that expression, the case load might be for many visits.

There is the first visit—the statutory visit—then it is done yearly, but it does not mean to say that he might not visit that very same case many times during the year.

Mr. Thompson: I just want—

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would suggest that this is properly dealt with in the field services branch, which was passed last night.

Mr. Thompson: I would say, Mr. Chairman, with deep respect to you, that the hon. Minister said that he wanted us to discuss this under this particular item rather than under field services.

Mr. Chairman: Well, then it is quite all right.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I thought, Mr. Chairman, it was discussed last night, but I have no objection to discussing this with my hon. friend again. I am trying to make myself clear to him.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I may say that I am really trying to clarify what I think would be a very bad impression made by the hon. Minister. Last night he said that the purpose of his field staff was to report and investigate. I would hope that it would also be to rehabilitate and to get people on their feet, but I think the very omission of that shows a lack of philosophy, and that is why I am glad that you say "Oh, yes." I think I would put it at the head of the purpose of your field staff, to

rehabilitate, report and investigate. That is the kind of philosophy I would like to see.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think, Mr. Chairman, that was expressed in my opening remarks. However, we were discussing, as I thought last night, the case load. For example, in a certain district there might be 400 cases that can arise. Counsellors visit and counsel on rehabilitation. I am sure this is the decision of the supervisor first and then the field worker himself. I quite agree that perhaps that should head the list—rehabilitation.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, last night the hon. Minister was asked how many of his staff had a bachelor of social work and he gave us some figures. Is it the desire of the hon. Minister that as many as possible of his staff should have such social work training, and that he feels there is a lack of such training?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I think I would be remiss if I said no to this question. I think we do. But at the same time I must confess that I think the people who do not have these degrees, but who have training in the field and deal with people generally, do not require these degrees as much as those who are supervisors, who are instructors and who guide these field workers. It would be an absolute impossibility to get everyone with a degree. My department wants to take full advantage of what we have to offer, and not to take away some of the experts from the other fields of welfare services such as children's aid. But our aim is to get as many people with degrees as we possibly can.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the hon. Minister, he would be remiss if he were not trying to get properly trained people. I suggest he is remiss. I want to quote from an article by Scott Young, which was in the *Globe and Mail* of March 23, 1965.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask, is this still on vote 1704?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, vote 1704.

Mr. Chairman: This was passed last night. We have allowed quite a lot of latitude, and I must rule any further discussion on 1704 out of order. We are dealing with vote 1705 and this matter should have been dealt with under 1704.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask you, Mr. Chairman, how do you know what I am going to bring forward in this article by Scott Young, before you rule?

Mr. Chairman: I asked you if it dealt with vote 1704 and you said it did, so that is sufficient. Vote 1704 was passed, and I announced we were dealing with vote 1705. We have allowed some latitude on 1704, but we feel that that has gone far enough as vote 1704 was passed last night.

Mr. Thompson: I will deal with 1705 then, under administration. And I suggest that under administration you need administrators. And if you are going to have to have administrators, you need to have trained people, I think this is very pertinent. And, therefore, I come back to Scott Young and he said, and I quote:

Here we are, back with administration, and who actually would function, who would be the people who would make the administration.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, it is a logical and incisive man who agrees with me on this point:

Here we come right down to the good old blue nose Ontario.

So says Scott Young.

The hon. Minister has just said that he would be remiss if he was not trying to encourage more qualified social workers. Waterloo Lutheran University wants to establish a school of social work, in order to get administrators, so they would be able to work under the financing of this particular section. But because this university has a specific religious faith, it does not qualify under the policy limiting Ontario educational grants to non-denominational schools. Already there is one exception to this rule.

St. Patrick's in Ottawa. This Roman Catholic college receives provincial financial aid for its school of social work, but gets it from the public welfare department rather than the education department.

Now I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, in view of the fact that he said he feels he would be remiss if he did not have qualified administrators, why he is not giving a grant to Waterloo University, in order that it can have a school of social work. When he, I know, agrees with me, that there is a great dearth of qualified social workers, why he is not giving a grant to Waterloo Lutheran University, when he gives it to the University of Ottawa?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): The trouble is, when they graduate, they become politicians.

Mr. Thompson: And very few; there should be more. There is a great need for more.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In politics?

Mr. Thompson: I asked that question of the hon. Minister, sir.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am sympathetic with the views of the hon. leader of the Opposition in this matter, as I stated last night.

I am sympathetic with your views in this matter, that a school should be opened, but as you know, there was a great demand at the time from the Ottawa university in that particular respect. How it came about, personally I do not know, nor how I can explain it, but it did come about at any rate.

As to the Lutheran university, I might confess to you that I have tried to do this personally, but apparently the law would not allow it. How it did in the first instance, I do not know. I cannot explain this.

Mr. Thompson: Is it illegal?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The regulations as set out in The Department of Education Act, I believe, or whatever Act there is in The Department of Education dealing with these matters, do not allow it, but for some reason or another, it was passed through this department for purposes which I have not available to me now. It was seven or eight years ago, I believe, that it was brought about and it was payment through my department. Because it was there, I was able to maintain it. If I could find a way to do the same thing for the Lutheran people, I would have no objection to it, I can assure you, because we need these schools, and that is about as much as I can tell you.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Minister, I appreciate this very much. We have heard that if a way can be found for you to do it, that you will do it. I wish that the session was a bit longer, because I would be in touch with the Lutheran people. I look forward to presenting to you a way by which you can do it, I appreciate that we will have your whole-hearted support and I know that when we have that, things get done. Thank you.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I find this a trifle amusing. I suspect the hon. leader of the Opposition does too, because he will remember at the back of his mind the forthrightly negative stand taken by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) when this precise matter was raised.

I would like to offer an observation on this business of a school of social work, Mr. Chairman, because I think we perhaps discuss

it in a somewhat flippant fashion. I am not at all persuaded, frankly, that Waterloo Lutheran is precisely the place for the next school of social work in the province of Ontario. I suspect there are a great many reasons other than the so-called religious one that motivated the response of the hon. Minister of Education in the earlier debate.

I suspect it because when you open up a school of social work, you need a minimum of five full professors, you need in the first year a minimum of 25 to 50 students, and you need a minimum of \$250,000 self-sustaining, which a private institution might not carry. Graduate schools of social work require around them a very heavy network of other graduate schools in order to sustain them, and if I understand it properly, Waterloo Lutheran probably does not have that network of graduate departments. Above all, you need a system of agencies in the community, to which students can be referred for field work, and the complex in that particular geographic urban area may not permit it.

I have used "may" all the way through, because I am not certain. But I suspect that some of those reasons operated in the back of the mind of the hon. Minister of University Affairs, or Education, whichever cap he was wearing. I do not think we should allow it to become merely a diversion because of the so-called religious factor. St. Pat's university obviously could sustain these things, and met all these various arguments.

Surely the way in which we establish the next school of social work in the province of Ontario is for the advisory committee of university presidents to sit down with the requisite departmental people and decide where that school should go. Then we go to the university which is number one on the priority list, and say, "Should it be here? Would you have it here?" And if not, then we go to another.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this business of social work education and training at the upper level is obviously the crux not only of this department, but of all the others in this general field. I have some observations I would like to make on the field, but I remember the hon. Minister last night saying that he had a statement on this vote and I suspect that it would be more appropriate if he made his statement, than if I jumped in, and I wonder whether he would consider doing so.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I was hoping to do that.

Over the past year, the in-service staff

training and development programme for departmental personnel has gone forward and should continue to progress in the year ahead. There are two types of in-service training: (a) The formal six-week training course of orientation and instruction and (b) on-the-job training.

The formal six-week course under the guidance of an experienced training supervisor consists of four weeks of classroom instruction plus two weeks of closely supervised field calls. The classroom work involves a study of how the various public agencies engage in the provision of welfare services, the meaning of departmental policy and detailed knowledge of the legislation and forms pertinent to the administrative field. An examination of private agency roles is undertaken and instruction is given in interviewing techniques, development psychology and human behaviour.

The two weeks of field work involve cases selected from the case load of the Toronto district workers. Actual cases are assigned. The trainee is briefed and calls are made. The results are then analyzed and critized by the training supervisor. Graduates from the course are returned to the field to work under decreasing supervision, as indicated. They may work in various capacities — welfare field workers, welfare allowance officers, regional administrators and rehabilitation counsellors.

During the past year, 54 staff members successfully completed this training course. Forty-four are now working as welfare field workers, five as rehabilitation counsellors, two as welfare allowance officers, one as a regional administrator, one as a departmental nutritionist and one as a departmental auditor. A minimum of 43 welfare field workers and 15 rehabilitation counsellors are expected to be trained on this course during the 1965-66 fiscal year, plus a number of staff who will serve in other capacities.

On-the-job training continues to be emphasized and developed. This takes the form of intensive supervision and individual instruction. For example, during the past year, particular attention was paid to this type of training for seven welfare allowance officers, five desertion unit officers, five child welfare supervisors, three administrative assistants and nine rehabilitation counsellors. The rehabilitation training supervisor, in addition to giving nine counsellors on-the-job training, has been responsible for providing the necessary professional supervision to six students, placed for field training with the rehabilitation services branch of the University of Toronto school of social work.

Twenty of the 38 counsellors on the staff of the rehabilitation services branch have full professional qualifications, that is post-graduate degrees in social work or psychology or an equivalent education from a British or European professional social work training institution; 12 counsellors have a BA degree, while six have grade 13 or partial university education. Because it is the policy of the department to raise the qualifications of these counsellors to professional level, all undergo a six-month in-service training programme, under the direction of a specialist in social work education. At a later stage this is followed by educational leave on full salary, to enable these counsellors in training to attend a school of social work.

In addition to the above, of course, the branch also offers field work instruction to six students from the University of Toronto school of social work, to provide opportunity for students to obtain qualification as rehabilitation counsellors. Two students from the welfare services course at the Ryerson polytechnical institute have been similarly trained in the general welfare assistance branch and the field services branch. An increasing number of staff members have been encouraged by the department to avail themselves of various opportunities for individual development and advancement through extension courses at the university and at the Ryerson polytechnical institute. Some one dozen persons are presently involved in this type of evening or correspondence training. They are variously proceeding towards completion, at McMaster University, of the certificate course in social welfare, the Ryerson certificate course in public administration, and the BA degree for entrance to a school for social work. Upon the successful completion of each year of study, it is anticipated that there will now be full reimbursement for the cost sustained by these employees.

The department continues to participate in the training of municipal welfare officers and children's aid society staffs. During the past year, the training supervisor gave a municipal welfare services course to a number of local welfare officers at the Lakehead. The officers attending this course showed noteworthy enthusiasm for the instruction. There is no question but that they have carried back, to their several municipalities, increased knowledge and determination to improve their respective local administrations.

Some of the instructional staff is drawn from our child welfare branch for the training courses under the auspices of the association of children's aid societies. They are

senior personnel from this branch and they represent the various branch units. A staff member assigned to each one aspect of the course may also sit as a student in other aspects of the course, to take formal lectures in an area of child welfare which may be less familiar to him.

It is anticipated, further, that a number of homemaker training courses will be given by department personnel in various municipalities and homemakers agencies. This will help to alleviate the shortage of trained homemakers and encourage the development of this service, particularly in the rural municipalities where it is now lacking. At the end of the fiscal year, the province will recover 50 per cent of the cost of these courses from the Dominion government.

The department has assigned a rehabilitation training supervisor, and a director of field services, to specific lecturing duties at the University of Toronto school of social work, and the welfare services courses at the Ryerson polytechnical institute. Valuable student contact is thus obtained and, for students so inquiring, they have been able to describe the various employment opportunities available in the department.

The Minister's advisory council for public welfare training was established in February 1961 under the chairmanship of Professor Charles E. Hendry, director of Toronto University school of social work. The other members who represent public and private sectors of the community include Mr. James Band, the Reverend Swithin Bowers, Mr. Stuart Legg, Miss Robena Morris, and Miss Bessie Touzel.

There are three major purposes: First, to promote ways and means of continuing the recruiting of suitable persons for training and placement in the public welfare services, Toronto, Ontario; second, to consider and recommend measures for the advanced training of personnel for service in the public welfare field in Ontario; and third, to study and recommend measures to encourage the further development of the present programmes and facilities for the education and training of social workers, with specific reference to the public welfare services of Ontario.

Among the accomplishments of the council are four noteworthy achievements:

1. Under the guidance of the council, representations were made to the federal authorities to stimulate the formation and realization of the present national welfare training grant policy. The Ontario representations were among those which were the

most forthright and they put their case forth with great vigour and conviction.

2. Primarily as a result of the well-documented Ontario representations, the welfare training nursery programme has been greatly extended to facilitate the professional and vocational education of social workers at the postgraduate and technician levels. The number of bursaries for students at schools of social work has been increased, from some half dozen in 1961 to 27 in 1963, and to 34 in 1964. Bursary assistance for students on the welfare services course at Ryerson polytechnical institute is encouraging in making possible this type of necessary training at the technician level.

3. The concept of formal training at the technician level was born out of the deliberations of the council in this regard. This concept has now come to fruition, with the establishment of the two-year welfare services training programme at Ryerson. The concern and interest on the part of my colleague, the hon. Minister of University Affairs, helped immeasurably in the realization of this programme. The Ryerson staff have also lent the most genuine support to the development of this much needed training facility.

4. Under the guidance of the council, the department has published a booklet entitled, *Social Work, A Rewarding Career*. This has been widely distributed, particularly to the university students across the province in the liberal arts graduating years.

The upsurge of interest in professional social work shown by such university students is in part related to the intensive distribution of this well-written document. At the present time, the schools of social work are receiving many more student applications than can be approved for admission, and suitable candidates are having to postpone their graduation education in this field. The schools of social work have apparently been unable to develop a suitable number of field placements, or training locations, and this has had some control of the student intake. Now the council is concentrating on the development of a suitable training course for staff employed in children's institutions, and it is anticipated that this type of training will be undertaken at a very early date.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I have a variety of questions. The first is that I have a table of the numbers of full-time students in the masters programme in Ottawa and Toronto, by the field of practice in which they were taking their field instruction. This

is dated November 1, 1963. It is rather interesting, and a little disturbing, and I do not quite understand it. There are a large number in child welfare—about 40. There are a large number in family agencies—56 in total. And there are large numbers in the field of psychiatric care—33. But not a single student from either Ottawa or Toronto is in the field of public assistance; not one, doing their field training. I am wondering now whether there is any way of providing an inducement, or some stimulus, to bring some of these social work people into the field of public assistance?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: To what year was my hon. friend referring?

Mr. S. Lewis: This is November 1, 1963.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: In 1964 we had one in it, I understand.

Mr. S. Lewis: You had a student?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Yes.

Mr. S. Lewis: How is it that there is such a disproportionate number, Mr. Minister? You have anywhere from 20 to 50 in other fields—even in the area of correction there are eight doing their field work—and yet in public assistance, in the public sector of the welfare field, not a single student was doing field work at that time. You say there is one now. I would have thought that this is going to make life rather difficult for the public side.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that this was started in 1964, and we now have six students. I presume that the study of the council will also try to carry on further and raise that interest which my hon. friend describes.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister: In order to attract people—I am thinking of graduates, into the field—have you got a promotional service? I know other provinces where they have, for example, a film showing the actual work a social worker would do in public welfare. I can think of one province where they show the mode of travel out in rural areas, and show the type of cases he has. It is a very attractive film, which goes to high schools and other areas. I wondered what kind of promotion the hon. Minister has.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised that we have no such thing as a film showing here. I am also advised that this booklet, about

which I spoke a moment ago, has really quite an impact and has proven very successful. Perhaps my hon. friend's idea is a good one and I will have a look at that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what does the hon. Minister think of the possibility of undergraduate programmes in the province of Ontario in fields of social welfare and social work? Has his department, in conjunction with the hon. Minister of Education, given any thought to this?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Actually, Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend will appreciate that this is really a matter for university officials to some extent. I can assure him that, as we have in other programmes now, our officials are looking at this. As for the policy being defined at the present time, as I stated before, we will leave it to the universities themselves. I cannot say that anything has jelled as yet between the officials, but this matter is being looked into to see if the encouragement and the push cannot be promoted to a larger extent than it is now.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I had wondered—and I apologize for having to leave because of a telephone call, so you may have already stated this and, if so, I shall read it in *Hansard*—but is there a co-ordination with the various departments in which social workers would be needed? I am thinking of field placement in mental institutions and prisons and workmen's rehabilitation. Do you see where, during the summer months, a graduate who has been studying at the university—if three or four Ministers connected in this area were to agree—could receive placement in any one of these areas, mental hospitals and so on, as I have stated? Have you got a co-ordinated approach on this?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is under study now by the civil service commission, which really has the jurisdiction in these matters, but I say that all social workers receive possibly the same training basically. It is to direct them into certain fields of endeavour. The study is being directed so as to determine what should be added to that particular course, but right now this is being undertaken by the civil service commission in respect of my department and other government departments involved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I might advise the hon. leader of the Opposition that we already have students of social work working in our department for the summer.

Mr. Thompson: Is it the civil service commission that would do this or would it be the four Ministers? I appreciate the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions telling me that he has students.

One of the reasons that I suspect people are not going into the field of public welfare is because they do not want to be narrowed down to this one area immediately. Yet when you think of the challenges within any government department for young people who are taking social work, if there were some flexibility—the training, for example, that they would get in working with people in The Department of Reform Institutions—I am sure it would be very useful for them in some other areas. The training they might get in a mental hospital would be very useful in moving out into the field, and I would hope that apart from the civil service commission studying this question, the Minister responsible for the departments might co-ordinate it and co-operate on it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what prospects are there for the placement of a student in the Ryerson course as at present constituted? Which agencies have refused to accept these students? Has a specific area in the welfare worker's spectrum been carved out for them? Is there a place for them, for instance, in the civil service commission range, and are there areas in the various departments where they can be effectively allotted? There was, if I may remind the House, not so long ago in the press an assertion on the part of the man who headed the Ryerson course—I believe it is Russell Jolliffe—that he was meeting with, first, some resistance from the professional social workers, and second, some resistance from obvious placement agencies. Since the government was part and parcel of the formation of the Ryerson course, I am curious to know what is happening.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: As you know, we are now in the first year, and the students still have another year to go in this particular course. That relates to our department, very much so. At the same time this course will also provide services for the municipalities

and all other services like the children's aid societies and so on, and it is expected to be known as social work technicians three. The course is not over until next June, I think. It is expected to produce social work technicians 3.

As far as I know right now, no agencies have refused to accept a Ryerson student. Private industry has readily taken them for placement. I can assure you that as far as the department is concerned, they need not be afraid, any one of them, that we will not grant them a placement in any of the other areas. We will be able to use them.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am tempted to ask you what technique a "social work technician 3" uses. Why this term "technician"? Perhaps you could tell me a little bit about the difference between social work technician one and social work technician three, and the salary range.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Would that be the last question I would be asked by the hon. member?

Mr. S. Lewis: No!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with these estimates, third readings and the Budget debate. This is the order of business, for however long it may take.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 21, 1965

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, June 21, 1965

Statement re members' northern tour, Mr. Roberts	4422
Statement re implementation of report, council on labour safety education, Mr. Rowntree	4423
Statement re use of Rule 56, Mr. Speaker	4423
Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, continued	4424
Recess, 6 o'clock	4461

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1965

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests: In the Speaker's gallery, the Crediton women's institute, Huron riding; in the east gallery, students from Laurie Smith public school, Burlington, and in the west gallery, students from Pine River public school, Ripley.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to direct three related questions to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree):

1. When will a fair wage schedule or schedules become effective for highway construction undertaken by The Department of Highways?

2. Will the schedule or schedules regulate hours of work and, if so, in what way?

3. What are the principal categories of labour for which fair wages will be set?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, my department is actively engaged at the present time in the establishment of fair wage schedules covering all recognized trades and classifications in highway construction and providing for maximum hours of work to go into effect at the earliest date possible. It is also planning and establishing the organization necessary to operate and enforce a proper road-building fair wages system.

I should also inform the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, although he obviously may already know, that as recently as last Wednesday my officials spent several hours with representatives of the provincial council of carpenters in a detailed discussion of this matter, includ-

ing the subject of hours and categories of labour.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts).

What position does the government take with regard to plans of the University of Toronto, acting under legislation passed by this Legislature, to expropriate land on which houses are standing on the Streetsville road when vacant land is available in the same vicinity that would be suitable for the purpose the university has in mind?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been raised by others whose interests may be drawn into this as a result of the action apparently contemplated by the University of Toronto authorities.

I would point out that the university is an autonomous organization and within the broad framework of our expropriation laws, has had powers of expropriation for many, many years. The government at present is making the necessary contacts and investigations so as to inform itself as to the facts of this situation.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), but as he is not in his place, I would be agreeable if it could stand over until tomorrow.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to ask a question concerning the apparition I see across the floor from me. I wonder if it is because the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests wants to remain faceless and nameless?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, in a moment or two I will answer the question.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Minister

of Health, I have been asked to draw attention to the epilepsy information centre for Metropolitan Toronto, the first of its kind in Ontario. It is a protégé of the Ontario epilepsy association.

Its success has stimulated plans for opening similar centres in other parts of Ontario. Present activity toward the establishment of similar centres is under way in Hamilton, Ottawa, Peterborough, London, Windsor, Owen Sound, North Bay, Sault Ste. Marie, Port Arthur, Brockville and other cities.

The kit on hon. members' desks describes the aims of an epilepsy information centre—understanding through education dedicated to removing the fear and prejudice which surrounds this much-misunderstood affliction.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your courtesies in allowing me to make a short statement before the orders of the day in connection with the now rapidly approaching hon. members' trip to northwestern Ontario and the coastal waters of the province.

A letter is on the desk today of those hon. members who have indicated their intention of taking this trip. To make sure that those who are not in their seats will receive a copy, we are taking the precaution of sending duplicates to the homes of all these hon. members.

I am glad to say that we are now in the final stages of preparation of this trip and if we are blest with good weather conditions, I expect it will be a memorable one for those who take it. The vastness of this province in its far northern regions cannot be comprehended by reading and this will be an opportunity of seeing this hinterland of Ontario. A copy of our proposed itinerary accompanies this statement, and for the record, it contemplates daily travel for seven days, each day over distances greater than that from Windsor to Ottawa, which roughly is the width of southern Ontario.

We will pass over parts of the old fur traders' routes, including the Dawson trail, to reach the southern part of the great northwest, Fort Frances, in time for the opening by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) of the road there, which will be a memorable occasion in the riding of Rainy River.

The following day will see the commencement of the deep penetration of the north, taking us into "the lake country" of the old maps, and the area inhabited by the Round Lake Ojibwa, thence northwestward across "the muskeg country," from the old maps,

through which such great rivers of northern Ontario as the Severn, Winisk, Attawapiskat and Albany flow from sources in the lake country to either Hudson Bay or James Bay.

Some wit in the department has recorded in the proposed itinerary, at the appropriate place, "During the remainder of the trip our time will be spent inspecting spruce, moose, goose and papoose."

If we are fortunate, we may get a glimpse of some white whales in Hudson Bay, although we may be too early for the annual cruise of these half-ton to three-quarter-ton mammals of the ocean. I am still hopeful that some summer I will have the opportunity of joining in an Eskimo hunt of them which I have observed but never yet participated in. I can assure hon. members it is quite a thrilling sport.

As we fly over a portion of Hudson Bay we will be able to recall the 16th century episodes of Froisher; of the 17th century activities in those waters of the Hudson's Bay Company, some of whose factors we will be visiting; the voyage of Henry Hudson in 1610 from the Thames to Hudson Bay—named after him—and the lower bay, now James Bay.

When we reach Fort Albany we will recall that towards the end of the 17th century and in the early 18th century, it alone continued to be occupied by the English when D'Iberville and his French force occupied a good deal of bay territory.

Our schedule calls for us to arrive at Port Severn and the mid-Canada line at Winisk on Thursday, July 1, Dominion Day, where we will see the new Canadian flag and the new Ontario flag flying at those faraway posts, the two most northerly settlements in Ontario.

While I expect that most of this trip will be under pleasant summer conditions, there may be one or two periods when the wind will be blowing from the Arctic, and I strongly recommend one change of good warm clothing.

All participants in the trip will be issued with head nets from army surplus supply which has been made available, and to which, Mr. Speaker, your attention was drawn a moment ago when I was trying to model it for a moment, by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Appropriate lotion will also be available as required—I am referring now to skin lotion. Last week I was in the north for a few days and I can say authoritatively that it was wise to take these precautions, but I anticipate that we will not be subject to too much inconvenience in this connection.

Steps have been taken to see that reason-

able insurance coverage is carried for all while travelling on aircraft of The Department of Lands and Forests. The programme, which will commence with an extraordinary demonstration of mechanized logging at the Lakehead, will be varied throughout the trip and will reflect many local activities.

We will have with us on the trip, from time to time, chiefs of the Indian tribes of the territories to be visited. The schedule is of such a nature that the main fishing opportunity will be at Gogama. I would remind the fishermen that there will be a quantity of fishing tackle available there, but those who wish to bring their own can do so and it will be packed and transported so as not to inconvenience the travellers en route.

To those ardent fishermen who may look for a longer period at Gogama, arrangements can be made for an additional 24 hours there, if notice is given in time.

As of now, it is estimated, Mr. Speaker—and I am glad to know that you are numbered amongst those who will be travelling on this trip—that the number, including members, press, executive officers, staff officials and air crew, will be approximately 80. From the Lakehead we will be travelling in 12 Land and Forests aircraft. A large number will be starting from Toronto. Reservations have been made from the Toronto international airport at Malton, for flight 503, Air Canada, 9.15 a.m., Monday, June 28, and anyone who has not already notified us of different intention, and who intends to join the tour at some place other than Toronto, please notify Mr. Charles V. Rich, local 2735, immediately, so that the release of reservation from Toronto can be made.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, in December of 1963, I asked the labour safety council of Ontario, a body representative of both employer and employee interests, to study safety education in the province, and to recommend means of dealing more effectively with accident prevention through the medium of education.

The council reported to me in January. During discussion of my departmental estimates, I undertook to inform the House at a later date about the implementation of the report. This I shall do now, and as briefly as possible.

The council's recommendations and our own conclusions on the steps that should be taken to implement them, are based on four principles:

1. Employees themselves, through their

own organizations, must be brought into more active participation in safety education programmes.

2. There must be close liaison between enforcement and education, since the latter is an indispensable support for the former.

3. There must be maximum utilization of existing education resources, plus a greatly expanded overall programme.

4. The present voluntary participation of employer and employee groups through the seven safety associations now operating under the sponsorship of the workmen's compensation board, must be preserved and, indeed, expanded.

Now these four principles, Mr. Speaker, must underly the implementation of any new and more effective safety education programme in Ontario. In line with these considerations, the following steps will be taken.

1. The labour safety council will be reconstituted and its terms of reference substantially expanded, to make it the co-ordinating and advisory body for both education and enforcement at the policy-making level. The membership will consist of the chairman, the presidents of the seven safety associations and corresponding senior labour representation. The council will report directly to the Minister of Labour, rather than having a role subordinate to the workmen's compensation board. It will be assisted by a full-time staff, under an executive director.

2. The workmen's compensation board will establish a safety education department, under a full-time director, to integrate resources and co-ordinate the programmes of the seven safety associations, at the operating level. This department will allocate funds to the safety associations and oversee their budgets; co-ordinate the development of safety programmes and the production of programme material; integrate safety association personnel administration; supply statistical guide lines to all agencies in the safety field and develop new programmes for areas outside the individual concern of any one association.

3. A close staff level liaison between the advisory, enforcement and education agencies will be created through the executive director of the labour safety council, the new director of the safety education department of the compensation board, and the director of safety and technical services of The Department of Labour.

Now many of the detailed aspects of the council's report can only be implemented as this new machinery goes into operation. It is my hope, however, that this programme, coupled with other measures already in

operation, and our newly revised safety legislation, will constitute an overwhelming alliance in the battle for safety, and the creation of accident-free working conditions throughout Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I thought I would take the opportunity of making a statement regarding the use of Rule 56, *Lewis' Parliamentary Practice*, which I may say to the members of the House, I have discussed with the leaders of all parties and their rules experts and have their unanimous consent.

For the information of the House, I would like to put the following on record:

Re amendments to motions for second—or third—reading of a bill and the application of Rule 56 as it applies to Lewis' book on parliamentary practice.

Several times during the life of this Parliament, procedural difficulties have arisen with respect to the effect of the defeat of an amendment to the motion for second reading of a bill. This difficulty has resulted from a failure strictly to observe the provisions of Rule 56, which provides that:

If on an amendment to the question that a bill be now read a second time or the third time, it is decided that the word "now" or any words proposed to be left out stand part of the question, Mr. Speaker, shall forthwith declare the bill to be read a second or the third time, as the case may be.

Probably by oversight or inadvertence on a number of occasions over the years, a vote was taken on the motion for second reading, even after the defeat of such an amendment, so that in the course of time this procedure gained the force of precedent, with the result that I specifically ruled, both during the 1964 session and again in the current session, that this was now a recognized procedure in this Legislature, and that Rule 56 was reduced in its application to hoist motions. In view of the difficulties that have arisen as a result of these decisions—and I only mention the occasion some ten days ago, on second reading of Bill No. 136—and after serious consideration of the problem and of the authorities, I have come to the conclusion that, if the House approves, we should return to the strict application of Rule 56 in future, even though this means the reversal of two rulings previously made by myself, as well as several rulings by former Speakers of the House.

So that all members of the House may clearly understand the correct procedure, I feel it desirable to outline it in detail.

When on a motion for second or third reading of a bill a member moves either a reasoned amendment or a hoist motion which seeks to strike out the word "now" or any other words from the motion for second reading, the general debate continues on that proposed amendment until its conclusion. On the conclusion of the general debate, the Speaker does not put the amendment as a whole, but first puts the question:

Shall the words sought to be struck out stand part of the question, or shall the word "now" stand part of the question?

If this question is decided in the affirmative, that ends the matter. The bill is forthwith declared to be read a second or a third time and no further debate or amendment is in order.

On the other hand, if that question is decided in the negative, and this is possible in Houses with a small government majority so that the House has decided to strike out words from the motion for second reading, then the Speaker puts the question, "Shall the words sought to be substituted stand part of the question?" and the debate may then continue on that question, and an amendment may be proposed to those words as in the case of any other motion.

The important point is that no such amendment can be offered to the proposed substitutional words unless, and until, the House has decided to strike out the original words. This applies to any type of motion, and an amendment to strike out words and substitute others.

Precedents may be referred to at page 526, and the following of May's 17th edition, as standing order number 39 of the United Kingdom House of Commons is identical, word for word, with the Ontario rule 56.

Of course, rule 56 applies only to motions for second or third reading of bills. It has no application to substantive motions, where a vote on the main question must always be taken either in its original form, or as amended.

Thank you.

Clerk of the House: The eightieth order. House in committee of supply; Mr. N. Whitney in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE (continued)

On vote 1705:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned, I think the

hon. Minister was going to answer questions relevant to social work technicians.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I presume that the hon. member for Scarborough West meant the Ryerson institute.

With reference to the question concerning the level at which the Ryerson graduates will work, I think it will be necessary for me to describe this role in comparison with the other levels of work being performed in the public welfare field generally and in my department in particular.

I should also say at this point that the civil service commission is at present engaged in writing a "social work technician" class theory. However, I would prefer the use of the term "certified welfare worker" as distinct from the area of responsibility of the professional social worker.

The basic level of case servicing is carried out by our welfare field workers, who have high school graduation and relevant employment experience and who have been trained within the department. They work under supervision to provide the necessary service which leads to the determination of eligibility for applicants and recipients of assistance. They provide common sense advice and guidance to clients where needed and refer difficult case problems to personnel at the higher levels.

A second level of case servicing is provided by departmental field workers who are skilled in elementary family counselling techniques. They may have a BA degree in social science and appropriate experience and competence in elementary case work, or they will be graduates from the Ryerson welfare services certificate course.

These certified welfare workers meet special family needs by rendering the necessary counsel for problems that are eventually concerned with household management, the budgeting of income, the care of children, and so on. They are particularly knowledgeable about community resources which could be deployed to meet special needs for drugs, housing, child adjustment, social restoration and rehabilitation generally. In this way, a significant approach to the prevention of further social breakdown can also be made.

Of noteworthy importance, I believe, is the fact that the workers performing duties at the level expected of the Ryerson graduates have the particular ability to understand and recognize the social distress they see in their day-to-day work. They can define most case problems and deal with them at a preliminary counselling level, referring the very

complex situations to professional personnel within the department or to professional social work agencies.

The necessary supervision of this level of work is provided by regional administrators and welfare field supervisors, some of whom are professional social workers, with the remainder being required to have university graduation or background and experience in social welfare administration. It is generally recognized that there are many jobs in the public welfare field that can be effectively carried out by personnel who do not hold the BSW or MSW degree. Indeed, the Canadian welfare council, the American public association and the association of professional social workers have made statements to the effect that the role of the certified welfare worker requires serious consideration in view of the different levels of competence required in the field and the extensive shortage of social work graduates.

In supporting the two-year Ryerson course we have responded to the consensus of professional opinion and to the expressed wishes of municipal departments of welfare and other social agencies. Many of the lectures at Ryerson are given by social workers and the director himself is fully qualified professionally. The exact level of competence of the graduate, of course is not yet known, nor will it be fully known for a year or two after the first graduates come from the course in the spring of 1966.

Judging by the content of the curriculum, the way the candidates are carefully selected on the basis of employment experience and maturity, and by the work 13 of them are doing this summer in my department, their competence after graduation is expected to be quite satisfactory.

We sincerely believe that the Ryerson graduates will be able to perform effectively the jobs for which they are being trained. The jobs that I am referring to are, of course, those that combine routine municipal or provincial welfare services with elementary counselling, jobs that are concerned with the more routine aspects of adoption processing, and children's aid court work and with jobs that call for trained personnel to give basic services to the aged, the infirm and children under institutional care.

It is generally recognized that professional social work skills are not required to handle many of the routine aspects of public welfare. However, the certified welfare worker will be properly equipped to give a quality of service at the level to which he has been trained.

One quarter of the Ryerson trainees this past school year have been on leave of absence with pay from my department; 11 others have received our bursaries. On graduation there will be departmental jobs for them to fill. Municipalities, children's aid societies, institutions and social agencies of various types are awaiting the first graduates as well.

I would also like to explain again that those areas of service requiring professional social work competence in my department are continuing to be emphasized, as in the past. Six social workers with their BSW or MSW degrees have recently accepted positions in our field service branch where they will serve as special family counsellors. The plan is for every regional office eventually to have professional social work service built into its welfare administration operation.

Family counsellors receive referrals from the field work staff and treat such complex case problems as emotional disturbance, alcoholism, marital conflict, family breakdown, school drop outs, delinquent behaviour and so forth. They also deal particularly in involved case situations requiring rehabilitation services and preventive social work by making use of resources within the department or from outside agencies.

In other branches, social workers continue to be recruited to serve as rehabilitation counsellors and child welfare supervisors. We have more such professional staff than before and again I would say that where a job requires professional social work competence we will endeavour to provide just that and nothing less.

Mr. Chairman, that is the statement I had to make on Ryerson.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I noticed where the hon. Minister said that he had six new MSW or BSW workers coming on the staff this year. I appreciate that he has gone into more detail with respect to the work of his public welfare workers. Frankly, I apologize in one sense, although I think there is a certain responsibility on his part to explain his reference in the previous discussion to a Justice Bathgate's report.

I was quite convinced that he would have a wider range of challenge for his social workers, but I am still very concerned that there is not enough stress on the trained social worker and this comes under the staff training. Again I do not know, within your in-service training, how many leaves of absence are granted for people who go ahead

and take further training. I would like to bring some of these points to you.

Daniel Feeney, who is director of the Ottawa children's aid society, said it costs \$8,000 a year to provide a trained social worker's services for one year. This figure includes the worker's salary and administrative costs. The average number of families that are counselled in a year by one social worker is 100. This means that prevention of family breakdown by counselling costs the taxpayers approximately \$80 per family.

If we have established that the social worker can do something in helping to keep a family together, keeping the children within the family, then he is suggesting that it saves the agency \$1,000 a year for maintenance of each child that the agency has to remove from its own home and place in a substituted agency foster home. If families average three children per family, 100 families account for approximately 300 children, and if these children had to be removed from their homes because of neglect, their maintenance would cost the taxpayers \$300,000. I think that is fairly simple and I notice that Mr. Feeney is now with The Department of Public Welfare.

I would think in view of just the economic factor alone, really we should be getting far more stress on your part with respect to trying to get qualified people. I come back again—and you have offered your sentiments about wanting to get new schools of social work, and you want to do what you could. Well, there is a block somewhere which obviously you are not at liberty to disclose. But we know there are two schools of social work; we know there is a university; and, as the hon. member has pointed out, perhaps it is for other reasons than religious that Waterloo Lutheran is not having this school.

I do know that Waterloo Lutheran said to me that they have available staff, that they had recommendations from the Canadian welfare council, and that they were keen to get going on this; but for some reason it has been stultified. I say this is a very small-minded approach on the part of the government, when we think of the finances that can be saved in welfare costs if we get people who will look into a situation and act as a preventive service to hold families together.

I frankly had hoped—and I have asked the hon. Minister this on previous estimates—to talk more about the challenge of the staff. I have a feeling that you are doing a patch-work job, that your staff goes in with its limited resources and the interpretation of various Acts, and I think it needs a Phila-

delphia lawyer to really decide whether one person comes under one particular segment of welfare service or under another. I hope you are getting a broader approach on the basis of need and not on technical interpretation.

I would like to go into this a little bit with the hon. Minister because this comes clearly, to me, under staff training. What is the challenge for the staff? And I want to say it comes under finances as well, because from estimates as to the number of persons living in poverty in the United States and Canada—major surveys in the United States indicate that between 20 per cent and 25 per cent are in poverty.

I will take examples—there are Robert Lampson, the AFL-CIO, the United States bureau of statistics—to show my figures on this. Harrington, as you know, has written a book on it. There was the U.S. House of Representatives committee and there have been many others.

It was suggested that Canadian figures—and I am talking about Canadian figures, not Ontario figures—are apparently about the same. Ontario has about 19 per cent on the basis of being in the poverty area. Official studies, comparable to those from the US, are lacking. This is another point.

I know I am criticized when I ask for research, but when I think of the lack of foresight on the part of this government in so many areas, it seems to me that it is the most logical thing that you should be doing some studies in order to see what is the best way to bring about services. You did a study in the past; you had these 100 cases which you studied with intensive counselling. It was shown from this that you could get people back on their feet. I would hope that from that experiment there would be something to infuse your whole department with new techniques, and new enthusiasm, and new imagination.

In your study—and I am referring to the study of the 100 cases, which I hoped would be in part of the curriculum of training which you give to all of your staff, whether it is at Ryerson or whether it is in-training of six weeks—I had hoped that you would be emphasizing that poverty is self-perpetuating, principally because impoverished parents are increasingly unable to provide their children with values of education, and other opportunities which will fit them for everything else in our society and which will develop them into productive citizens. It is suggested—and again this is from a United States study, but I think it is also apparent to us that it

would apply in Toronto and in Ontario, too—that school drop-outs seem to be almost universal phenomena among the so-called lower economic classes. In Canada, there is a high and interesting co-relation between the amount of education and earnings—we all know this—so there is a rapidly diminishing demand for unskilled labour. And if the impoverished parent has no skills, and does not see the value of education for his children, this is part of the recurring poverty which is taking place—the hard-core cases.

May I say what are some of the results of poverty—and these must be apparent to you, we have discussed them in other estimates—if we do not tackle the problem? American studies of low-income groups indicate that they have the highest rates of physical illness, most mental illness, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, crime, school drop-outs, desertions, bad housing, unemployment and almost every problem to which welfare pertains. And this is why, economically—all I am trying to argue is on an economic basis—your staff training, which we are discussing, should be so important. This six-week course, and this lack of trained people, and your voicing hope that we may get more and then telling us here that you have six more coming in, is just not putting up an adequate battle in connection with saving costs for the people of Ontario with respect to welfare cases.

I remember, as I talk about this, that I have had, from certain Conservative private members, the suggestion that the poor—and I had it two sessions ago, although I am not going to name the person—had a lack of backbone and initiative. I know that, in a way, they are invisible to the general public because we are living in a fairly affluent society, but yet I think the hon. Minister is totally aware that there are real gaps within our society for such people, and that there is a lack of opportunity for them—and it applies to both rural and urban areas. I think we have seen, from Galbraith and others, evidence pointing out the fact that we have to get some kind of redistribution in our affluent society to make sure that the possible aids and services toward human betterment have priority.

The poverty line used in Canada is \$3,000 a year for a family of four, and it is more than \$1,000 under what they require according to the new budget guide which has been prepared by the social planning council for Toronto. Let me ask: Who are the people with whom you are concerned? You have named some before but I want to re-emphasize this. They are mostly persons, for example, who, for any reason, have

become long-term recipients of public allowances. They are the aged, the disabled, widows and their children; they are wage-earners who, for various personal reasons of inadequacy, limited training, obsolescence of skills, or business conditions, are unable to secure a sufficiently high regular wage for themselves and for their wives and their children. And there are many people, as ARDA has disclosed, and even shown us in Norfolk county, who are living in depressed rural areas, or are members of "disadvantaged" groups.

I am thinking particularly—when I am talking of "disadvantaged" groups—of the Indian who has left the reserve. I am not trying to put the blame solely on the provincial government in this area; I think that this is a co-ordinated effort on the part of both federal and provincial governments to get going on this situation. We know where the poor are located; we know they are located in depressed rural areas and in the city centres of urban areas; and we also know that this is a permanent thing—and I want to come back to this fact again.

There is a hard-core group—and you, with one of your studies, found this out—which is passed from generation to generation. This is why I am saying that we have got to have thoroughly skilled people to try to break through this barrier of a tradition of poverty on the part of people. I could quote statistics from both the United States and from England showing that a group could stay steadily at a very low income level.

I want to re-emphasize that I think the poor have become poorer, not because of being spineless or lacking in initiative and the other things that used to be thrown at them, but because I think they develop into a culture of poverty in which the poor, through the mutual influence of persons in similar conditions, develop values and outlooks that are in conflict with our society as a whole.

I have done quite a bit of reading on this over the past year. We have Harrington pointing this out to us. It requires more than a six weeks training course. If I may say so, though I understand the need for technicians, you need a greater challenge than that. You require training in sociology and anthropology to understand the cultural barriers that you have to break through.

Let me say this, and we are still talking on finance, Mr. Chairman, that with the services which your people must offer after their six weeks interpretation, that is insufficient. But they go out to 979 municipalities

in Ontario, and as I said before, I think that from all your different legislation, your sponsored programmes and so on, it must be an extremely confusing picture. I think they go out as bureaucrats almost, for I think it is for the most part what they have had to be learning.

I would far rather see these people going out, perhaps with not all the knowledge of the existing legality of one law over the other, but with far more sense of dignity about human beings and wanting to get people on their feet. As I said when you were listing the orders, I would have hoped instead of investigation and report that the top order would be to help people to help themselves. But in your municipality, and this comes under the financing, I think that there is complete inadequacy of service. I think that in some of your shared programmes, the homemakers, the nurses and the nursing homes—we will be coming into some of this later so I will not dwell on it—there is utter disparity all over Ontario.

Welfare provinces can provide some of these services, and provide them well. Welfare municipalities can provide them well. But often in municipalities which need them most, they cannot meet the cost of these requirements.

We have had clarion calls from people like Bessie Touzel suggesting that we co-ordinate on a county level, and that we amalgamate services; from people like John Morgan asking you to get away from this quilt patchwork approach to welfare services. Yet somehow you are moving so very slowly on this.

At the county level, I would be interested to know how many county administrations you have. But you are still timid in comparison with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) in his approach. I would hope that you would be producing a system, not only of administrative order, but also order in connection with the different classes that people fall into.

I can speak very personally of cases that come to my office. I would like to say again that I am very sorry to learn your Deputy Minister, Mr. Band, is ill, because I think every member knows that in almost every case he has tried to see if there has been a gap, or tried on some basis of humanity, to get coverage. But far more important for us as lawmakers is to see that we are not pushed into this situation where the member is asking Mr. Band to use his humanity. Let us make our laws more humane and more recognizable with respect to the needs that are there.

I think that there are municipalities of which you are fully aware that have strained resources. I think there are some that frankly have had less public understanding of what could be done with trained people.

As well as training the people yourself, I think you have got to do a selling job in showing that a trained person really can benefit a community economically. I do not think you have done that completely. I think within your department also—I say this with respect to the majority of them, because it takes dedication to work in The Department of Public Welfare—there may be cases where some people have an ingrained suspicion of new approaches, an ingrained suspicion of the person who has got a new enlightened approach to social science.

And let me say that I think that you do get young people who walk out with a master's degree and think that they understand the whole world's problems. And that does not apply either. There is a balance in this. Somehow we have got to try to get those two things drawn together.

We are talking about a lot of money when we are talking about welfare, and I think we should emphasize this under this financial administrative branch. We are talking of 12 per cent of the national income which is being spent by every level of government on health and welfare. The federal government was spending \$3.98 billion in 1962-63. It was spending 69.3 per cent, the province was spending 27.7 per cent and the municipalities were spending 3 per cent.

I suggest, sir, that we are spending our money badly, because we are not tackling the preventive areas. Instead of coming in when the ship has got a leak and trying to plug it up, what you are doing with your little technical books is that you are taking six weeks of whatever it is the staff are studying. They move in with their services after the ship has floundered, and then say OK, you are entitled to so much to get salvage and such. I think there could be far more done in connection with prevention.

It is quite obvious to me that one of the most important Acts that you produced was homemakers and nursing services, and this should have been a force of people, of crusaders, who were going around this province, to hold families together, to keep people from getting into institutions, to keep young children from being broken up from their homes. Yet year after year when we ask, yes, there is a little bit of progress, there are more municipalities.

But it has not been a sweeping movement

around this province, and I suggest that is so because of a lack of courage, or perhaps because it is the sacred cow of municipal autonomy to you. But above municipal autonomy rides the transcending aspect of trying to keep families together, and also to keep institutions from getting overcrowded. There are many things that I think you could be doing, and I want to list some of them under your training programme. I know a number of others have been listed before from the studies that you have done, but I would like to see again—I would like to see a new budget for families, couples and individuals, living in rural and different sizes of urban communities, based on studies of actual living costs, in each type of community and use this as the yardstick for establishing allowances in any public assistance programme.

I would like to see—and I may say these are recommendations of the planning council of 1961-62—that the operation of all public assistance programmes be based on sound and clearly defined standards, with respect to the amount of assistance, at a level consistent with health and decency; an adequate provision for qualified staff to administer the programme and to provide case work and counselling service. This means that when you say there is a lack of trained people, you then ask why are there not more. You then say the source from which we get trained people is too small. You say, therefore, that if there are universities that are going to be preferred to develop schools of social workers, you, sir, I hope will say, "I do not care how we do it. Whether it was through some technicality that it did not come from The Department of Education, I need these people for my department, and whether The Department of Education and the Minister are scared about precedents, I need them. I managed to get around it with the University of Ottawa and I will get around it with the University of Waterloo. I need the people and I am going to get them." This is the approach I would like to see taken.

Let me say that according to Dr. Bessie Touzel—who I think has given great service to this province in a quiet guidance which I know the hon. Minister has availed himself of and I know, indeed, so have many others—no thought has really been given for many years to the question of how county and local municipalities organize to deliver services for which they are responsible. I refer you to the report of the welfare services in York county.

Let me take another point. It has been pointed out by the advisory committee on

child welfare in its recent report, that recommendations made over 12 years ago by the committee on child care and adoption services, are still pertinent. This group also noted that findings and recommendations of the Minister's committee on child care in 1953 are repeated in the present report. Five other committees since then were noted by that committee as having made similar recommendations. Their conclusion was that recommendations cannot be implemented satisfactorily without a broad, well-integrated and long-range plan for welfare services in the province of Ontario and that it was time action was taken.

Integration of services is something that has been fought for year after year, not only in this Legislature, but also from outside. You hear, as I say, the voices of Professor John Morgan, of Bessie Touzel and of every other authority in the field of welfare.

During the past two years, the various operations of 30 municipalities in the Sudbury district have been integrated into one operation for the larger area and I think that is a great step. I think it is a very great step, and I would like to see that across the province. I do not know whether we could take the period of time when you started this desire for integration of services on the county level and the number that have been done and then say, "In view of the number that are done each year, how much longer will it take us until we finally get across-Ontario coverage?" But I suggest it may be something like another 20 years. Perhaps, if I am wrong, the hon. Minister would correct me.

In ten municipalities of Wentworth county, the local and county services, other than those of the children's aid, are provided through the county unit, and the recent decision by Welland county council has been to do likewise.

Dr. Bessie Touzel, in her recent report to York county, recommended that this be done in York in progressive stages. The first stage would include the homes for the aged, hospitalization of indigents, training school arrangements, homemakers and nurses services and nursing homes, as well as for general welfare assistance, both sanitary care and non-charitable services. The second stage, and you have done something on this, and I congratulate you on that, would be the child welfare services, now being provided as you have with the new Act.

But I suggest that we have got to have more integration of services, be it on the county or on the regional level, and it should be more than just encouraged. Surely you

have come to this realization. You have a very persuasive and a very charming personality and we all recognize that. But you must have come to a realization that your powers of persuasion just have not got the counties together. It has been slow and it has been too long and who suffers? That is the question that must trouble you. Who suffers?

Let me take it in certain priorities which the government might assume. Who suffers? The government, because it costs it money. We talked about these 100 families. If they had qualified people, one child being kept within the home would cost \$100. If the child is not, if it is taken into a children's aid society, the cost is \$1,000, or \$300,000 in all. So, not just on a humanitarian basis, just economically, we are suffering on this. But apart from that the whole disruption of family, the whole overcrowding of institutions, the breakdown that we have, the juvenile delinquency, and—I hate to say this—a large part of some of the high rates that we have are because of the inadequacies of a preventive force and a preventive emphasis on the part of the welfare services.

I sit down, sir, with this point again: The cost of staff training at \$29,000; six new social workers coming into your department; your Ryerson programme; your lack of social work schools, and the fact that staff are leaving, all are an indictment on someone, an indictment that welfare services in this department are not functioning properly. I do not know who the indictment is on, but I know who has to take the responsibility in this House, and that is the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister is going to wait for a minute to reply, perhaps I could make some comment on this branch in an area which has been worrying me for close to two years, and which I have been exploring a little and on which I would now like to offer some thoughts.

My mind goes back to a reference on the comment page of, I think it is, the *Canadian Welfare Journal*, December, 1964. A mournful and plaintive letter was reprinted by this journal. I would like to read a section of it into the record because it is the peg on which I would like to hang certain remarks:

Dear Mr. Editor:

We all know of essential primary welfare services where key positions have been vacant for years and where overworked and disillusioned personnel have withdrawn to secondary services or left the field

altogether, deploring the singular lack of concern or action by the appropriate provincial authorities.

Could someone tell me why the provincial Department of Public Welfare seems so lacking in conviction about the value of the services provided by the children's aid societies?

Mr. Editor, I have convictions about the value of our services or I would not continue as a local director but my head gets mighty sore from banging against the wall of provincial indifference. My heart sinks at the increasing flow of competent personnel away from our field to other allied disciplines of secondary importance to family welfare; my feet grow weary in a constant endeavour to build up a local public image of welfare with no provincial guidance to support me.

In short, Mr. Editor, I need staff, and I want to know why the provincial Department of Public Welfare doesn't appreciate my problem and do something about it. My opposite number in the field of public health has constant, constructive guidance from The Department of Health. What is wrong with our relationship with our provincial department? Why won't my best friends tell me?

Signed,

ONE OF THE GOATS

It sounds like a prelude to an advertisement for bad breath, I realize, at the end of it, Mr. Chairman, but it is singularly relevant to this particular branch in the department.

I want to remind the hon. Minister of something about which he is now acutely cognizant. As one social service estimate after another of this government appeared in this Legislature over the last five months—I can think of Health, Reform Institutions, Attorney General, and Education—the plea, nay, the whimper and the cry, has been that “We cannot adequately perform because we do not have an adequate staff complement.” And “It is not our fault, gentlemen, we are doing everything under our power, we are advertising in all the reputable newspapers for a superintendent at Mercer reformatory, we simply cannot find anyone.” And similarly in one department after another.

Now from Public Welfare, this abject plea comes forth across the Legislature saying, “We are endeavouring to draw people in but we simply cannot find them.” So our public welfare services can reach only a certain level, appreciably below the optimum level, let it be said, and can proceed no further.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say—in conjunction with other hon. members on this side of the House, and the hon. leader of the Opposition—that that simply is not true. That the reason for the low level of social services across the entire province of Ontario, encompassing every government department, and every aspect of social welfare, reflects only the inability of the government, and particularly The Department of Public Welfare, to undertake a vigorous, meaningful, staff programme. There is nothing in this province worthy of the name “staff programme.” Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the province of Ontario has less imagination in the development of social service personnel than any province in the country. Indeed, I would say, worse than any state in the United States, with the exception of certain southern areas. And one study, one survey after another, has demonstrated that to be true.

So we have this silly pot-pourri of six-week training schemes in one department after another, essentially training the same people for roughly the same services, total overlapping, very little content and very little substance, as I am about to show. And let no Minister again have the temerity to come into this House and say, “We cannot find the people,” or “We cannot reach a level of services because we do not have the people,” when, in fact, no effort has genuinely been made.

I recall a remark of Mr. James Gripton, of the University of Toronto school of social work, who is an eminent authority in this business of staffing the social welfare services. Mr. Gripton said in a recent article:

It is pretty clear that we are little interested in Canada in solving the personnel problem in social work unless it be by talking it to death.

And that is all we have had in this session where social welfare personnel are concerned, Mr. Chairman: a relentless, consistent talking to death.

I want to suggest five specific areas for expansion and development. Some of these will not be new to the hon. Minister. I think one of them—the last—particularly important; but I want to suggest them and to make short comments about each of them and then perhaps evoke a response.

The first is the obvious area of professional social workers and schools of social work. Let us, once and for all, kill this business about professional social work staff having to handle all social problems, or that it is desirable that they should. Mr. Chairman, those of us in this Legislature—I am sure all hon.

members, and certainly the government hon. members, will know that it is simply impossible to find enough graduate social workers to do the job. They do not now exist; they will never exist; and it is futility to engage in this frustrating pursuit of social workers who will not, in fact, exist.

If memory serves me correctly, the number of social workers, as a percentage of the social work complement generally, has been diminishing since World War II. It has been falling rather than rising, and that is true in every jurisdiction. In the year 1964 in Canada we graduated 238 social workers, and we lost 278 either by natural attrition, death, retirement, or whatever the reason; so, as a percentage of our entire social work welfare personnel, our entire complement, social workers are a contracting proportion.

For every social worker who graduates, there are four jobs available on the open market and easily 75 to 80 per cent of our jobs now in the entire agency area are still held by non-graduate social work people. That means, Mr. Chairman, that we have to face reality. We have to give up this myth of founding our entire social work structure on a professional level; it cannot be done. And it means very simply, as I am sure the hon. Minister knows, that we have to reassign our social work personnel, our graduates, our MSWs, and our doctors in social work; we have to allocate them rather more intelligently in the areas where they will best serve. Then we have to develop a wealth of ancillary staff such as hitherto we have not even contemplated. And that, I suggest, is a great lack on the part of the government.

In other words, we must redefine the relevance of the present schools of social work.

Mr. Chairman, in one sense there can be no doubt as to the validity of the Opposition argument in this Legislature: We need not only one new school of social work in Ontario, we need a minimum of two graduate schools of social work in this province at this moment. I profoundly hope that the hon. Minister of University Affairs (Mr. Davis), in conjunction with the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, is about to undertake such an expansion.

Then the question must be asked: What do we do with the graduate schools of social work once they are operating? I suggest that their function has changed somewhat. They have three specific fields: First, the continuing work in graduate education, that indispensable ingredient to give strength and bulwark to the field as a whole; second,

specialized training for people who are presently in the field, who can come to the school of social work for special courses for special periods of time from whatever agency or government department; and third, a totally new intensification of research, something that has been sorely lacking. Social work departments of any kind, that are worth their salt, sustain themselves on the research drive. We have been so hard pressed to produce bodies that we have lost a lot of the research orientation.

Those three areas, I suggest to you, must mark the schools of social work. It is academic whether the schools are placed at Waterloo Lutheran, or Western, or at Queen's, or at York, as I have heard rumours. It is much more important that they be geared to fill the new role in the whole field of social welfare personnel. That is the first point, Mr. Chairman—the redefinition of schools of social work, the recognition that we cannot rest our entire hopes on social workers—the hon. Minister, I am sure, will agree—and the expansion in that area.

The second aspect is probably heretical in the province of Ontario. It may not sit well among some hon. members of this Legislature, but I think it should be put forward as a possibility. It is the possible development of undergraduate university courses in social welfare or social work. And by that distinction, I draw a distinction between the theoretical and the practical at the undergraduate university level.

Let it be said, Mr. Chairman, that in a variety of jurisdictions in the United States, of which California and New York and Massachusetts are the best examples, the only way they solved their staffing problems in the field of social assistance services was by a crash programme of undergraduate degrees. We do not do things that way in Ontario; we worry, and perhaps rightly, about watering down the undergraduate liberal arts programme; we worry, perhaps rightly, about an excessive vocational orientation of our undergraduate programme if we start giving degrees in social work and social welfare.

But what has happened in other jurisdictions is that courses, in sociology in particular, have been greatly reinforced by specific subjects in social work and social welfare, and the young men and women who have emerged with that kind of degree have fitted much more readily into the total social welfare structure.

Let me remind the hon. Minister and the House that there are two such courses functioning in Canada now. At Sir George

Williams University in Quebec you have an undergraduate—three-year, I believe—social work course with a degree; and at Memorial University in Newfoundland, you have, for the first time in Canada, a four-year honours degree social welfare course, fitting people right into the apparatus of social service establishments.

Mr. Chairman, again I do not offer this categorically as the answer. I offer it as something that is worthy of exploration. It strikes me as odd indeed, that when many jurisdictions in North America and, indeed, in some of the western European countries—I shall refer to them in a moment—are developing this idea of undergraduate social work education; we are still quarrelling about a new school of social work, rather than developing the ancillary services. I suggest that this is one way to do it, and the point that breaks one's heart, Mr. Chairman, is that it is not as if nothing is known.

As recently as the year 1964, Dr. Maisey Rogers, school of social work, University of Manitoba, did a study of all the undergraduate courses who would respond to her questionnaire presently functioning in the United States—undergraduate courses in the field of social welfare and social work. She got 73 replies—all of them affiliated, let it be said, with the council on social work education.

Of the 73 replies, 30 were particularly applicable to our environment because they were from liberal arts colleges. Dr. Rogers found, interestingly enough, that of all the replies, most of them had successfully functioning undergraduate departments in social welfare or social work. And where they were not specifically designated as such, they were strengthening the course structure of sociology, or psychology.

As soon as the men and women graduated from these general or honours courses, they were fitted directly into the mainstream of social welfare establishments, just below the graduate social worker and somewhat above the welfare worker.

So the studies are available, the material is available. The council on social work education—the Canadian equivalent of the American body—produces one treatise after another on undergraduate content in social welfare courses and on the need for such. The investigation of such groups as the Canadian welfare council go on record as suggesting that this area be explored. But not a word from this government. I think that is very sad because you do not cure a critical situation by perpetuating an indifference, and that is, in fact, what is happening.

That is the second area I wanted to mention, and I mention that it need not, in any sense, if properly planned, water down a university curriculum.

The third area, to which the hon. Minister has made reference is the establishment in the province of Ontario of defined career lines in the social services. By that, one means the social worker, then the undergraduate social welfare worker, then the welfare worker who comes out of the Ryerson course, then the administrative supervisors who are a category unto themselves, and finally even the area of clerks and stenographers, the people who make first contact with the welfare recipient in the majority of cases.

This is one of the few jurisdictions on the North American continent that does not have established welfare roles—where there is not a differentiated welfare worker career line. The United States is now federally, as the hon. Minister knows, discussing two distinct career lines; the social work level and the welfare work level. And one province after another—Newfoundland, since the year 1949—has worked on the basis of different career lines in the staffing of public services.

But not so the province of Ontario. We have just started the Ryerson course; we have marshalled forth our creative powers and called it "social work technician three" as though we were operating on a television set rather than on a human being. We retreat a little and talk about certified welfare workers—I hope you erase that phrase, "social work technician three" from the vocabulary of the civil service.

This is our nod in the direction of a desperate staff shortage.

That is our nod. And why do I call it a nod? Because at Ryerson, Mr. Chairman, in this well-trumpeted course, there are a total of 23 students enrolled, even though there were 100 applications the first year and 300 applications the second year. The only increment that the director can think in terms of is jumping from 23 students to 30 students, and The Department of Public Welfare feels that it has indulged in great largesse in paying for six from the general welfare assistance branch on a full-time basis to the Ryerson project.

There are 13 field agencies participating in this two-year Ryerson project. But it is important to point out that the social work profession as a profession and the agencies as agencies are still not clear in their own minds what they are going to do with these people, or whether they want them. Too

many agencies still have a BA fixation, despite the fact, I think this is worth pointing out, that there are some 13 or 14 courses given over the two years oriented to social welfare and social work, and their field work is of an exceedingly high quality. That is what we should be doing: developing a new welfare worker level and using our community colleges for that declared purpose.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, as shown in one study after another, the public assistance areas are the important areas of tomorrow. This is where people may show their idealism, if such it be, and their practical involvement, if such it be. But to have one course in the province of Ontario for 23 people, expanding to 30, is ludicrous.

You should have a network of welfare worker courses right across the province, bringing people literally in the hundreds, not to say thousands. And you do not start them, as you started the Ryerson course—overnight; think of it on a Wednesday and announce it on a Thursday, in effect.

I appreciate that that is unfair, because it was in the planning stage to some degree. But just to hurl it into the mainstream of social work so that even the agencies did not know what it was all about! To this day there are many social work agencies who do not have a clear conception of what is going on in the Ryerson course.

How does one expect to gain community assistance when operating at that level? You must have a clearly defined plan—from which the government shrinks. And into the plan, you fit the welfare worker. You multiply the courses across every community college in Ontario, so that when you have 300 applying you do not have to turn away 90 per cent of them. Then, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to the hon. Minister, one department after another would not have to come to this House and plead for redemption because it hasn't enough workers to staff its social assistance services.

That is just terrible myopia. It makes no sense at all, and all these areas are as yet to be exploited. They have not been exploited in this jurisdiction, although they have been exploited in all kinds of other jurisdictions.

Let me make reference to another thing with which the hon. Minister will be familiar. The Younghusband report in the United Kingdom made a total analysis of all social assistance-social work areas, and came to the conclusion that you could carve out three distinct levels: the social work level, the welfare worker level, and the level which is something just below that. They are now on

a crash programme of development, producing graduates who fit neatly into the social work-social welfare scheme, and they are overcoming their crisis.

We in Ontario have a crisis at the graduate school level. We have no undergraduate programming, we have one welfare worker course with 23 students about whose future we are uncertain. Nothing else. This simply flies in the face of all the logical progression in this whole field. It shows no imagination whatsoever. I suggest to the hon. Minister that a very powerful look has to be taken at this, along the community college line that has been proposed.

I will say in ending this part of my remarks, Mr. Chairman, that the government has at its disposal the best people in the field. You could not have a better man in this area than Professor John Morgan. I am sure—I have not discussed it with him intimately—but I am sure he would give of his services to this government in setting up these training courses. The finest training course in Canada is in Newfoundland, of all places, and it was set up by Professor John Morgan. It seems rather odd that all the advisers to this government, in order to find a practical demonstration of their theory, have to go either to Quebec, or to Newfoundland, or to Saskatchewan or to British Columbia; but they can never fulfill their objectives in Ontario. In Ontario they receive only hostility, they receive very little encouragement. No one can pretend that in the area of staffing the social services we have come up with any kind of plan.

The Canadian conference on social work has accepted the welfare worker rationale. We have found in one agency after another that it is commonplace in other jurisdictions and yet nothing at all is done in Ontario.

Let me quote once more from James Gripton on staffing and training, before the Canadian conference on social work, as far back as June, 1960.

Not only must we face the reality that social services may never be staffed exclusively by professionals, we must also recognize that it would be undesirable and extravagant to do so. The necessity of employing the non-professional may be acknowledged in the first instance because of the shortage of professionals, thereby making it necessary to entrust certain functions to the non-professional, and thus conserve professional time and skill. However, there are many tasks in any service than can be performed quite adequately by the non-professional.

I ask the hon. Minister, where are these non-professionals, and I say to him that, alas, we do not as yet have them.

That is the third point, Mr. Chairman, a different set of career lines with separate training programmes.

The fourth point I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is the question of in-service training. I am going to be as kind as I possibly can and say that in-service training in the province of Ontario, whether it be at the public agency level of government or at the private agency level is a sad, laughable joke, nothing more than that. The very heart and soul of in-service training in The Department of Public Welfare consists of a six-week course. What a pathetic manifestation in the middle of the 20th century—a six-week course.

What does this emboldened course do? It looks at the Act and the regulations thereof and explains them to the recipients of the course in detail, rather like the way we might go through a bill on the floor of this House. It does not have time for discussing the relationship of the worker to the welfare recipient. It does not have time to discuss social work skill. It does not have time to discuss the subtleties and sensitivities of this field. It discusses only the Act and the regulations in great detail.

Lest the hon. members of this House think that I overdo it, let me tell them what is done in the province of Newfoundland in exactly the same six-week course for comparative purposes. Here is its curriculum:

1. Objectives of social welfare programme: An introduction to the social welfare programmes of Canada, their philosophies, objectives and limitations with particular reference to the legislation of Newfoundland.

2. The art of interviewing and helping people.

That is not so unorthodox for social workers, people who will handle a case load of 400 a month—the art of interviewing and helping people. We do not get it in this province. And what does it consist of in Newfoundland?

A study of the principles and skills used in interviewing people in need, with special attention to the importance of an understanding of human growth and behaviour.

We are just beginning to institute courses on human growth and behaviour for teachers in OCE and in teachers' college, so I suppose it is too much to ask that that be given to people who are working in the social welfare

field, but it is desperately needed. Then, thirdly, you have administration in public welfare:

A study of the principles and practices of administration, particularly as they would apply in the case of Newfoundland.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, why is it not possible for the biggest and most resourceful province in this country to have a similar six-week programme? Why must we limit all our activity to this restricted circumscribed parochial stab in the direction of Acts and regulations? It is not enough. No wonder your social services break down.

When the hon. leader of the Opposition sneers about what is being done for people in the field, he has every right to sneer. It is pretentious and extravagant in the extreme to think that people trained for four weeks on the operation of Acts and regulations can perform a proper service in the field. It is impossible. Some of the most difficult human problems relate to general welfare assistance; and these are the people with whom such workers are dealing. It is no fault of theirs that they inadequately perform the service, it is the fault of government.

I would also point out, Mr. Chairman, that unlike this province, where you have this kind of welfare-worker and in-service training in a government, in Newfoundland you do not have people leaving in large numbers. Again, Newfoundland is a very interesting example. I do not know how many people would want to work in Newfoundland for a lifetime and dedicate themselves to it—I suppose indigenous islanders would like to—but it is significant that 25 per cent of its welfare department has served over ten years, that another 25 per cent has served from five to ten years, that another 25 per cent has served from three to five years, and that only 25 per cent has served under three years. I do not know what the breakdown is in the province of Ontario but I would be willing to guess that it does not bear comparison.

I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is a reflection of the inadequacy of any government in-service training. As a matter of fact, just to expand for a moment, one of the other tragedies is that whereas there is no government in-service training there is very little agency in-service training. I have some figures here and I find them rather interesting. To put it in the simplest terms: out of 74 people in the private service field engaged in some kind of educational training or instruction, not a single one of them in the year 1963 was full time—not one. The only

full-time instructors we have are in the department for social work at the graduate level.

And why not one? Because, for example, when we passed The Child Welfare Act through this Legislature we made no provision in the body of that Act for grants for the purposes of education and training. The only training programme we have to which the government adheres is this little six-week expedition; the occasional application of an individual to a school of social work; the back-door training which the government sponsors in conjunction with the children's aid society—that is really the children's aid society's, not the government; and the Ryerson course—which I suspect, if the government could have dropped it, would have been dropped, only Ryerson took it on and it is now a distinctly Ryerson course; and one or two other things like the Thistle town childcare worker experiment which is The Department of Health and not the The Department of Public Welfare.

In other jurisdictions, Mr. Chairman, governments have realized that if we are to avoid an indescribable crisis in this field, government has to make provision for in-service training. In the United States in 1962 legislation was passed which is remarkable in the western world. Before individual states could receive federal funds, they had to meet certain training standards. They had to meet certain staffing requirements. Every state had to have a full-time state training director.

What do we have in the province of Ontario? A man who gives the six-week courses. I have no doubt as to his dedication, but that is not a training director in the meaning of the word.

Not later than July 1, 1967, every American state had to have a fully operating programme of staff development, including: 1. A description of the organization and scope of the staff development programmes; 2. An organized programme of in-service training available to all staff in state and local agencies administering public assistance; 3. An outline of what the plan must encompass, the length of time for training, the number of employees who must be involved, and the nature of the orientation. In every single state it is made mandatory that individual agencies have full-time directors of training before the federal grants will be available—not only the province or the state, but the agencies as well.

Mr. Chairman, we have nothing corresponding to that in the province of Ontario. This government will not even concede the

relevance of agency staff training. It will not even, under its new Acts, like The Child Welfare Act, grant money appropriated for that purpose. One area of social assistance after another will fail and fail wretchedly, unless we begin to develop in-service training and staff training programmes.

They do not exist at the government level, and they do not exist at the private agency level, except in individual inspired experiments, like Thistle town, the Jewish family and child service and some of the children's aid societies. And there is no direction coming from this government at all. The direction from The Department of Public Welfare is reminiscent of that given to day nurseries, or homemakers. It is here; it is showpiece; if you want it, take it, otherwise fend for yourself—regardless of the damage to families and children in the process.

Again there is this whimpering cry that we have not enough staff and not enough trained people; but this will not stand up to an analysis of the situation in the province, and that, Mr. Chairman, brings me to my fifth and final point on this vote.

One of the fundamental reasons why we do not have enough social workers, why we do not have enough undergraduates moving into this field, why there is an insufficient welfare training programme, and why there is no in-service training in the province worthy of the name, is that we are the only jurisdiction in Canada which does not know what is required. We simply have never made a manpower survey in the social welfare field; never, in this province; for what reason I do not know.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): I do not know how we get along without you.

Mr. S. Lewis: I simply do not know. I have mentioned at other times, Mr. Chairman, that back in the early 50s there was a survey made of all of Canada—although it managed to except Ontario—and in one jurisdiction after another they knew their needs. But not in the province of Ontario.

Not only do we not know our staff needs, the manpower needs, Mr. Chairman, we do not know the caseload or the workload. If some of the hon. members want to decry this particular facet of it, I ask them to ask the hon. Minister some of these questions.

How many people at a supervisory administrative level in social welfare will we need by 1970 in the province of Ontario? I challenge the hon. Minister for an answer. How many people will we need at the post-graduate level in social work, by 1970? What

is the best ratio of worker to case load, in highly complicated general welfare assistance cases, in aged cases, in disabled cases, in blind cases? How many? Why is it that this jurisdiction does not know, when one after another of the other jurisdictions has a careful manpower programme worked out? Why is it Ontario has not announced specifically that it will join the federal Department of Health and Welfare survey of manpower needs? Why can none of these questions be answered by this government? Is it purely a matter of hope and prayer and Scotch tape, and nothing beyond that? Is it the panic-ridden holding up of a crumbling structure of welfare, because no one knows the requirements? And so no one can plan.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Nonsense!

Mr. S. Lewis: I am perturbing the hon. Minister of Labour. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that at least the hon. Minister of Labour, in his new blueprint for industry and in his new research branch, is beginning to evaluate manpower needs across the province; for that we, in the Opposition, congratulate him. But in the public assistance field, nothing is known; absolutely nothing. We are planning completely in the dark, and we do it with a bravado which bespeaks one tragedy of social assistance after another, because the majority of our problems in this field relate to a lack of awareness of what is needed and what is involved.

You can speak to one agency head after another, to one professor at the school of social work after another; one can read the literature from the council on social work education. Everywhere there is the same cry, "Why cannot we undertake a manpower programme, an analysis of demands, and a meeting of needs, staged over the next five or ten years?" I do not know why. I do not know why the hon. Minister and his comrades have refused to do so, but they have, for whatever reason.

So who has had to do it? This is the interesting thing. When The Department of Education failed in its training of teachers to identify certain exceptional children in the schools, the Ontario mental health foundation, a private agency, government-subsidized, had to run across the province from school to school, giving courses to teachers, in the abdication of government responsibility, in the abdication of government responsibility. And in the abdication of this department's responsibility, the Canadian welfare council has had to step in.

In 1963 and 1964, the Canadian welfare council undertook a series of studies under the commission on utilization of personnel. These were the areas it undertook to study, and I would simply like to put them on the record, to show the specifics about which so many people in this field are concerned:

(a) To identify levels of competence, education, and experience required to satisfactorily carry out various types of social welfare tasks.

(b) To develop a system of classifying social welfare positions that will indicate the level of competence required for the social welfare tasks assigned to each class of position.

(c) To test the validity of the classification system by trying it out on a representative number of public and private agencies. Hopefully, such a series of tests would also give a rough indication of the number of personnel needed at each level of competence to man the range of welfare positions found in Canadian social welfare services.

(d) To determine, while testing the validity of the classification system, the possibilities for making more effective use of professional social workers in the redistribution of social welfare tasks in the agencies under study.

Mr. Chairman, why should such a study have to be carried out by the Canadian welfare council—and concentrated indeed, in large measure, in the province of Ontario?

This is not a private agency task. This is a government task. It is a government which evaluates the manpower needs in society, not some private agency whose conscience is so unhappy at the prospect of diminishing services that, in desperation, it turns to such a survey.

So they analyzed an agency here and an agency there, and learned a number of fascinating things. They learned that we were not utilizing our personnel properly; that we were abusing our professionals; that they were in the wrong positions; that the wrong people were supervising; and that the wrong people were in field work; that the jobs that were being done by professionals could better be done by volunteers; that we were either under-utilizing or over-utilizing; that, in the agencies studied, the welfare worker set-up was, by and large, inadequate. So that, even as we now stand, we could make immeasurable improvement if the government took a manpower survey under advisement. But it has not done so, and it is not enough to wait

for the Ontario welfare council or the Canadian welfare council to do so.

As I say, it is not only Canada and the province of Ontario, Mr. Chairman, who have done this. There is a Michigan study, with which the hon. Minister is familiar. There is a United States bureau of family welfare services study which is available; and there is, above all, and I want to make reference to it in this House, a California project, with which the hon. Minister is doubtless familiar. What they did in California, faced with a similar crisis, two years ago—part of the fruits of which some of us who were on the trip saw—was this. California is no idyllic social welfare apparatus; but, in certain areas, particularly reform institutions, they had a masterful set-up of trained people.

What California did two years ago was to take 500 cases at random in the state, analyze each of them and break them down into areas of greater complication and lesser complication. Then it analyzed the number of cases to match a worker of a certain skill level, projected these skills to a statewide basis, and decided how many workers would be needed to fulfill this certain case load.

When it was finished, it was able to estimate for the year 1970, an exact ratio of manpower needs in the entire social service area. Then California went to work, gave the money, and began training the people in equivalents to Ryerson courses and undergraduate courses, and spending tremendous amounts of federal money in in-service training. But the point was, Mr. Chairman, that they made the study; and it is a study we have never made. And the wails on the other side of the House will not ring true until such a study is made, and until the hon. Minister is able to answer some of the questions.

The hon. leader of the Opposition, and I think the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), asked the hon. Minister earlier in his estimates: What is a reasonable case load? We could not get any answer, Mr. Chairman, about a reasonable case load, because no one in the province of Ontario has worked out the degree of complication in certain shared assistance programmes, and the number of cases per worker that is desirable. Every other jurisdiction which has worked it out has come to the ratio of one worker to 50 or 60 complicated cases. Our ratio is one to 396 at the moment. Now maybe it would not be as small a ratio for the province of Ontario; but we cannot tell until the study has been made and the study simply is not available.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is in many ways a restless Legislature as the bells for tomorrow ring nigh, but I think that on this side of the House it is incumbent on us to raise these particular areas in these estimates at this time, and at length, because unless we get an answer here, there is no answer.

Unless this government begins training programmes and manpower surveys in the field of social welfare, our entire service will be crippled for lack of personnel forever. There will never be a solution, just never.

As I say, the modest, and I have no doubt intensely sincere, responses of the hon. Minister that they are trying will not provide an answer, because when we look over those five areas again—just let me enumerate them—we have no plan, no blueprint. The hon. Minister of University Affairs—I think he was at the time wearing the hat of the Minister of Education—admitted during the Education estimates that there was in fact no blueprint in this area. It is the only such area of government. We pretend to a blueprint in every other area, except this one.

First should come graduate schools of social work, their relevance, their role and the numbers required; second, undergraduate courses leading to a degree in social welfare or social work; third, welfare worker career lines, and training provided at the community college level for a new level of social welfare worker; fourth, in-service training at government level and private agency level, with a massive inpouring of funds; fifth, and most important, a detailed analysis of manpower requirements in the social service field right across this province, missing not a single agency. That, in the ultimate goal, Mr. Chairman, is the only conceivable answer to our manpower problems in this field.

Mr. Chairman: Before proceeding with vote 1705, I would like to make an announcement. This House is always pleased to welcome important groups of visitors, and today we would like to welcome the Preston schoolboys safety patrol in the west gallery.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be very long. I have appreciated and enjoyed the two discourses, first by the hon. leader of the Opposition and now the hon. member for Scarborough West.

In reference to the hon. member for Scarborough West, he has expressed his views and he has brought forth some comparisons which in most instances I trust were compatible. I would say some others might not be

as compatible to this province as to other parts of the country, but, however, on the blueprint he has expressed five points. As to the points themselves, I am not in entire disagreement with him. How to arrive at them is another story. Naturally, he professes a different point of view than we do on this side of the House and that I can appreciate. But at the same time, I think these five points have a lot of merit and I can assure you that we will look at this very closely. The full implications were not expressed in so many words, but I think his views can be found in there and some analysis of his sentences will be required for that. I cannot say honestly that I disagree with him.

However, I will also tell him that with the small experience I have had with this field in dealing with people generally—either firstly as a professional and then coming in through this field later on, and also as a politician, if you wish—sometimes the theory is so much easier than the application of what you would like to do. It is one of those actualities that you have to work with. When he is an authority—I do not know if the hon. member will ever be, but when he finds that out—he will remember these words I have spoken now, that theory is so much easier than practice in many of these things. However, I think he put that forward with his usual sincerity in this matter and I think the points are worth looking at and I will do so, I can assure him.

As far as I am personally concerned, if the universities can afford or will have—let us say they should—a course in social work, all of them, I would appreciate it very much. Anything I could do from where I stand to encourage this I would, I can assure you. I think perhaps the course at Ryerson will be an encouragement and will be sort of a guiding light toward that end somewhere or another, especially in the undergraduate field.

I like the idea and the point that he brought out, that professionals cannot do the whole thing. As a matter of fact, they can do very little when it comes to that field, I would say. I still like the good old common horse sense of people who deal with people as they go along and they do not need a lot of fancy education to do that. I have been in the field myself when I was younger, and when I was a country lawyer, if you wish, and I have had many occasions to deal with these things. I found out that people can be talked to much easier, they are not as scared, if they know they are on the same level, rather than when talking to some guy with a lot of titles at the end of his name.

Mind you, graduates of the in-service training and the practical course for the people going on the job, those who have that experience, they get to know the people and they get to be trusted. They are not only there to fill in forms, I can assure you. If I left that impression, I wish to take it back. They are there also to counsel people. They are sort of like a father confessor in many instances and they can give good advice. This I know. And I know that these people do not look at the clock to see what time it is and if they should quit work. There is no time of the day or night when they do that. My hon. friend knows this, too. I think we cannot do without those people. I would rather do without the professionals than I would do without these people.

I would say I appreciated his words and I can assure him that they will be given very close study.

In respect to the hon. leader of the Opposition, I think he, too, understands how we work and he understands, too, that some matters are very difficult sometimes to put into practice, although they are there and we are trying to do these things as much as we can. We are only human beings, and he knows that.

I would like to say, by the way, that I appreciate his words when he mentioned four regional welfare services. I found out this afternoon before I came in here that there is another region that has come in definitely and that is the district of Parry Sound. Again, Mr. Chairman, I do not know, and perhaps I am all wrong, but I just cannot force anything upon anybody. I like them to come along and I try to persuade them, and I think maybe the new Act, which this Legislature has been so kind to pass, at least in second reading, and up until third reading, to help these people in their administration costs, will be a means of bringing them in. Mind you, I have never met any groups yet—and I have talked to many groups, united counties or groups of that description—who have spoken against regional welfare consolidation. They are all for it.

But at the same time, if my hon. friend has any experience with people out in the country dealing with county councils and that sort of thing, you are dealing with hard stock politicians. As far as we are concerned here, we are sissies compared to these fellows. So these are the fellows you have to convince.

But I am quite satisfied, sir, that we will do so in the long run because they take experience from the others. That is one way

of doing it, and I hope we will be successful, and I hope that next year that number will be more than doubled. As a matter of fact, what happened when I made a plea for this at their convention recently was interesting. Something I seldom do is to have a speech that I have made—because I never found them that good—printed and distributed, but I have been requested to do that for them, so apparently they have shown some interest, at least.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know what else I can add here. I will easily tell you that I do not profess to have that great ability of retaining the speeches very well, and the meat that is in them. I am trying, as I talk to you, to remember what has been said and if I have not answered most of the points, I felt that they were a theory expressed to help me in my work more than questions to be asked directly about administration, which really is what the estimates are. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks that were made by the hon. gentlemen in question. I know they were sincere and I know they have been made to help me, and those who work with me in the performance of what we have to do each and every day.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a couple of comments, if I could. I am a little concerned by the hon. Minister's remarks that in a professional worker, as far as he is concerned, good old common sense is the thing that counts. When I think of the great advances in medical science, Mr. Chairman, I would rather take a young doctor who has studied, and graduated, and got some degrees after his name when I am lying on an operating table, than I would some horse-and-buggy old guy who has got some kind of medicine.

I would say that in the social sciences, although it may be hard for some to realize, there have been discoveries, there have been new approaches in connection with behaviour problems, and so on. I am just a little concerned about constant reliance on the fact that in the case of the professional, someone who happened to go and study some of the social science that is developing around the world, you are suspicious of them, because that is what I infer from it, and I suggest that is probably the case.

I believe there could be a very stultifying atmosphere in your department where there have been people who have felt that, according to regulation 22, you give an unmarried mother 20 bucks. That is according to the old Elizabethan law, which is almost like a

rite from the Bible, from a descendency from one of Moses' utterances, but this is what we stand by. Ours is not to question why, ours is but to do and die.

I think there needs to be a little more questioning in your department, and I think that you need a little bit of theory to get away the cobwebs of practice, because you are costing us a lot of money with your cobwebs of practice.

I suggest that my hon. friend from Scarborough West is introducing a breath of fresh air in this Legislature with some of his approaches. And if you suggest that this is new or something else, then I say, with great respect, that there is senility developing on the part of a government that has been in for 22 years.

May I say I am not referring to you personally, but to the philosophy of a department that cannot look at fresh new ideas. The hon. members drew them from around the world to you.

One of the things that concerned me is that you have not used imagination to recruit new people. And I was concerned at your whole attitude to women—and I will pause after that. I wanted to say that I have a column here, it is "Do you want women to study their place in community?" What I noticed, and unfortunately it is not here—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That is a research.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, and it is a research that I am sure you and I would both gallantly step into to look at. One of our situations is this, that when you talked of common sense—and I want to concur with you to some extent on this—I think just academic background in itself is not enough when dealing with human beings. On the other hand, I do think that from social science research we are learning more about behaviour problems. I think that there should be a balance of these two, but I never sneer at a guy who has a professional degree. I appreciate the hon. Minister did not say that, so I stress it.

Let me say this—and this comes back to the manpower study that my hon. colleague from Scarborough West was talking about—I know that he was including women when he referred to manpower. It is because of his legal background that he refers to man when he is also referring to woman.

Let me say that in the United States there was a report of the commission on the status of women, and I am bringing this up because

of the reactionary approach that we had from certain members around here the other night when it was thought that women might perhaps want to do more in their society. It was suggested that in some cases the only reason that they move out into society to take jobs is not from the economic need but because they have got to keep up with the Joneses or something else. The hon. Minister of Labour did not say that, but there were some others, more reactionary in their conservative thinking than the hon. Minister, who certainly suggested that. I would say in my own riding that there are an awful lot of women who have to get out to work, and they would love to be able to stay at home.

Let me come to this study because this is an untapped source that you have not used enough. This is from this president's report on the status of women. It is a part-time study:

The commission finds that for mature women using educational facilities at any level, part-time study is the most likely pattern. Its legitimacy must be recognized by institutions of higher learning in assessing plans of study suggested on this basis, and by academic and other bodies determining eligibility for fellowships, scholarships and loans.

The problem: The problem is the current rigidity in regard to admission—prerequisites, residence and scheduling. They have to be made more flexible. For example, proficiency testing should be widely available as a means of obtaining credit for knowledge acquired outside regular academic courses.

I think my hon. friend would agree with it.

In the nursing profession, in the welfare services, you have women with experience of having brought up children, with a sympathy toward the problems. You have a whole untapped force there, and I consider that one of the reasons why they are not being attracted to take part in this field after their children are grown up is because of the rigidity on the part of both university and training courses, and I would include Ryerson with that. You have got a kind of a time-clock approach, so you say they have to be there at nine for their study and leave at five.

Some of them would be glad to work part time, but they have to get home in order to cook supper for their family and keep it together. There has been no imagination in this area, yet here is a great wealth of source. I would hope in your manpower study you will be including women, and

trying to think in terms of the woman. Let me say that we never think in terms of the woman in our society, in the vocational work. The hon. Minister of Labour, I think, is probably doing a study now on this. He has got a women's division, I understand, but certainly from this—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We think of them every day.

Mr. Thompson: Have you done much study in some areas?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Certainly we have.

Mr. Thompson: Well, let us have a look at some of this kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Have you seen any of the surveys in this field?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I have. I have looked at some of your surveys.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Then you must know what has been done on them, the work that has been done on them.

Mr. Thompson: For example, in nursing and nursery schools, I could ask the hon. Minister, how did you decide on priority of giving grants to nursery schools? Did the hon. Minister decide to put them in certain industries? Did you decide to place them in certain hospitals? What areas did the hon. Minister decide that the nursery schools should get grants for the working woman? What about certain ethnic groups in connection with where there are two parents who have to get out to work to get established? Have you done studies on this to know that a nursery school should be located there?

I will tell you bluntly, you have not. You have not done studies on so many areas, and the hon. member for Scarborough West was completely on the mark. Last year, I asked, for example, about rehabilitation services. How many people in this province needed rehabilitation services? The hon. Minister told me he did not know. The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) does not even know this. I do not want to wax irritated at the inefficiency that I behold in the department, otherwise it would take me from now until six o'clock at night.

But to tell you we have done studies, sir, is just not accurate. On the one study that you did do, on the 100 cases, we heard the ludicrous philosophy in which you came out as saying that most of these people could not be employable. I think there was an

editorial in one of the papers saying, "Cecile puts his foot in his mouth again," or something. Take advantage of the very meagre studies you have done, but do more. One area to attack is women, and I will come to that later because, under rehabilitation, I want to talk about the rehabilitation of this lost sex and show that they should be able to play a greater part in the community.

Vote 1705 agreed to.

On vote 1706:

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks to make on this vote. First I would like to note that the general welfare assistance estimates have increased, between 1964 and 1966, some \$16,041,064 to \$19,319,000 in 1965, and to \$25,534,000 for the estimates of this fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I am not quoting these figures to criticize The Department of Public Welfare for these increases. I would like to say, however, that this does not prove that a better job is being done. I think it can be said, without fear of contradiction, and it has been said many times today, that a lack of trained workers, at all levels, tends to make us wonder whether this money is really being spent in an adequate manner.

I would like to make a few comments on a series of articles published in the *Ottawa Citizen* in March this year. I do not agree with all the facts and figures in these five articles. These articles have been objected to by social workers and others because: (1) The series did not present a balanced picture of the welfare situation in Ottawa; (2) Statistics had been twisted; (3) Selected exceptional cases had been used to make the points; and (4) The articles negated the value of education in welfare worker training.

In the first of these articles—and I think this will be of interest to the hon. Minister; he has probably read those articles, or someone from his department has done so—it says:

Ottawa's welfare department has replaced its knuckledusters of yesteryear with fancy kid gloves. Financial assistance, once so grudging, is now as free as the law permits. The welcome mat is out all the way. As the result city welfare assistance doubled and redoubled during the past five years from \$545,000 in 1959 to more than \$2 million in 1964.

I am talking about the city of Ottawa, where there is perhaps the smallest number of unemployed in this province; and this is the story of welfare assistance in that city.

And the 24,410 persons assisted in 1959 mushroomed to a record of 73,000 in 1964, a figure equal to 30 per cent of Ottawa's total population. In addition, a sum exceeding \$3 million was paid out in Ottawa by provincial and federal governments for child welfare, mothers' allowances, old age assistance, excluding pensions, medical and dental services, blind persons' allowances, and other welfare payments.

Now a little further in this first article it says:

Now the case load threatens and still threatens to smother the workers, many of whom were forced to deal with 200 and even 300 files at a time.

I shall not read the entire article, it would take too much time, but I think I can quote you some of the pertinent facts.

There is one thing that is being said in the article, and that is the fact that perhaps a lot of people leave the smaller municipalities to come into the larger cities, and this problem applies to Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Ottawa, and other places.

This article says:

Probably the reluctance of the smaller municipalities to accept this responsibility will never be better revealed than by a letter received by the Ottawa department of welfare, in reply to its request for a verification of residence for Mr. and Mrs. Mike Smith.

This couple, wrote the welfare officer of an eastern Ontario township, is a prime example of the kind of person whom we are expected to assist and support through welfare. He will only work if there is no alternative, and then only if he can see his way clear to swindle his employer or helpers or someone. He lacks ambition to get up and go to work when he is employed. He is unreliable and even objectionable if work is provided for him. He has lived here for two years with no welfare because he knew it was not the habit to grant welfare to persons of his age—

he was 40 years of age:

—and ability, who was in good health. Here we tell them: "There is a job in your trade, so hop to it," and if he did not work that is his fault, not the fault of the municipality.

Then they go on, naturally, about how this gentleman left this small municipality and came to Ottawa to receive welfare assistance.

From this second article, I will just pick out one paragraph here and there:

What is more, this fact is often so obvious that welfare workers actually a lot's concern

played persons not to go to work. They would be fools, one welfare official explained, to take a job, say, at \$50 a week when it means they would be cut off welfare assistance. Why I would not do it myself.

Then another paragraph here:

Other so-called employable persons seek the sympathy of their doctors, some of whom grant certificates of unemployability at the drop of a hat.

Then they talk about Alan Brown, 48, who was not satisfied when a doctor found no applicable disease and rated him fully employable. So, six weeks later, he went to another doctor who, referring to his previous examination reported:

"This man has had the benefit of a thorough medical recently and nothing in particular turned up. I would categorize him as a medically unstable person." Mr. Brown is now home free and can go on receiving welfare assistance indefinitely without fear of being asked to find a job unless, of course, a future medical report tells a different story.

Mr. Chairman, I have another paragraph in the third article. This is in connection with welfare workers and the job they have to perform:

We found no welfare workers who did counsel their clients to the full extent of their considerable abilities, though most were aware that this was not their prime function. Many felt that they had no choice, in the absence of more qualified assistance, but to offer the best advice they could. "What do you do?" asked Sid Ford, a welfare worker who is married and has two children, "when you recommend that a woman who has just had her eighth illegitimate child should see her doctor regarding birth control and she refuses?"

In the same article, they refer to the lack of social workers available. They refer to one, a girl 21 years of age, a graduate of St. Patrick's college, who carried a load of about 150 cases just nine months after being on the job:

Miss Gray says she was most disturbed by the poor diet of many welfare recipients. Some mothers fed their children nothing but bread and milk for a large part of each month. In most welfare homes, it was a feast when the monthly welfare cheque arrived, then after a very few days it was back to the bread and milk. Efforts to assist families budget their spending were generally futile. They simply had too many

bills to pay. One man had only \$12 left for food after he paid his bills, Miss Gray said, "How can he possibly live for a month on that?"

In such cases she would sometimes ask the Salvation Army to help out, which it invariably did, with big boxes of canned foods.

Article number four talks about how hard it is to turn back the needy, and this article talks about the regional office at 288 Dalhousie Street where about 80 per cent of applications are received:

—is modern and bright with private cubicles for consultation. Unless a case is urgent, Mr. Georgenis prefers to have interviews conducted by appointment. Each of his workers hears seven applications on a typical day, allowing about 45 minutes for an interview.

Single applicants are generally judged on their record of residence. All applicants are obliged to state whether they have money in the bank before the city will help them, and the welfare department has the right, if it cares to exercise it, to search the list of depositors in local banks to discover if a particular applicant is telling the truth.

On one occasion the city found it was supporting a woman who had \$11,000 in her savings account. Recently assistance was refused to two elderly sisters who claimed they could not make ends meet on their income. They had been trying to squeeze by on the interest on their savings; the principal totalled more than \$60,000.

Article number 5 talks about the various problems of the welfare setup in Ottawa, and this paragraph says:

Every welfare worker in the firing line knows full well that money alone can never bring victory. Yet, because it is the only ammunition available, he makes the most of it.

I visited welfare aided homes in Ottawa where the filth and stench were so bad you would swear the occupants kept a dead horse in the cellar. In a gloomy corner you would find half a dozen tiny children huddled around an old TV set. It was as if their only glimpse of the world was caught through a 17-inch screen. Curiously, almost every welfare home has a television set. Youngsters often call it their "dream" box.

Without doubt, extreme poverty exists in Ottawa, no less than in other cities, and nobody has found a cure for it; and the city welfare department director, Mr. Godfrey, last year initiated a series of

training programmes for his staff that gives promise for the future. To spur the effort, he hired Miss Jean Grant, an MSW graduate of the University of Toronto with 18 years experience in the Toronto welfare department. She is in charge of the training programme and, at the same time, supervises the department's child welfare unit, comprising four workers who specialize in cases involving child maltreatment neglect.

Attempts have been made to co-ordinate the various services of welfare in Ottawa. Apparently they have not encountered too much success and, as this article says, in ending:

However, past attempts at co-ordination by the Ottawa welfare council were unsuccessful. Explained a spokesman: "Nobody wants to be co-ordinated."

Mr. Chairman, I think this series of articles—and I have already said that I do not agree with everything that appears in them—seems to prove what my hon. friend from Scarborough West and my hon. leader have said about the lack of social workers in the field.

Naturally there are not enough social workers in the provincial Department of Public Welfare, and I think the same problem exists all throughout the province in various municipalities.

I would like to say a word or two, Mr. Chairman, about housing and welfare, because in this amount we pay out for welfare in this province, I think we have quite a considerable amount of money for housing. Some time ago there was a meeting of the Ottawa welfare council where the question of housing was discussed. It was said at the time that there were approximately 900 to 1,500 families in Ottawa who needed public housing.

In the past few years no housing of any importance has been made available to families receiving assistance. Mind you, my point is this: There have been a number of new housing units built in Ottawa but very, very few of those housing units have been made available to the families receiving assistance, particularly to large families. Welfare workers have told me that no more than eight families with limited income had been given suitable housing in the last year or so.

In the case of private owners, of course, we understand that they will rent their homes or their houses in better circumstances. I would just like, in closing, to make a few remarks about this family that I know well, living not far from my own home—a family

of eight children, father and mother. The father is working and the mother is at home, and the father works for possibly seven or eight months a year and is out of work for the balance of the year. At the present time, this family receives assistance from the city of Ottawa, and consequently from this department.

This family is living in a very old, unpainted house, where they are paying \$95 a month rent. This house, if it were not rented to that type of a family, might bring about \$35 or \$40 in rent. But this family is really paying a tremendous rent because this is the only accommodation that is available. It means that this government is paying quite a considerable amount of money, not only for the rent of those people but for other welfare allowances. I say that there should be better co-ordination between The Department of Public Welfare and the other departments in order to avoid this kind of a situation.

We know that these families need assistance, but I am sure that this one family, for instance, if it received proper assistance from a social worker, could be off the welfare rolls within one year. Naturally, this cannot be done at the present time because of the lack of sufficient trained social workers. But, continuing on this thought, that was very well explained by my hon. friend from Scarborough West, of having sufficient trained workers, I am sure that not only this one case I am quoting, but many other cases throughout the province, could be taken off the welfare rolls if we had a sufficient number of trained workers to rehabilitate those families.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: No, go ahead.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I want to make reference to one part of the hon. Minister's opening presentation, that part which disappointed me, frankly, more than any other. I suppose there are degrees of disappointment in the minds of the Opposition—the hon. Minister doubtless smiles to himself—but it occurred on page 8, and it came as the last paragraph of a very perfunctory summary of nursing home regulations, and read as follows:

The third major effect of the new regulation is to maintain high standards of care for the health, safety, and well-being of the residents and the efficiency of the nursing home.

Mr. Chairman, our nursing home legislation, supervision, well-being, and maintenance of care is a travesty in the province of Ontario. It is one of the most serious areas of government delinquency that we have had during the course of this session.

It was exceedingly sad to those of us on this side of the House that after the excessive public furor in the concentration of the media, the newspapers and informed opinion on the inadequacies of nursing homes, the hon. Minister could walk blithely into the House on the lead-off of his estimates and suggest that all we would do would be to perpetuate these new regulations which are already proven in the minds of those to whom they will apply as irrelevant and ineffective. Maybe the hon. Minister can answer some questions about these new regulations, promulgated under The General Welfare Assistance Act in December, 1964. Section 27 (e) says:

Proprietor means the person who has been granted a licence to operate a nursing home under a bylaw passed by the council of the municipality in which the nursing home is situated.

Mr. Chairman, how does the hon. Minister judge a proprietor? On what basis? With what qualification? What qualification is needed to be one of those who looks after a total of 5,500 people in nursing home care across the province?

Then 27 (l) says:

An inspection of the building is made each night to ensure that there is no danger of fire.

By whom, Mr. Chairman, and under what circumstances?

Section 27 (m) says:

Adequate supervision is provided at all times for the security of the residents and the nursing homes.

What adequate supervision? How can you define adequate supervision? What does the hon. Minister mean by adequate supervision?

Similarly 27 (s) says:

Adequate dietary standards are maintained in the nursing home, and nourishing meals are provided at regular and reasonable intervals and are prepared by or under the supervision of a competent person.

What adequate dietary standards? And which nourishing meal? And what kind of effrontery is it to pass this vagary in legislation when one scandal after another reveals

the hopeless inadequacy of so much of our nursing home structure?

Section 27 (b) says:

A sufficient number of staff in relation to the number of residents cared for is on duty in the nursing home at all times.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House challenge the hon. Minister. What does he mean by a sufficient number of staff? What are these nebulous staff ratios which result only in the damage of our elder citizens?

Each member of staff is of suitable age, physically fit, and qualified to undertake his duties in the nursing home, and certified by a physician to be free from active tuberculosis or other communicable or contagious diseases.

What qualifications? How does one establish them? What kind of control is the province prepared to exert over nursing homes which now, it is known widely, have been abusing the privilege of caring for elderly citizens?

Section 27 (y) says:

Medical care and attention is made available to the resident.

What is meant by medical care? Under what circumstances? How does the hon. Minister apply it?

And then section 28, I guess it would be, subsection (g), says:

For the purposes of subsection 7 the director may require the inspection of the nursing home by a provincial supervisor.

Why should inspection be a permissive part of this legislation? Why is it not mandatory? And why is it not made regular? Why is it not accepted on a constant basis across the board?

Finally let me refer to number (f):

Adequate arrangements are made so that a physician is available at all times to provide medical care and attention, in emergency or otherwise, as may be required from time to time by any resident.

How do you guarantee such an establishment? How, Mr. Chairman, has the hon. Minister sought to guarantee it under the regulations of 1964 which, in their context, are in some respects even more ludicrous than the regulations which preceded them? Indeed, Mr. Chairman, that is by no means the opinion of isolated members of this House, it is the opinion of Associated Nursing Homes Incorporated, Ontario, which circularized a letter to—

Mr. Chairman: May I ask the member if he would confine his remarks to vote 1706, general welfare? Homes for the aged is the next vote.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I am on vote 6, General Welfare Assistance Act, under which fall all the nursing home regulations. This is the only branch under which they legitimately come. The hon. Minister is nodding his head in agreement, Mr. Chairman. They would not, in fact, come legitimately under any other branch, not nursing homes as such. Am I right Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: Thank you. The associated nursing homes then circularized a letter to all the hon. members of this Legislature, and indeed to the public at large. They indicated that the government had not even taken the trouble to evaluate its new regulations in the presence of the people who would have to enforce them. This is a pretty serious proposition, Mr. Chairman, when you are dealing with the lives of 5,500 people, at a minimum, in the province of Ontario. And what did the letter say; what did the associated nursing homes have to say? They said as follows, and I quote:

Regulations imposed on essential facilities without consideration of their feasibility or enforceability are not only useless—

I emphasize, “are not only useless”:

—but hamper the efforts of persons concerned with providing services to those requiring nursing home care.

Then they ask some very pertinent questions and I quote:

How is it possible to employ registered nurses and registered nurses’ assistants according to the demands of the regulations when the number of these persons available in Ontario is not sufficient to staff our active treatment and chronically ill hospitals? If professional nursing services were available to staff nursing homes according to the regulations, how can nursing homes absorb this increased cost of care and provide all the other essentials to good patient care at the per diem rate for care set by The Department of Public Welfare?

Obviously both questions are applicable, both questions are appropriate and both questions were never taken into account by the department before it drafted the regulations.

Then we have this very interesting accompanying letter from the medical officer of

health in Kent county, as he applies the proposed bylaw to the establishment of four very good nursing homes in Kent county. He said this:

The present nursing home bylaw has little legal force. It is quite possible to run a nursing home and not be licensed.

I repeat, “and not be licensed.”

The present bylaw is not designed to upgrade nursing homes, its only purpose is to facilitate welfare payments and prevent the indigent inhabitant of a nursing home from becoming a charge on the welfare budget of the municipality. The proposed new bylaw for nursing homes suffers from all the defects of previous bylaws for nursing homes. It in no way prevents unscrupulous operators from running shabby nursing homes.

Is it the policy of this government, Mr. Chairman, to promulgate regulations which promote the running of shabby nursing homes by unscrupulous operators? Obviously, the hon. Minister would answer in the negative. But that is the effect of his regulation as at present constituted.

Then the medical officer of health in Kent county questions one after another the regulations which I raised a few short minutes ago in this House and indicates that they are distinctly inappropriate and cannot possibly be enforced in one respect after another.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we had a pretty serious crisis in the nursing home field. We related hair-raising stories in the press, of abuse and damage to senior citizens, of exploitation and inadequate medical attention. We had private surveys done, and individual stories in various periodicals and newspapers of the day. There developed a public furor which, in its proportion, was equalled only by the hospital bed shortage in Metropolitan Toronto last year. And the hon. Minister of Public Welfare went into hiding, and came forth with this anaemic recitation of regulation—the total purpose of which would be to perpetuate the ills which have existed up till now.

Then the Ontario welfare council, Mr. Chairman, was good enough to release to the public the results of a preliminary survey. The two major points in that survey were as follows: Out of 425 nursing homes in the province, 165 give inadequate care—165 out of 425. How does the hon. Minister justify it? And, in addition, the nursing homes employ 1,034 practical nurses for whom there is no consistent training programme in the province of Ontario.

Some of the things the report did not say,

which will be new to this Legislature but which I suspect the report will say, is that we now, at the nursing home level, have only one registered nurse for every 36.8 patients. And, on the basis of all of the model nursing homes operated in the province of Ontario, that ratio should be one to 17 patients. In other words, the ratio is something under half of what it should be. And I say, Mr. Chairman, in the strongest possible terms to the hon. Minister, that that is not geriatric care, that is geriatric contempt. It is not geriatric aid, it is geriatric abuse.

It is not sufficient merely to have a select committee on aging studying the problem at this point. The select committee on aging has a very able chairman, and it is doing some very effective work; but if memory serves me it was the select committee on aging that also became concerned about the nature of the nursing home regulation.

Now we have had the associated nursing homes expressing the same concern, within the last week, to the hon. members of this Legislature. And it seems to me that we cannot sit back in a sort of reconciled washing of hands and say that we will wait for a final report from the select committee, or we will alter these things some time in the future. There is nothing, Mr. Chairman, but nothing, preventing this hon. Minister from reconstituting the entire set of nursing home regulations; indeed, I want to suggest to him in a moment that he can go much further than that; and I intend, on behalf of our party, to set out an alternative proposal in this entire field.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that neither the major scandals nor the general public inquiry has been answered by this quiet, reticent, whispering declaration on the part of the hon. Minister that the purpose of the new regulations is to maintain high standards of care. Your medical officers of health claim that you will lower care.

The hon. Minister says "Name one." I have spoken to other doctors in health areas; I can think of Dr. Dale in Wellington county, I believe, who submitted alternative nursing home regulations. We have the medical officer of health in Kent county. One can think of several across this province.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: On both sides.

Mr. S. Lewis: On both sides? I hesitate to suggest that, Mr. Chairman. I would think that all the medical officers of health are unanimous in their feeling that the regulatory function by the provincial government, where nursing homes are concerned, must necessarily be inadequate.

And, Mr. Chairman—this is equally important—this government treats nursing homes and the work they must fulfill in this society in a patchwork and disoriented way. You have your Homes For Special Care Act under The Department of Health; you have your nursing homes applied under general welfare assistance; you have the sheltered home care under another Act; you have foster home care under yet another one. There is no co-ordination or integration of this entire field.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that is more than half the problem, that in the plethora of Acts and the amalgam of administration we are defeating our own purposes; we are undermining every single constructive proposal that might be made.

It cannot go on, Mr. Chairman; it cannot be allowed to go on. There are 5,500 people involved. The majority of them, the vast majority of them, 77.9 per cent of them, if memory serves me, are in nursing homes of less than 20 beds; and every reputable study of nursing homes suggested that figure is, in fact, too small, that you cannot maintain the kind of standards required unless you have homes of at least 40 or 50 beds, when the size of the problem is to this extent. There are some of us who would quarrel with the whole rationale of nursing home care. That can be left for another time, during another session. But, under the circumstances as presently constituted, the small nature of the homes, the inability of supervision, our inability to supervise adequately, and the lack of provincial direction, I suggest to you, are very serious liabilities.

So, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make the following proposal to the government and to the hon. Minister; and I think it is a proposal which would be echoed by people directly involved in the field of geriatric services. I wish to propose a new Act governing the licensing, administration, and operation of nursing homes in this province. What Ontario needs at this moment, when nursing homes are essentially business ventures to rehabilitate the aged, is a specific nursing home Act, an Act comparable to The Homes for the Aged Act. Such a nursing home Act should include in its jurisdiction nursing homes and sheltered care homes. The Act would supersede and consolidate all existing legislation, whether presently applicable to The Department of Health or The Department of Public Welfare.

Now, in other words, Mr. Chairman, these nebulous regulations must be defined as to what is meant by "nursing home" and what is meant by "sheltered care home"; and the

constant overlapping, confusion, and competition between departments must somehow be overcome.

My second suggestion is that the new Act should specifically define "nursing home and sheltered care home services" as distinct from "boarding home services."

Third, nursing homes and sheltered care homes must be provincially licensed under one government department.

Fourth, this nursing home Act should apply to all nursing and sheltered care homes, not just those including welfare recipients or patients discharged from Ontario hospitals.

Fifth, there must be a uniform licence fee for nursing and sheltered care homes.

Sixth, we need in Ontario a training programme for practical nurses, which would meet the approval of the college of nurses of Ontario. Training plans should take advantage of existing programmes 3, 4 and 5 under the Dominion-provincial retraining agreement. Indeed, section 3 in particular opens up the range of training for practical nurses to staff nursing homes. It has not thus far been exploited by the government.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose on behalf of my party that an information and service bureau be set up in urban areas and in county health units. This service would place residents in the proper facility—that is, either a nursing home, a shelter care home, a boarding home for the aged, or a foster home for the aged. Regulations to the new nursing home Act would follow these lines, and let me set them out:

1. Exact definition of nursing sheltered care and boarding home services; that does not exist under the present regulation.

2. Staff required and its ratio to the number of beds for all three types of homes; that is not given under the present Act. And the inspection needed within all three categories relating to medical officers of health, fire and building departments.

3. What is required for the physical plant of such homes, doors, fire escapes, adequate landscape features, windows, toilets, baths, temperature—all these things must be spelled out if our nursing home legislation is to operate effectively.

4. Nightly inspection of the homes, elimination of fire hazards, use of oxygen, water supply, fire alarms, fire drills, etc.

5. Preparation of food and diets and dietary standards generally in something other than "adequate dietary standards will be maintained." Declarations of motherhood, Mr.

Chairman, are not appropriate in provincial regulations.

6. Patients' records should be uniform in all homes.

7. Qualifications of the nursing staff, the kitchen and cleaning staff should be set out.

8. Definite arrangements for medical and dental care for each resident. Not medical and dental care holus-bolus on one visit, but a regulation for each patient.

9. Medication control, such as locked cupboards for drugs, and records kept, as required by law.

10. A minimum standard programme of recreation and reactivation, including the provision of a common room on each floor of a home. One of the most despairing features of nursing homes as they are presently run, and as I think the final Ontario welfare council report will show, is that the reactivating ingredient, the rehabilitative features, are the ones most woefully lacking. We consign our elderly to the wastebasket of the geriatric system, and that is not good enough. It is scandalous that the government is prepared to tolerate it, and if one is going to set up legislation to give nursing homes for aged, then the least one can do is to have the moral and social responsibility to set up the minimum regulations and enforce them by government.

And finally, Mr. Chairman:

11. Treatment rooms and equipment for emergency cases.

The hon. Minister of Public Welfare has been quoted as pondering provincial licensing of nursing and sheltered care homes. This would only be a halfway measure, I suggest, for a service that is fraught with ineptitude and malpractice. Indeed, if pressed I have cases of malpractice on my desk here in the Legislature now, which would make—I do not mean this unkindly, Mr. Minister—even the small fertility on the top of his head rise and take notice. Nothing short of a new and stringent nursing home Act will alleviate the situation of thousands of older persons in nursing homes, and set a provincial standard for nursing homes.

Mr. Chairman, the provincial government, and The Department of Public Welfare in particular, can no longer retreat from this proposition. It is no longer sufficient to think in terms of regulations only, I suggest. Indeed, I suspect, I have read many of the submissions—my hon. colleague from Hamilton was good enough to show some of them to me—I have read some of the submissions made to the select committee on aging, and

I think that the people in the field are obviously moving in the direction of something more than mere regulation. They are moving in the direction of a consolidating Act for nursing home and sheltered care home care, stringently and vigorously run by this department of government, with no holds barred, tolerating no further abuse, recognizing the trite but important maxim that the aged have made an immeasurable contribution to this society, and that we have a moral responsibility to provide for them once that contribution has terminated.

That, Mr. Chairman, is our proposal.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, a lot of the words my hon. friend has spoken I thought maybe I had written myself at one time or another. But I would like to put the situation in perspective now. You say that the government of Ontario, or some department of government, should now license all these homes? With that I do not disagree. That is coming to a fruition, I think. But we do not want to apply the remedy too soon in case the remedy might be worse than the cure for the time being. There is a progression towards this goal.

As far as these regulations are concerned, as you know, we are not licensing, as of now, the nursing homes. We are simply reimbursing the municipalities who license these homes with part of the cost that they pay for indigents while in these homes. We have increased these subsidies towards that service, and the regulations have been made more stringent than usual because of the fact that we are leading exactly to what my hon. friend has in mind.

I would much prefer to have across the province homes for the aged in sufficient numbers that they would take care of all our aged people if that were possible. I think we have established as policy now that we are trying to build more than one home in each county. Instead of having one institution, we will have more distributed all over the area where they are needed, because that will render a better service in that particular instance. The homes will never become large institutions, but will always remain as a home. All of the facilities are in these homes for the aged that were mentioned a moment ago. We have features of reactivation and common rooms and so on.

I think we are leading up to licensing, and I appreciate the doctor's point of view of a moment ago. But other doctors may want the plan in reverse. I have letters from some doctors who do not agree with the hon. member. I have the expert doctors in my

department who certainly have a lot of experience in this, and are complete professionals in this matter. I have reference to the two main doctors there, Dr. Stuart and Dr. Priddle, who are very well known, and who say this is a progression towards the idea that you have in mind. As a matter of fact, I have had that idea in mind for many years.

I cannot tell you now under which department licensing should be because of the features it has, but I believe this department has handled the nursing home problem in pretty fair fashion so far, and I think it may be that you are right when you say it should be done this way. In other words, it should be fashioned along those lines. With that I do not disagree.

He knows very well, and I guess he has mentioned this, that many people get into the nursing home field now. Retired doctors, for instance, retired nurses, and so on, are getting into this field on a very high quality basis. So much so that no indigent would ever be placed in some such nursing homes as exist now in a few instances. But the day will arrive, and, like my hon. friend, I hope it will arrive, when there is control over all these nursing homes, and we can deal with the municipalities in the same way we deal now with those who are indigent. And the programming will be just as good for that particular person as for the person who can afford treatment. I think, in the main part of his talk in this respect, we are not too far apart. But at this present moment, I am advised that most of the people who run nursing homes across the province who want to get the service of a nurse or an assistant nurse, can get them if they wish to.

Mr. S. Lewis: May I answer the hon. Minister? I simply wanted to say to the hon. Minister, if he is in fact moving towards consolidation of an Act, that now is the time to start talking about it publicly. I feel that very earnestly. I think that we make a mistake in talking purely about the licensing of provincial nursing homes because it allows the field in general and the public in particular, to assume that all we are concerned with are particular features of particular regulations, rather than the overall social problem. If the hon. Minister is prepared to accept the proposition—I did not realize that he was—that a provincial nursing home Act is a likelihood in the future, then now is the time to talk about it, while the field is exceedingly fluid and flexible.

I want to suggest to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it is not the objective

which can kill the nursing home situation, it is the progression of steps towards that objective which is killing the situation, because the progression is in fact too extended.

I do not want to read a letter into the record, but the hon. Minister knows because he has received a copy, the hon. Minister of Health has received a copy, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) received a copy, and I spoke to the woman involved last night. He has received a copy of this famous case of a loss of some \$7,555 over a three-month period in one nursing home, Mr. Chairman; an approach to nursing homes which was not only exploitative in human terms; but in the worst kind of avaricious economic exploitation.

And this kind of thing can go on. It goes on apparently in many homes across the province. The licensing, the policing, the provincial Act is needed now, or you will have hundreds of people similarly exploited, in very short periods of time. In this case, less than three months, to lose \$7,500 to one unscrupulous nursing home operator!

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pursue the details because it is probably not right to do so, but it is a demonstration. I mention it because I know it has come to the hon. Minister's attention and it is a distinct case of the kind with which we are perpetually dealing in this field.

So let us have the Act without further ado—perhaps even before the select committee on aging reports.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have listened to the hon. Minister's remarks. He talks about "too soon," and he is working towards something.

As far as I am concerned, I have been appalled at the indifference on the part of this government to people who are placed in nursing homes, to the homes for the aged and to the whole approach that is being taken. I know you object to this because you always want to say Ontario is the leader. As you look at other countries, you see that there is a compassion and a respect and a dignity for people, especially the aged in their declining years.

Sir, there is a man who, in many other ways I have a great fondness for, but I think he developed the insidious disease which comes to a government that has been in power too long. This comes to a government that has been in for 22 years.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Are you referring to Mackenzie King?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am referring, frankly, to a man of whose riding I am a part-time constituent. In some ways I think he looks after some of his riding, but he has this dangerous, insidious disease of complacency.

These are remarks that he has made, sir, in a report from Queen's Park in the *Port Hope Evening Guide* of January 6. He says that today Ontario is considered to have the finest homes for the aged anywhere in the world and that very few in the United States even approach the facilities provided for aged persons in Ontario. It is interesting to see that, because that was given on January 6.

Let us look at some headlines, because I am going to raise the headlines that have been written steadily across this province. "Brutality probe uncovers 21 cases." Is this what you are satisfied is the finest in the world?

Mr. Reilly: Are those private?

Mr. Thompson: I am quoting now:

A six-week police investigation of alleged brutality in city nursing homes has revealed 21 cases in which there might be grounds to believe—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Nursing homes—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Not a home for the aged.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Stick to one subject at a time.

An hon. member: What are you talking about? Homes for the aged—

Mr. Thompson: What I am talking about is simply this, that you have had a responsibility for too long—

Mr. Walker: You will always be right where you are, in the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I have order?

Mr. Chairman: I would ask that you confine yourself to vote 1706, general welfare assistance branch.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I am. I am talking about general welfare assistance—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Thompson: You referred to the homes for the aged.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I referred to the homes for the aged and I would still maintain that

position, but now my hon. friend is making a comparison between a home for the aged and a nursing home and I do not think he should make that comparison.

Mr. Thompson: All right, I accept that. Let me put this to you. As far as I am concerned, you are responsible for the treatment of people in these nursing homes, whether they are aged or whether they are not, and for the standards and for the licensing, and you yourself have told us—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I am not responsible for the licensing.

Mr. Thompson: You have told us that you are going to move in. I hope I understood you, with respect to standards for these. I shall quote time after time, instances where because of indifference of government and where you have not looked into situations, there has been brutality uncovered in many situations. I just want to read a few of them into the record. This is from the *Globe and Mail* of June 30, 1964:

A six-week police investigation of alleged brutality in city nursing homes has revealed 21 cases in which there might be grounds to believe a criminal act has been committed, Chief Leonard Lawrence reported to the board of control yesterday.

I could go on into that fact. From Kirkland Lake—now I am going around the province a little bit:

Five elderly pensioners died last night when trapped in the blazing top room of a rooming house which served as a temporary old aged home.

Here is another:

DEATH AT GREEN ACRES HOME FOR AGED WILL BE PROBED

The action came after Mrs. Gertrude Atkins of Scarth Avenue complained her mother was not sent to hospital until five days after she fell and broke her hip.

Then it goes on into the fact where she says:

—residents sitting on toilets for long periods of time, calling for nurses who were too busy to come and help them back to bed.

I could go into many other areas.

From the *Hamilton Spectator* comes a picture headed "Rotten Drapes Again Budget Fight," and it shows a controller waving a tattered faded set of yellow drapes before his budget-cutting colleagues. The controller described the conditions of Macassa Lodge draperies; they are rotting off the walls, they are disgraceful. The story goes on right down

that line, and I realize some people will laugh. Sure, I want that on the record. They have laughed at us on it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: In the *Ottawa Journal*:

Mayor Reid promised Monday night to look into complaints about admittance requirements to Macdonald Manor apartment units project for the elderly.

It seems to be rather a dictatorial basis by one person who wants to—

Mr. Walker: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. leader of the Opposition permit a question? Did you ever visit Macassa Lodge? Did you ever visit—

Mr. Thompson: No, I did not.

Mr. Walker: Well, we did; that is why we laugh at your suggestion. So did the hon. gentleman down there and he would refute what you just said.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I am sorry. As I list time after time from reporters—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Never mind reporters, we were there.

Mr. Thompson: Are all the press wrong?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You cannot guarantee those facts.

Mr. Thompson: I see. Well, afterwards I will look through *Hansard* to see how many papers you have not guaranteed the accuracy of. I think there will be quite a number.

Mr. Kerr: Those papers must have quoted you wrong.

Mr. Thompson: In the *London Free Press* he is arguing for some kind of a halfway house situation, which would be established in homes for the aged and nursing homes to fit persons with minor disabilities, and also goes on listing a number of things which give some sense of responsibility to the patients.

"Rules Bar" is the heading in the *Globe and Mail*. I suppose that is another one you do not guarantee the accuracy of.

Many aged persons in Metropolitan Toronto who need low rental housing cannot get into existing facilities because of inflexible eligibility requirements, according to the Metro social planning council.

And then the article goes into a number of situations. The *Globe and Mail* did a fine series about the whole situation of homes for the aged being understaffed and so on.

Here is another one from the *Globe and Mail*, about Newmarket now:

Deputy Reeve Floyd Perkins of Richmond Hill yesterday told York county council that York Manor home for the aged was understaffed by Nursing Home Act standards. He told council the Act called for one registered nurse to be on duty at all times in the nursing home for each 50 patients. In the home for the aged, there are only three registered nurses on call for 150 patients.

And so it goes on. From the *Toronto Telegram*:

North Bay—Ontario Welfare Minister Cecile has refused to order an investigation into the home management unless the board asks for one, because it might bring on demands for a spate of other inquiries.

This is you quoted in the *Toronto Telegram* of March 25, 1965. It seems an awful kind of approach, but if you are concerned about the conditions, it seems to me—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: About having an investigation, Mr. Chairman, nobody from North Bay ever asked me for an investigation; that was strictly a question from a newspaper reporter to which I answered: "If somebody asks me for an investigation, then we will look into it if an investigation is required." But nobody ever asked me.

Mr. Thompson: I refer you to this and I do not know if you refuted this. I have been misquoted in the press myself. This is from the *Toronto Telegram*, March 25, 1965.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That is right; I remember the interview.

Mr. Thompson: If somebody had asked you for an investigation, you would have had one conducted, am I correct?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The municipality did not ask me for it; nor did anyone else.

Mr. Thompson: I go again into the *Niagara Falls Review*, which is urging a study into staffing needed at homes for the aged. I take here the *Toronto Daily Star* of December 30, 1963, which criticizes the treatment of the aged. Add that one to the list that you say I do not quote correctly. Perhaps you will agree with me on this:

"No country treats its older citizens as badly as Canada," Alderman May Pritchard said yesterday.

She goes on to say that Toronto has slums, whether we like to call them that or not. She

moves on to describing some of the homes that they have.

The *Telegram* of February 25, 1965—

Mr. Walker: The hon. leader of the Opposition is all wet, and he knows it, because he has never been there!

Mr. Thompson: How blind can you be?

Mr. Walker: Go and see it with your own eyes. All you are doing is reading—

Mr. Thompson: I am quoting, time after time, from a variety of newspapers from all over this province.

Mr. Walker: All you are doing is quoting from newspaper clippings. You have never been there!

Mr. Thompson: Let me suggest to you that I have been in some of these homes. I happened to work with an aged group myself at one point.

Mr. Walker: We had better put you on our committee and you would find out.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say that I would assume that this writer has been there, much as you have wanted to refute every single newspaper story here. Let me take another one—the *Toronto Telegram* of February 25, 1965:

A writer who worked undercover in Ontario nursing homes said last night: "Procedures read like a living script from Dickens' 'Oliver Twist'."

A report on nursing homes appeared in the March issue of *Chatelaine*—another thoroughly irresponsible report, I suppose. How blind can you be!

Mr. Walker: We are not arguing about nursing homes.

Mr. Thompson: I have quoted steadily from a number of papers about conditions in nursing homes, and if this particular colleague wants to suggest that these reporters are all inaccurate in the conditions which they describe, then I suggest that he really needs to get a new set of blinkers.

A report on nursing homes appeared in the *Toronto Telegram* and the author, Miss G. Salter, describes a Toronto home where patients are "treated like savages and the air is filled with violence." She goes further:

A helpless, sweet-faced, old lady covered her face with her hands when Miss Salter approached her.

And she goes on:

Her hands and arms were covered with livid bruises. She was told by an attendant that the bruises were the result of brutal handling.

The spattered floors and the battered walls were in keeping with the nauseous stench emanating from the rooms of neglected, incontinent patients. The helpless patients spent their days sitting on sodden piles of wet rags.

No backrubs were given, nor were chafed, wet body areas washed or dried. The nurse, on call 16 hours a day, lived in a town 60 miles away from Toronto.

"Nursing homes," said Miss Salter, "have become big business."

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Mr. Carruthers: Is that the article out of *Chatelaine*?

Mr. Thompson: No, it is from the *Toronto Telegram*.

Mr. Carruthers: Several of these articles, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

Mr. Carruthers: The point of order is this: You are quoting newspaper articles—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): What is wrong with that?

Mr. Carruthers: Many of these magazine articles have been written, and the writers have had a very difficult time to get them published.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is a good point of order—a very good point of order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Nursing homes—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: You used better material than this when you wrote them—

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, that as far as I am concerned I would not have the irresponsibility to suggest, as a number of your colleagues are doing, that all of these papers in some way have irresponsible re-

porters. I would have the sensitivity to say that these reporters are uncovering a desperate need, and a disgrace to every one of us, and to you, sir, and to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, for not having acted sooner. I am arguing the point that he says he does not want to move too soon. I am suggesting you are moving too late, and I am quoting reasons why I am suggesting you are moving too late:

"Nursing homes have become big business," she said last night, "and there are lots of racketeers in it. There is plenty of room for good private nursing homes. I just do not think people should make money out of human misery."

Let me go on with this.

This is from the *Toronto Telegram*, a paper which I must, in all honesty, say has not always shown a complete bias toward my own party. The headline says: "Woman Tied to Chair in Metro Nursing Home"; and this was April 3, 1965—not 1865, Mr. Minister, but 1965.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: If my hon. friend is trying to show me that nursing homes are not good in the province of Ontario as a general rule, as I said in my remarks a moment ago, he does not have to convince me that nursing homes in many cases are not what they are cracked up to be. I know this. The thing is that we are progressing toward this regulation, but if you apply the remedy too quickly, the cure might not be as good as it could be.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Minister, as far as I am concerned, I am reading an indictment of you. If you have been aware of these conditions over the years, and you stand up before this House and say that if we apply the remedy too quickly we might not arrive at the cure, then, sir, you should have resigned. You should have—if you have not come through with some legislation in order to protect the citizens of Ontario.

"Woman Tied to Chair in Metro Nursing Home" reads the headline, and you stand before us with a complacent face—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Why are you telling that to me? You should tell that to the metropolitan council or to the city council.

Mr. Thompson: I will tell it to whomever I feel is concerned, and who should do something about it; I feel you are, and that is why I am talking to you. The authority lies with you in connection with the standards,

Another headline—"Many Nursing Homes

Condemned as Fire Traps by Hospital Chief"—is in the *Globe and Mail* of January 8—two days, by the way, after my friend, the hon. member for Durham told us we had the finest in the world. Dr. John B. Neilson told the legislative select committee on aging: "From what I have seen of nursing homes, I hope if I become chronically ill—"

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: He has got to the point where he does not know what he is reading now. Does it say what the patient was tied with? I have been in nursing homes; I have been in local nursing homes where the patient has been tied in the chair with a bed sheet—very comfortable and perfectly in order. If she had not been tied in to it, she would have fallen out.

Mr. Thompson: Sir, I become more sickened with some of the arguments raised by this government. We had, at 999, a man who, we understand, has been tied to a chair because of lack of staff; he had not had proper treatment and he died. And we have the insipid kind of argument on the part of the hon. Minister of Health: "We tied him with a bed-sheet," he said, "what is wrong with that?" And for the hon. member for Durham to stand up and talk about a woman tied to a chair in a Metro nursing home, and say: "The fine point is how she is tied." I suggest he should be far more concerned with getting adequate staff and standards rather than the kind of rope you are going to tie people with.

Dr. John B. Neilson is a very responsible man according to some of you outside; he happens to hold a responsible position in our hospital services commission. And what did he tell the legislative committee on aging? He said, "From what I have seen of nursing homes, I hope, if I ever become chronically ill, that someone will not put me in one." He said a lot of these places are fire traps and the commission chairman said, of nursing homes, "I think my friend has been through a lot more than you have"—this is Dr. Neilson talking. Is he as irresponsible as all of these newspaper reporters, or would you say that he has some sense of responsibility about the welfare of the people within these homes?

He said there is no privacy in any nursing home he had ever been in, and a lot of these places are fire traps. "Garbage For The Blind"—let us have a look at this one. And the hon. Minister says, "Don't move too soon, we will work towards agreement, or work out something." And what do we get here? "Garbage

For The Blind" is the headline from the *Toronto Daily Star*, January 9, 1965.

Two statements about private nursing homes this week made a full-fledged inquiry a necessity.

Burrow Dean Morris, past president of the associated nursing homes of Ontario, testified before a legislative committee that some nursing home operators are profiteers who are cheating the public and shamefully mistreating elderly patients. He even suggested that some operators have indulged in despicable practices, such as feeding blind patients meals made up of scrapings from other inmates' plates.

Later in the week, Dr. J. B. Neilson, chairman of the Ontario hospital services commission, also deplored conditions in the province's nursing homes, charging that a lot of them were fire traps.

This is the end of the editorial of January 9, 1965:

Instead of treating serious charges by responsible people as if they were idle gossip—

and let me repeat that one for some of the hon. members in this Legislature:

—instead of treating serious charges by responsible people as if they were idle gossip, the provincial government should appoint a qualified commission of inquiry to search out the truth. The helpless old in nursing homes must be protected against swindling and neglect.

As far as I and my party are concerned, to hear that plaintive whine, "Don't let us move too soon," when I read out indictment after indictment and think of the suffering of each of the people in this kind of situation—

Mr. Carruthers: Would the hon. leader of the Opposition permit a question?

Mr. Thompson: I suggest to you that we have to move quickly and the government has to assume its responsibilities with respect to this whole area.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have listened to the cackle—because it is cackle, they really have not reflected much on it—

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Your own members know that statement is not true, they would not agree with you.

Mr. Thompson: I would say this, sir: If this is the attitude; and I am sure it is not because I notice from the front benches, the Treasury benches, we are getting a different approach

than we are getting from some of these fellows, they are listening attentively—

An hon. member: There are only three of them there.

Mr. Thompson: I suggest the hon. Minister is listening to this, but that there is an overwhelming indifference, a blindness on the part of a number of his colleagues. This is fine for me, but I say—

Mr. Carruthers: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Thompson: —I am making my appeal to the hon. Minister of Health on this. What should be done—

Mr. Chairman: If the member for Durham wants to speak afterwards he can. This member has the floor.

Mr. Thompson: What should be done—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: If I am lost on this, it is because I have such a mass of documentation by responsible reporters in connection with an examination of our nursing homes that I really find it hard to choose which to read. I may say that I also find a certain nausea at the fact that there is this indifference instead of an aroused concern—

Mr. Knox: It is not indifference!

Mr. Thompson: —an aroused concern by all of us to try to do something about it. Standards and control are obviously the first things, and I appreciate the hon. Minister is saying that he is looking into this area. All I say, sir, is in view of the reports that we have had steadily here, you should not be coming to us today saying: "I do not want to move too soon." You should be coming and saying: "I should have moved far long ago with respect to this." I suggest you have been moving, as you have in so many areas, too little and too late.

May I say that I could look, for example, at what they have done in Sweden and the standards they have set and the approaches they have taken to help older people, who can work in their community and live in a day care centre where they have freedom of movement. May I say there is a whole new approach there—and I will not go into it at this point—that can be applied with respect to this nursing care.

I would have hoped that before this session ends the hon. Minister would have come

through very clearly to declare the province's responsibility for demanding standards of these nursing homes. In view of the indictment we have made, in view of the obvious human suffering that these stories show, I would have hoped, sir, that the hon. Minister would have come through with legislation and with the full authority that he has as provincial Minister of Public Welfare, to say, "This mess is going to be cleaned up and I am going to see that citizens, older citizens and ill citizens, are not pushed around for cheap commercial gain and abused in hidden crevices of nursing homes around this province."

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Chairman, just to set the record straight, that statement I made to the Port Hope *Evening Guide*, I will back up any time, in any place.

As far as the provincial homes for the aged are concerned, they are the finest, I would say, on the North American continent. The committee visited a number of these. We visited the older homes in the province and I think thanks to the committee's work those homes are now going to be replaced. The hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, tried his best to confuse the issue, starting out with homes for the aged and then ended up with nursing homes, with a great number of comments from individuals who make personal comments through the press; in many cases, perhaps, just for publicity.

The one case in particular—I have explained this in the House before and he brings it up again—in connection with feeding the blind the scraps off the plates of other patients in nursing homes. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who made that statement was invited to come and verify those remarks before our committee but it was found he was not in a position to do so. It is rather odd that the same accusations, the same criticisms, appeared in an article in a United States publication. It paralleled exactly the remarks made by that gentleman in connection with feeding scraps to the blind off the plates of other patients.

It is rather odd that in many of these cases, when the people are asked to verify statements they have given to the press they are not in a position to do so and refuse to appear before the committee.

These things cannot carry very much weight. If the hon. leader himself had investigated the situations then I think we would be prepared to listen to him; but just to read other people's comments adds very little weight to an argument in connection with nursing homes. We realize and the hon. Minister realizes that a great deal has to be done

in connection with nursing homes, but certainly that kind of argument, carries very little weight, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walker: I would just like to add a word here in support of what the hon. member for Durham has said. I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition was a little upset because he heard, as he put it, I think, it was, "from this area." He must remember that sitting in the first two rows on this side of the House are five members of the homes for the aged committee who have visited east and west and north across this province. We visited nursing homes and we have visited homes for the aged. We in this committee could not argue his statement in regard to nursing homes. We have found nursing homes in which we ourselves would not like to be placed. On the other hand, we have found nursing homes that were very fine institutions.

Mr. Carruthers: Hear, hear!

Mr. Walker: But he is a little mixed up—which is not unusual for the hon. leader of the Opposition—when he inserts in the middle of his tirade something about Macassa Lodge and refers to other homes for the aged in this province, then he is absolutely wrong.

I want to say here and now that I visited Macassa Lodge from one end to the other and I certainly did not see any drapes on the windows decaying or falling off or any of that other tommy-rot that he was talking about. I do believe we have to keep the record straight. Nobody, I do not think, in this whole House, is going to argue that there are not problems in nursing homes in this province; and that is one of the big items with which the homes for the aged committee is dealing.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to reply to my hon. friend that first of all I have quoted from newspaper articles. I assume that they are responsible papers. I do not think that we would disagree with this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I would also say, sir, that from my own point I have visited homes for the aged, and it was one of the main interests that I had for a period. Unless we want to take the approach that unless, for example, you had typhoid you cannot speak about typhoid; in this particular situation I have worked with a group of aged people, of retired pensioners in a settlement house. They came as a group to this settlement house once a week. We worked in trying

to create new interests for them, to broaden them out into the community. I think it was a successful experiment, it has been written up across the country.

I do not think, if I want to be boastful about it, that there is another member who has had a similar experience, and I have written articles on it. But I am not talking about what I have done personally, I am talking about the fact that it would seem to me that from such evidence written by reporters, they all cannot be so biased. As the publisher of a paper, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), I am sure that he feels the integrity of newspaper men is such that you will not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I was simply reading the facts as presented in the papers, and if it hurts the government and they have decided to squawk and say that all these men were prejudiced, then I suggest that that is a weak argument on their part.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the hon. leader of the Opposition knows that his statement is nonsense.

Mr. Thompson: What statement?

Mr. Boyer: The statement that we are irresponsible on this side of the House and have no regard for the people who are in boarding houses, in nursing homes or in homes for the aged. I ask him, is he not failing to distinguish between the exceptional, the particular case, as reported so sensationally in the items he has read; failing to distinguish between these and the general picture; and thus failing to give credit to the good care which is given to so many people in many nursing homes, and certainly throughout the whole province in homes for the aged.

Mr. Thompson: I am not denying that there are many good homes.

Mr. Boyer: You never mentioned any.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: And you know why I did not mention this at the start. I am concerned that if there is one home where the facts, as stated in these articles, pertain, then I am not satisfied to say I will wait. I would be concerned to pass legislation to close that home down, or to ensure that standards were maintained.

Mr. Boyer: That is utter rot!

Mr. Thompson: I do not think so.

Mr. Sargent: I agree with the hon. member for Oshawa that the committee on the aged have done a very responsible job. They are concerned about the plight of the older people, and the people in nursing homes. My knowledge is that the people we have in this business across the province, by and large in the infancy of this new trend, are trying to do a job. But I do not think we can do enough to pinpoint the importance of what my hon. leader has said, that there is a great area for criticism in this field and anything we can do to focus this is good for all of us.

Now, in light of what my hon. leader has said, and I agree with the hon. member for Oshawa that they have tried to do a good job and we appreciate that, but this is a relatively new field in welfare. We have to look upon it as an area in which there can be rackets. Since 1959, the nursing homes of Ontario have tried to incorporate and get some legislation on their behalf, and it is only since this year in the Ontario *Gazette*, January, 1965, that we have had some legislation to make this thing tick.

So I do not think you should stand up and brag about the job the hon. Minister is doing in this field because he has been prodded for five years to get to this point. There are many things that this Associated Nursing Homes Incorporated of Ontario, want done, but they cannot prod this department into action. And for you, like a bunch of trained seals again, to clap and criticize my hon. leader for trying to help these people—

Mr. Carruthers: Get down to facts.

Mr. Sargent: He was talking facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: We are all here trying to do the same job through our people, and they stand up and they hate to be criticized. Everything you do is right. Now, that is not true.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Well, the association in their letter, and all the nursing homes of Ontario have five very pertinent points that they cannot get the hon. Minister to act on. I respect the time of the House, but you should have read this letter from the Associated Nursing Homes Incorporated.

An hon. member: Everyone got that.

Mr. Sargent: Then I do not see, in light of receiving this document, that you can be so pure and think this department is doing a good job in this field.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I read the letter, and it made sense to me; it was laudatory of the hon. Minister.

Mr. Sargent: After the remarks from the hon. Minister I deserve to take about half an hour to reply. But it is such stupid remarks that he gives out that takes the time of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I say again, we respect the job this committee has done, but there is a big change they have yet to bring about in this field of nursing for the aged, especially in the field of getting together with The Department of Health in supplying nurses, trained nursing staff to service these homes. We have, under this Act, legislation to say that nursing homes must have this staff, but there are no trained staff for the positions. So how, I would like to ask the hon. Minister, do you intend to implement this Act if you have no trained staff? That is your problem, it is not ours.

Mr. Knox: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on the scurrilous article that the hon. leader of the Opposition was reading there with respect to blind people being fed scraps. The Ontario association of the blind does not know of a single case of that ever happening in the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is thinking of the hair dryer.

Mr. Knox: I might also add that for a patient to be tied in a chair is not as bad as the hon. leader of the Opposition makes it sound, and he knows that very well. There are many occasions when this is the only answer to getting somebody out of bed. They can be gotten out of bed, but they are unable to sit and remain in the chair, unless they are tied there. This they want, and this is done, and it is carried on in a perfectly proper manner. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has gone around all the places that he says he has, he knows it.

Mr. Thompson: I would like to ask if this is a fact. I understand there are 440 licensed homes in Ontario and several unlicensed homes. Could I ask the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, is Ontario the only province which does not license nursing homes, establish standards for them and provide provincial inspectors with authority to see that the standards are maintained?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Would the hon. leader of the Opposition please repeat it?

Mr. Thompson: I asked you, sir, is Ontario the only province which does not license nursing homes, establish standards for them and provide provincial inspectors with authority to see that the standards are maintained?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I have not that information with me here, Mr. Chairman. I cannot give that to the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not know if any other provinces have standards and maintain them.

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, in the calm and gentleness of this debate and taking part in it with the same sort of feeling that has been expressed toward me, that I consider it pretty shocking for a Minister of Public Welfare—in view of the indictment that we have had across this province and the deep concern which we have about these standards and the lack of standards that we have—to stand up in this House and tell us he does not know what the standards are in other provinces.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: If my hon. friend has any pleasure in abusing me in that respect, that is quite all right, but I do not think I should have to carry that kind of information any more than I could tell you how many nursing homes there would be in the state of California, or how many nurses would be there.

Mr. Thompson: I want to clarify again, I did not ask you how many nursing homes are in the state of California. You have a competent staff around you; if you would use them they could give you the facts. We are asking, are there any other provinces in Canada which do not provide licensed nursing homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You do not even know the question without reading it.

Mr. Thompson: I am very sorry. I am asking are there any other provinces which do not license nursing homes, establish standards for them, provide provincial inspectors with authority to see that the standards are maintained?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: I am just a trifle concerned with the way in which this general issue has been deflected and I was so encouraged by the hon. Minister's original remarks that if I could, I would like to bring them back for a moment.

I would like to ask rhetorically, what we are all fighting about. The hon. Minister is on record as wishing to revise regulations and possibly bring them within provincial inspection, because there are certain inadequacies. The select committee on aging is rightly and courageously on record as expressing inadequacies in nursing home areas and the need to move. I think what we have to accept, all parties in this Legislature, is that mere provincial licensing is not enough, and that we must now move to the point of a provincial Act, specifically for this entire field, of which licensing will be but one aspect.

Since the hon. Minister by and large agreed with this direction, and I suspect that the select committee on aging does as well, let us not be lost in the somewhat futile pursuit of sensational exposés. I admit all of us in the Opposition indulge in this from time to time. At this point, we have found a certain area of agreement and I want to ask the hon. Minister whether he is prepared to give us any point in time at which he would move from provincial licensing to an actual Act. Has he given it any further thought in those terms?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this moment, I cannot commit the hon. Minister of Health. Right now, both our staffs and we ourselves are looking at this picture very closely and have been doing so for the last year and a half or so. As a matter of fact, licensing was incorporated in the two amendments that were brought in in similar Acts on other occasions; it is all in the same field. After the surveys—and we have looked throughout the province for at least the last two and a half years—it has been found that this is one thing that you have to go into rather calmly and not try to hurt the people who are in such homes more than you would help by closing the homes up right off the bat, so to speak.

There has been a great movement, as you know, from the western provinces and proprietors are coming here and building here, which is really giving an impetus. Now I think we are pretty close to a solution somewhere or another, but we have got to find a spot where we can put these residents, before we throw them out. I would say to my hon. friend that I would hope that we could move into this pretty definitely. Maybe next year we will have something very definite to show. I could not really assure him of that, but this is my sincere hope. That is as far as I can go.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then I profoundly hope that is true.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, since I could not get an answer, I will read the hon. Minister this quote from the *Globe and Mail* of July 27:

The Ontario government is at the moment shirking one of these burdens. It is the only province in Canada which has not brought nursing homes under provincial licensing and controls.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You want to be thankful for one thing. If there was a really good newspaper strike, you would be out of all information.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Public Welfare's attention was drawn to the announcement made by the law reform commission as reported in today's paper? It is going to inquire into family law, adoption, illegitimacy, consequences of divorce and separation, and generally the field that the hon. Minister concerns himself with. I wonder what arrangements, if any, the hon. Minister has made with the law reform commission, or internally with his own staff, to make themselves available to the law reform commission as it embarks on the conduct of what could and should be a most valuable study for the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, I must tell the hon. member for Downsview that I am glad he brought it to my notice. I have not had a chance to look at a newspaper yet today.

Mr. Singer: I would appreciate it if perhaps before the estimates are over, the hon. Minister can consult with his colleague, the hon. Attorney General, because—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure if we check back we will find, as we do in most instances when these commissions are appointed, that we offered them all the facilities of the government at any time, in any field of study. This is pretty general in every commission that this government establishes, and I imagine it is true for this commission.

Mr. Singer: Oh, I imagine it is true, but I thought that I could perhaps come to the hon. Minister's assistance this afternoon, when he said he was going to get a new statute underway very shortly—

Hon. Mr. Cecile: I did not say that.

Mr. Singer: —and he could call on the services, the excellent services, of this group that is set up by the law reform commission

and I am sure it would be more than anxious to assist him in his task. I just wanted to be helpful.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, there is a problem which I would like to raise relating to this vote. In a way I suppose one could say it is a small problem, but on the other hand, it is a big problem so far as some people are concerned. I will explain the problem and I would like to give a concrete illustration of it.

As I understand it, there is no provision for dental care under any welfare allowance other than mother's allowance, and that under mother's allowance dental care is available only for children. Am I right in that assumption? The only dental care that is possible under the welfare allowance is extraction—in other words, have your teeth completely destroyed. Am I right in that?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: That used to be the case. Now it is extended to all adults under both programmes.

Mr. Bryden: When did this happen, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Just in a recent amendment to the regulations.

Mr. Bryden: I am glad to know that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Reilly: I bet that spoils your speech.

Mr. Bryden: No, it does not spoil anything. I think this was a serious gap in the regulations, but I am glad that the department has finally recognized the nature of the gap and has done something about it.

I may say that my experience was that this probably was as big a nuisance to the department officials as it was to the people affected, and no doubt this was a factor in getting the matter straightened out.

Vote 1706 agreed to.

Vote 1707 agreed to.

On vote 1708:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, under rehabilitation services, it seems to me that the hon. Minister's statement that the department, in co-operation with the University of Toronto school of social work, has developed a special training course whereby a steady flow of professional rehabilitation counsellors will become available to serve Ontario's handicapped, leads to several questions. How long a course is it, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. leader of the Opposition would not mind, I had intended, as I intimated some time ago, to make a short statement.

Mr. Thompson: Is the hon. Minister going to make a statement?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: If I could do it now perhaps it would answer some questions.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The rehabilitation services branch of The Department of Public Welfare is responsible for administering the federal, provincial and vocational rehabilitation programme. The basic purpose of this programme is to develop or restore the working capacity of handicapped persons and to prepare and place them in safe and satisfying employment. It does not take the place of basic health, welfare and educational services provided by hospitals, schools or local welfare departments, but rather supplements and co-ordinates services on behalf of individuals so as to provide the necessary continuity of service without which the seriously handicapped person could not achieve ultimate rehabilitation.

Although the programme is administered by The Department of Public Welfare, its services are not confined to welfare recipients but are available to all handicapped persons who can benefit from them. This includes persons discharged from general hospitals, Ontario hospitals and clinics, doctors in private practice, voluntary organizations such as the Canadian national institute for the blind, Canadian arthritis and rheumatism society, march of dimes, Ontario society for crippled children, Canadian hearing society, and public services such as municipal departments of public welfare and national service.

To be eligible a person must (1) be a resident of the province for one year; (2) suffer from a physical or a mental disability which causes an employment handicap; and (3) have a reasonable expectation that rehabilitation services may prepare him for work.

The services available are the assessment services which are required for the determination of eligibility for service and the nature and scope of services to be provided. This includes medical assessment to establish the nature and degree of disability, the need for medical attention, and the individual's work capacity. It also includes social and vocational assessment to evaluate the person's potential in relation to various occupations.

The primary objective of rehabilitation

services is to restore the disabled person to maximum functioning by either eliminating or mitigating his physical or mental impairment. This is accomplished by providing medical, surgical, psychiatric care, artificial appliances, therapy, and other medical and related services.

While many handicapped persons referred to the branch already receive complete medical attention financed by the Ontario hospital services commission or Physicians Services Incorporated, our counsellors found it necessary to finance treatment and appliances for 302 people at a cost of approximately \$50,000 during the fiscal year 1963. Substantially full implementation of this aspect of the programme has been achieved during the past year, and further utilization is being anticipated in the years to follow.

Individual counselling and guidance through all steps of the rehabilitation process help the disabled persons select and obtain the right job objective. During the fiscal year 1963-64 over 3,000 persons received such help. At the present time the active case load is over 2,500, an increase of 22 per cent over 1962-63. While it is possible for some handicapped individuals to return to former occupations following medical rehabilitation, many are forced to learn new trades because of functional limitation. With the exception of counselling, vocational training continued to be the most expensive service provided and involved an expenditure of over \$486,201 in tuition, books and supplies, transportation and maintenance, during training.

At the end of the fiscal year 1963-64, 459 handicapped persons were undergoing courses of training. Eight months later this number had increased by 18.5 per cent to 544. Clerical occupations continued to provide more training and placement opportunities than any other single course of employment, but a growing emphasis on the training-on-the-job method is opening up more opportunities for the handicapped in other fields which hitherto were not available. With 22.8 per cent of this training being conducted by on-the-job technique, Ontario leads to quite an extent in the utilization of this method of rehabilitation.

There is maintenance and transportation during the provision of training and restoration services: Approximately two-thirds of the clients attending courses of training also receive maintenance allowances. In February of this year, regulations under The Rehabilitation Services Act were increased so as to make it possible to pay allowances to single persons of up to \$100 or \$120 a month, and

to married persons of up to \$180 or \$220 per month.

Equipment and tools, if necessary, are provided to give the person a fair start: barbers, watchmakers, electrical equipment repairmen, were among those trainees who were provided with the necessary tools. One paraplegic, who was confined to a wheelchair, was helped to start a thriving electrical repair shop in Owen Sound.

Placement on the job and follow up after placement ensures stability of employment: during the fiscal year, 1963-64, some 139 handicapped persons were placed directly into employment while 415 were successfully employed following training or the provision of restorative treatment and orthopaedic appliances. Improved employment conditions greatly facilitated the placement of the handicapped but they have also created a problem. Many persons with lesser disability have been able to become rehabilitated without the help of organized programmes. This leaves a great number of referrals, consisting of more seriously handicapped persons suffering from mental illness or mental retardation, and long-term recipients of public assistance. While successful rehabilitation of such persons is more rewarding than that of the less seriously disabled, success is less assured, and greater demands are made on the time and skill of the rehabilitation counsellor.

As indicated, the rehabilitation services branch is responsible for the actual administration of services. This is done in co-operation with voluntary and other departments of government, and here the central agent is the rehabilitation counsellor. He serves as the basic professional worker in the field and is responsible for the operation of the case-finding programme, and in identifying clients'

problems and helping them establish eligibility. In consultation with the attending physician, he helps the client develop a plan leading to rehabilitation. The counsellor is directly responsible for counselling, guidance, and placement, and he arranges also for purchase of training services. With respect to placement, of course, the national employment service under the rehabilitation of disabled persons agreement is responsible for assisting with placement, and our policy is to utilize their facilities to the utmost.

A clear-cut plan of co-operation has been arranged so that the full facilities of the employment service can be utilized, both in planning training programmes and placing handicapped persons following training. The counsellors of The Department of Public Welfare are assigned to the department's regional welfare offices so that services may be provided on a local basis. The job of the counsellors is to work closely with hospitals, private organizations, the national employment service, private physicians, social services, and rehabilitation officers of The Department of Health in their various localities, to make sure that handicapped persons, wherever they may be, can have the opportunity to utilize the full range of services provided in this programme.

To meet the rapidly increasing demand for service, our estimates are providing for a 50 per cent increase in the staff of the branch. This increase will bring the total to 61 and will provide for the location of staff in our regional offices—Windsor, Chatham, London, Kitchener, Hamilton, Toronto, Peterborough, Kingston, Ottawa, North Bay, Sudbury, and the Lakehead.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, June 21, 1965

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Monday, June 21, 1965

Estimates, Department of Public Welfare, Mr. Cecile, concluded	4465
Resolution re supply to defray expenses of government departments, concurred in ..	4465
Third readings	4469
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	4498

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1965

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE (continued)

Vote 1708 agreed to.

Vote 1709 agreed to.

Vote 1710 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare.

This also concludes the estimates for the year ending March 31, 1966.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of supply rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The Chairman of the committee of supply reports the following resolutions:

Resolved,

That supply in the following supplementary amounts, and to defray the expenses of the government departments named, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965:

Department of Economics and Development	
Special grants	\$ 3,520,000
Department of Energy and Resources Management	
Special grants	858,200
Department of Health	
Special grants	9,372,000
Department of Public Welfare	
Child welfare branch	1,640,000

and Resolved,

That supply in the following amounts, and to defray the expenses of the government departments named, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966:

Department of Agriculture	
Main office	\$973,000
Agricultural and horticultural societies branch	1,009,000
Agricultural rehabilitation and development branch	1,258,000
Dairy branch	1,005,000
Extension branch	2,943,000
Farm economics, co-operatives and statistics branch	387,000
Farm products inspection branch	556,000
Farm products marketing board	114,000
Information branch	478,000
Live stock branch	838,000
Office of the commissioner of marketing	43,000
Ontario food council	156,000
Ontario junior farmer loan branch	255,000
Ontario telephone service commission	109,000
Soils and crops branch	582,000
Veterinary services branch	1,393,000
Demonstration farm, New Liskeard	94,000

Department of Agriculture, continued

Horticultural experiment station, Vineland	\$571,000
Kemptville agricultural school	690,000
Western Ontario agricultural school, Ridgetown	588,000
Federated colleges, Guelph	7,449,000
Main office	600,000

Department of the Attorney-General

Main office	97,000
Ontario police commission	606,000
Legislative counsel's division	164,000
Administration and finance division	486,000
Civil law division	180,000
Criminal law division	1,268,000
Administration of justice division	8,830,000
Public safety division	2,408,000
Ontario securities branch	463,000
Office of superintendent of insurance	259,000
Ontario law reform commission	158,000
Ontario provincial police	23,907,000

Department of Civil Service

Main office	155,500
Position administration	216,500
Recruitment and examination	224,500
Training and development	97,000
Administrative services	324,500
Pay research	90,000
Ontario joint council, civil service arbitration board and grievance boards	33,500
Employee relations	67,500

Department of Economics and Development

Main office	4,896,000
Economic council	211,000
Office of chief economist	612,000
Ontario development agency	288,000
Ontario House	416,000
Trade and industry branch	1,335,000
Ontario housing corporation	1,797,000
Ontario housing corporation	9,750,000

Department of Education

Main office	340,000
Departmental business administration branch	878,000
School business administration branch	346,000
Personnel branch	137,000
Information branch	236,000
Programme branch	9,803,000
Teacher education branch	5,930,000
Special schools and services branch	5,063,000
Technological and trades training branch	6,635,000
Youth branch	75,000
Ontario fitness programme	100,000
Federal-provincial agreements	30,294,000
Scholarships, bursaries, etc.	2,535,000
Legislative grants	342,083,000
Miscellaneous grants	1,070,000
Grants to Ontario colleges of education	3,774,000
Grants to Ryerson polytechnical institute	5,473,000
Teachers' superannuation, etc.	14,893,000
Student aid loans	100,000

Department of Energy and Resources Management

Main office	\$203,000
Energy branch	660,000
Ontario energy board	102,000
Conservation authorities branch	1,623,000
Ontario water resources commission	4,077,000
Water management programme	400,000
Conservation authorities branch	6,750,000
Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario	1,800,000
Ontario water resources commission	25,000,000
Water management programme	1,500,000

Department of Health

Main office	8,703,000
Public health administration branch	2,442,000
Public health nursing branch	84,000
Maternal and child health branch	115,800
Dental service branch	85,200
Nursing branch	410,000
Epidemiology branch	912,000
Medical rehabilitation branch	603,000
Tuberculosis prevention branch	5,622,000
Industrial hygiene branch	1,119,000
Environmental sanitation branch	297,000
Laboratory branch	3,560,000
Mental health branch	74,860,000
Hospital services commission of Ontario	68,078,000
Hospital services commission of Ontario	9,500,000

Department of Highways

Main office	4,734,000
Maintenance—King's highways and other roads	87,383,000
Construction and other capital projects	237,252,000

Department of Labour

Main office	1,124,000
Industrial training branch	1,494,000
Conciliation services	445,000
Labour standards branch	689,000
Labour relations board	515,000
Safety and technical services	2,060,000
Human rights commission	119,000
Research branch	200,000
Labour standards branch	9,500,000

Department of Lands and Forests

Main office	1,985,000
Fish and wildlife branch	562,000
Forest protection branch	208,000
Lands and surveys branch	1,096,000
Parks branch	172,000
Research branch	879,000
Timber branch	1,068,000
Forest ranger school	235,000
Junior ranger programme	820,000
Basic organization	21,613,000
Extra fire fighting	750,000
Lands and surveys branch	100,000
Timber branch	793,000
Basic organization	4,000,000

Office of Lieutenant-Governor	
Office of Lieutenant-Governor	\$330,000
Department of Mines	
Main office	532,000
Geological branch	1,135,000
Mines inspection branch	342,000
Laboratories branch	212,000
Sulphur fumes arbitrator	25,000
Mining lands branch	398,000
Main office	1,000,000
Department of Municipal Affairs	
Main office and branches	55,195,000
Ontario municipal board	438,000
Main office	1,557,000
Department of Prime Minister	
Main office	146,000
Cabinet office	91,000
Office of Provincial Auditor	
Office of provincial auditor	547,000
Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship	
Main office	381,100
Companies branch	529,800
Citizenship branch	318,500
Office of the Speaker	27,500
Legislative library	74,100
Clerk of the legislative assembly and chief election officer	129,300
Sessional and other requirements	1,321,000
Queen's printer	238,700
Registrar-General's branch	820,000
Post office	720,000
Department of Public Welfare	
Main office	6,966,000
Child welfare branch	8,791,000
Day nurseries branch	403,000
Field services branch	1,687,000
Finance and administration branch	337,000
General welfare assistance branch	25,534,000
Homes for the aged branch	3,156,000
Rehabilitation services branch	938,000
Welfare allowances branch	36,314,000
Welfare allowances branch	21,199,000
Department of Public Works	
Main office	1,125,000
Ontario government buildings	9,000,000
Leased premises	3,200,000
Maintenance of locks, bridges, dams and docks, etc.	125,000
Miscellaneous	160,000
Public buildings	43,000,000
Dams, docks and locks	975,000
Department of Reform Institutions	
Main office	2,690,000
Parole and rehabilitation service	605,000
Institutions (Ontario reformatories, industrial farms, training schools and district jails)	18,269,000

Department of Tourism and Information

Main office	\$129,000
Administrative branch	1,069,000
Publicity branch	278,000
Advertising branch	1,107,000
Tourist promotion and information branch	361,000
Tourist industry development branch	557,000
Public records and archives	337,000
Theatres branch	118,000
Travel research branch	81,500
The St. Lawrence Parks Commission	1,900,500

Department of Transport

Main office	1,031,000
Ontario highway transport board	217,000
Highway safety branch	484,000
Motor vehicles administration	6,096,000
Motor vehicle accident claims fund	603,000

Treasury Department

General administration	1,262,000
Accounts division	7,243,000
Revenue division	5,809,000
Data processing branch	604,000
Ontario racing commission	239,000
Pension commission of Ontario	163,000

Department of University Affairs

Main office	332,000
Grants to universities and colleges	62,786,000
Miscellaneous grants	30,000

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading, upon motion:

Bill No. 44, An Act to make uniform the powers of expropriation granted to universities.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Public Service Works on Highways Act.

Bill No. 73, The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Gas and Oil Leases Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 94, An Act to establish a foundation for the preservation of the burial place of John Graves Simcoe and his wife.

Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The General Sessions Act.

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I rise and I would like your indulgence to make a point of order. This afternoon, just after the House convened, the government Whip called me and told me that we were going into the Budget debate following the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare. I see he is not here to confirm the agreement, or whether there has been some change. I know my own group said that the last instructions they had been given was that they were going into third readings, but I felt that the Whip's conversation with myself was a change in order and I instructed my group to that effect.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I can only say that this has been the order of business, I believe, as I announced it last week: that we would complete the estimates and take third readings and

then complete the Budget debate. This has been my understanding and there has been no change. Whether there was some misunderstanding between you and the government Whip I do not know; but certainly this is what I told him as well, because it has been the course of business in my mind for some days.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I agree that there may have been some misunderstanding, but that is the reason, I believe, why the rest of the members are not here.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May I say, sir, in all fairness, in a communication I had with the Whip today, he told me that this was the order of business.

THIRD READINGS

(continued)

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Ophthalmic Dispensers Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act.

Bill No. 114, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of the Centennial centre of science and technology.

Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Bill No. 118, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Bill No. 119, The Child Welfare Act, 1965.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Bill No. 123, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Public Service Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 126, An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act.

Bill No. 127, An Act to establish The Ontario institute for studies in education.

Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Logging Tax Act.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 133, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill No. 135, The Milk Act, 1965.

On Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have tried to elicit from the government some understanding of what it really meant by coverage of the bill. We have asked it for some of the most pertinent facts which I think the people of Ontario would wish to know about a so-called medical services insurance plan and we find that not only in this Legislature have we been denied these facts, but the facts have been denied the people of Ontario.

We, at this point have been asked to pass this bill, and have not the slightest idea what the premiums are going to cost the people. We have asked other questions in connection with the coverage of the aged, and the coverage of those abhorrent words, the "poor risks." Will it be a maximum amount for them, or will it be less? Again we find a vagueness, almost a fog put up to try to describe the inadequacies of this bill, not only to the Legislature, but to the people of Ontario.

The purpose of the bill has been referred to as making medical services insurance available to every resident of Ontario regardless of age, the state of past or present health, financial means or occupation, and yet, sir, we know that a bill substantially based on the same principles as this, which is in the province of Alberta and which is a voluntary

plan, includes over 210,000 citizens out of a population of almost 1.5 million that are not covered and we firmly believe that the same kind of situation will develop if this bill were to go before the people of Ontario. This is not a medical services insurance bill which is available to every resident of Ontario regardless of age, the state of past or present health, financial means or occupation. It was put most adequately by one of the hon. members of the Opposition:

Availability may be for every one to have a Cadillac, but if you do not have the financial means, it is not really available to very many people within the province.

We say, sir, that it is believed that there are marginal income families who are too proud to find a means test or who are unable to pay the premium, even with some subsidization as is provided for a certain income bracket. We have this fact on the experience of Alberta. We suggest on the basis of the operation of the Alberta plan it is estimated that 900,000 citizens of Ontario will not be covered under the present Ontario medical health plan.

May I say that I am reading here some of the points which are being presented to the people outside this Legislature today by a group of people, to show that there are church institutions which are not deserving of the name of being "comfortable pews," and this includes members of every congregation and of every denomination who have become aroused at the situation being brought before the people of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Let me quote in this respect:

We believe that family premiums, and if the family premiums are estimated at \$180, then we believe they are excessive.

In trying to elicit answers from the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond)—who I notice is not here when this bill is coming up for third reading—we tried by every device we could to learn from him what the premiums are.

He said that it was ridiculous for a *Globe and Mail* article or editorial to suggest that the premiums might be something over \$200, and when we tried to push him on this to find what they really were, we could get no answer from him. We suggest that if \$180 is just for physicians' services for many families who are in this grey bracket, who

are outside subsidization or even under some part of subsidization, then this bill is inadequate because it will not provide coverage.

It in no way considers the whole health coverage; it in no way considers prescription drugs; it in no way considers, for example, the treatment of children with respect to dental care or with respect to optical services or with respect to regular checkups. When we wanted to get into regular checkups, we found again that there was evasion and answers that were vague.

We talked about the people who probably—in my terms—most need coverage. Surely a government that was deeply concerned about the health of the people would be concerned about two categories, and they are the young child or the baby, and the mother. We know that in this crass, hard term of "bad risk," these are the people who are bad risks, and similarly the aged. Yet we get the callous kind of approach from the hon. Minister of Health, who in every defence of his bill was constantly referring to the fact that under most existing insurance plans this kind of thing is not covered. I am not interested in the insurance companies and the sort of coverage they give; what we on our side are interested in is in the health of the people of Ontario.

We protest that the Ontario plan will discriminate against bad health risks and I want to emphasize that and underline it—the elderly and the ill. We believe that a medical health plan should provide for a basic premium uniform for all citizens. The Ontario health plan does not cover certain health needs which I mentioned before, such as drugs, psychiatric care and dental care. We believe that a health plan should be comprehensive in coverage and may I say, sir, that we oppose the inefficiency and the duplication of overhead and the excessive costs of coverage implicit in the Ontario medical health plan with its employment of private insurance carriers.

I base that on the fact of one of the most comprehensive studies that has been done in the history of Canada and I refer to the Hall commission. When I think of, for example, volume 1 of the Hall commission report—over 1,980 pages of statistical facts set up, apart from volume 2—I think to myself, "Surely when the government is bringing in its plan—"

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. Cowling: Lewis' *Parliamentary Procedure*, page 61, has to do with third reading and in that section it says:

Debate on a motion for the third reading of a bill is more restricted than is the debate on the second reading as discussion is strictly confined to the contents of the bill.

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. leader of the Opposition is not talking about the contents of the bill.

An hon. member: Certainly he is!

Mr. Cowling: He is talking about the Hall report.

Mr. Speaker: It is my opinion that the leader of the Opposition is speaking relevant to the contents of the bill and as the bill has some 28 or 30 sections it allows for some latitude. However, I must inform the member that although bills may be discussed on third readings—the same as on second readings—nevertheless discussion is somewhat more restricted and you perhaps should confine your remarks as to why the bill should not be given third reading at this time.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that, sir, and I am giving reasons why I think the bill should not be given third reading. In order to show that I am talking about sections of the bill, I will come to (b) carriers, and I suggest that from examination that has taken place, we are aware that the retention cost of carriers has been 27 per cent as compared with 7.5 per cent in Saskatchewan with the government agency, and that we believe the administration of a medical health programme should be by a government agency. We believe that the medical profession should remain in complete charge of the areas of its medical, professional competence, and we hold that the treatment of sickness is not a commodity to be traded in the market place.

Sir, I could go on at considerable length in connection with this bill, but I am going to deal with some of the arguments which I have listened to from the other side in connection with certain sections of the bill. One of the arguments that was raised, was that the hospital services commission was not a compulsory body and if the hospital services commission, if we want to get into some semantics about it, is not a compulsory body, then I suggest that within the principle of this bill we could use, instead of carriers, the hospital services commission. But I would strongly urge, on any person who is a thinking person within the government ranks, that

he be fully aware that the hospital services commission is compulsory; but the hospital services commission has 15 or more employees, who are obligated to belong to it, and we see nothing wrong with this. We are delighted with the fact that the citizens of Ontario are able to get coverage through a premium so they do not have the fear of excessive hospital costs; our argument, sir, in connection with medical costs, is based on the fact that we consider, for many of the people, that there is a very real dread of sickness taking place within a family.

We recognize that in this province, and in Canada, we have had enormous advances in medical science. We recognize that we have had some of the most brilliant men, within our province, who have developed such things as insulin. I think of Dr. Banting and Dr. Best, and many others, who are working in order to get greater health for the people of Ontario. We also recognize, sir, and I want to re-emphasize this point, that part of the reason for the research which is being done, in order to bring benefit to the people of Ontario, is because of the fact that a government, taking a collective responsibility, has provided funds for the research.

We recognize that we need more doctors. We are fully aware of this and we have asked about this. We recognize that, in the education of doctors, there is a responsibility of government, and I think the government itself recognizes this. The hon. Prime Minister has informed us that, with the lack of doctors and the need for doctors, he has started two new medical schools, and we in no way feel embarrassed, or hate or detest the fact that we are compelled to pay taxes towards educational facilities for doctors. We are proud to do that. We say, sir, that we recognize we have an obligation—not only in paying a premium individually, which is our choice, except for those who are working with 15 or more employees—through taxes, to be compelled to pay for the health of all the people. We are sharing this cost.

Taking the fact that medical science has advanced, taking the fact that the practitioners of medicine are helped in their training by us, taking the fact that the hospitals themselves are contributed to by us, by the people of Ontario, we are arguing that this whole health field then should become an obligation of society itself, and that it should not be left in the hands of private profiteers. And I say this although I, myself, have nothing against profit motive in many areas.

In many areas I think this is the incentive of free enterprise, but when it comes to the

health of the people, and when it comes to education, then, sir, I suggest that we, collectively, have a responsibility not to just hand this over to groups of private profiteers so that they can make the most profit they can from it.

We have looked, as has the Hall commission—with respect to my hon. friend from High Park—and examined, as has Pierre Berton in *Maclean's* magazine, as have many others, at the kind of coverage which has been given in the past by the profit-making organizations, the insurance companies. And if the field is open to them, and there is nothing else, why should they not be in it?

But the point is: With the field being open to them, in order that they can give coverage they have to limit the coverage. In order that they can give coverage, they naturally have to make some profit. They have to do sales promotion, and this means a high administrative cost.

And I think all of us recognize Hall as a man of great eminence—indeed he has been so recognized by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), in that he has been appointed to look into another very delicate problem in this province. No one, I am sure, is going to belittle the scholarship of a man of the eminence of Hall. Besides, as I am sure my friend is going to point out, he was appointed by Rt. hon. Mr. Diefenbaker, which again should cause a certain amount of affection towards him.

Let us say, on the basis of philosophy—and this was another argument that came up, sir—there were some who said that, as Tories, they really could not go for the idea of having a compulsory medical insurance plan. Well, of course, there were such contradictions in their arguments that made me blush, almost, to listen to them. You had the situation of the hospital services commission. We even had the hon. Minister of Health, not a philosopher—I never thought of him as a philosopher, because he told me he had listened to a man in the early '30s who I considered, even though he did not belong to my party, a pioneer for social justice. Then he listened to Mackenzie King, another man who set a platform for us. Then he listened to Bennett, and everything Bennett did politically was a failure because it was all ultra vires; therefore he went over to England to take his knighthood, or viscountcy, or whatever it was. And this was the man—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member, if he would try to speak to the contents of the bill. He must keep the contents of the bill always before him.

Mr. Thompson: Well, sir, you see the bill is such a complicated one to speak to, that I am trying to deeply understand the motivation behind the hon. Minister who drafted it. I felt that, perhaps, if I could discuss some of the heroes whom he idolized, that this might give more understanding; but, in view of what you say, I will swing back again to the bill.

I would say that Hall has shown that there is a great need for people to get coverage. He has shown that, from the sickness survey in 1951, there were people with low incomes who had a high rate of illness and yet who were not able to use the services of doctors. He has shown, sir, that, from a national point of view, and I say from a provincial point of view too, health is important. And he suggested that, when you saw the rejects in the armed forces during World War I, this showed up that with all the medical science we have, with the fact that we have a high proportion of doctors, with the fact that we have magnificent hospitals, there were still people who were not able or, for various reasons, were not taking advantage of the health facilities that this province and this nation could provide. And he said that we have got to do something in connection with this.

He examined and studied every possible way; and I am sure, the man appointed by Mr. Diefenbaker is a man with perhaps a background of Conservative philosophy, I am sure that he is. Let us look at the idea of income grading, let us look at it. And may I suggest, first of all, in the Hall commission report that he decided that this—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I will have to inform the member that he is for the most part discussing the Hall commission report and his philosophy of medical insurance or Medicare, and the member is not really discussing the contents of the bill; so I ask that he be just a little more restrictive in his remarks.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate that, sir, and, as always, I recognize your ruling. Therefore, I would say that I am talking about the open enrolment period, section (1) of 1, because, you see, that open enrolment period means that there will be only certain times when you can get coverage. If we went further into the kind of coverage under some of the regulations, we would find that some of us will get subsidized coverage but others will get it given to them completely, because we are so low in the economic bracket that we have become charity cases.

Mr. Hall, taking those two sections which are referred to—section (l) and section (n)—said: “This is a lot of nonsense, and it will not work.” He deplored it. He deplored it for these reasons, because he said inherently this is a means test—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: I am afraid, sir, that the unfortunate thing is that it does not have enough to do with your bill. We are pointing out the inadequacies in it and the very fact that you, with the comprehensive study that has been done, refuse to listen to the facts of the study, that an income basis for making the basis of getting coverage was wrong, that it had a means test attached to it, that there would have to be enrolment periods and so on down the line like this. And Mr. Hall said, “Let us have a ringing charter with health, let us start moving in the 20th century on it.”

And what do we see here with the basis of this Hall commission? What do we have as an alternative? We had a Hagey commission. And what happened when we had the Hagey commission on which most of these sections are structured? People came before the commission and said, “Surely this government with its wealth, its affluence, surely it will have concern for the people of Ontario and will not bring in something structured on such plans as those of Dr. Hagey.”

I was on a debate with Dr. Hagey, and I was hoping that there would be a tussle—I think he is of Irish background—not only of personalities, but of philosophy and everything else in connection with its findings. And do you know what he did? He denied. You know I could almost refer to a Biblical situation of when—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: —where someone denied responsibility. Dr. Hagey denied the responsibility for it. He said, “I have passed it, as Pontius Pilate, over to some other place.” And what did they do with the Hagey commission? You know what the hon. Prime Minister of this province said in his defence. I have listened to a lot of others in the defence of the sections of this bill, and I want to say there is one of them who I thought wanted to argue on a constructive basis and that was the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly). There were a couple of others who are up in this area. They took the retention

figure and they said, “Okay, we are going to argue on the basis of the retention figure.”

What did we hear from the hon. Prime Minister of this province? I want to list to you the arguments as I heard them. These were his arguments on it. His first argument was, “Don’t talk to me about Saskatchewan.” That is a kind of emotional attitude about Saskatchewan, he did not want to hear anything about Saskatchewan. Here is the first demonstration of another approach. But let us go further on this. In Saskatchewan, the premium is \$24, and the premiums that we are hearing suggested, although we do not know, are going to be something like \$180.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. leader of the Opposition cannot compare the premium in Saskatchewan with the premium under the Ontario plan.

Mr. Thompson: No wonder the hon. Prime Minister does not want to hear about Saskatchewan. No wonder he will jump up and get mad about it. This is a coverage of a plan, and in this situation we have him saying, “I am tired of hearing about Saskatchewan.”

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. Prime Minister rose on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I only wanted to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition a question.

Mr. Thompson: I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will have his turn.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He is afraid to answer; he is intellectually dishonest. He knows there is no comparison.

Mr. Thompson: “He is afraid to answer a question,” he says. How did the hon. Prime Minister answer that question? He told us it was a part step forward, but I say it is—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I realize the member—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to remind the member once again that we are really straying on the third reading of this bill; I am trying to be not too restrictive and as tolerant as possible. But I find that whenever the member indulges in questions and answers, and when he continues discussing the philosophy of the Hagey commission and the Hall commission, we are really getting away from the contents of this particular bill and I

must bring you back to that. I would ask the leader of the Opposition if he could try to confine himself to the contents of the bill.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say, sir, that the next point we had on the bill was this, and frankly I was disappointed in both the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health on this, because in my first speech as the leader of this party I had outlined fully what our programme was. We have tried to keep this on the basis that it is written in *Hansard*, there are three pages on it, about basing it on the Hall commission. And yet the hon. Prime Minister got up and I suggest, sir, that he was so embarrassed with the inadequacy of the bill that he started to play politics and he said, "I do not know what you stand for" and the hon. Minister of Health said that. I suggest it is because the hon. Prime Minister did not bother to read what we stood for. It was in the papers, we clearly enunciated what we stood for, a compulsory programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: You know, you can over-ride the rights of people and show a lack of concern for the people, but those men who stood on the steps—and I heard some people laugh at them—those men are becoming an increasing army of people aroused against the government.

Now let me come to another point on this bill. One of the arguments that the hon. Prime Minister had raised was the fact that the federal government was not sure, or he was not clear, on what they were going to pay. As far as I am concerned, I would go to Ottawa myself if I were the Prime Minister of this province, and even though I am not the Prime Minister of this province, I would go to Ottawa and I would say to the federal Liberals, "You went to this country on the basis that you would work for a national medical insurance programme."

I have, and I will again. As the Premier of the province I would not back down on this score, hiding behind the skirts of the Ottawa situation.

I would go up, feeling that I belonged to and represented the greatest province in Canada and I would tell them, "You on your platform said you were going to have a national medical health plan, and you were going to co-operate with the provinces. Stand by your words and get on with it."

Has the hon. Prime Minister done that? Has he gone to Ottawa? No, sir. He has not. I can assure the House that my provincial

members and I, with the small voice that we have—because we are concerned with the Ontario situation here—together with the voice that we have with our federal colleagues will say: "Get on with this! Get on with this!"

We watched the hon. Prime Minister of this province swivel and turn and dodge and the other things. Then when he goes to Ottawa, what does he do? We find that he has gone to Lesage and Pearson and come out with something. He, of course, was taking his first timid steps; then he is going to say "Me, too." What is he doing in this medical insurance thing? Time after time he has been saying, "Me, too" or "I cannot quite go very much further, we have got to go slow." We have listened to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) talking about the nurses' situation. I know what he did with his estimates, which certainly reflects from the point of view of this bill. What did he do? He rushed the last three through as quickly as he could—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out for those of you who were not here at five minutes after eight, there were three Liberals in their seats.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You would not know, you were not here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Now once again I am going to inform members that we are not discussing the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare. We are discussing third reading on the contents of Bill 136. Now please try to stick to that if you can.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is the most loyal, he bangs his desk the hardest.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I respect your ruling not to talk about the hon. Minister of Public Welfare. If I did not respect it I would suggest that there were many Tories absent during the day who just came in now.

Mr. Speaker: I must ask the member not to discuss the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare.

Mr. Thompson: I just wanted to note the kind of thing I might have said if I did not respect your wishes. May I say, sir, we are the Medical Carriers Incorporated and surely should be feeling the pulse of the people. Surely this should not have people such as the United Church ministers, and others who are downstairs, picketing on this. Surely this Medical Carriers Incorporated should show a breadth of representation from across this province. Does it? No, of course it does not.

Let us look at the fees for doctors. What kind of control have we got over the fees for doctors? Have we had examples in the past where perhaps the doctors might raise their fees? Doctors are human like everyone else. Many are great men who give with dedication and sacrifice to the service of their community, but there are situations—you can ask people in PSI or AMS and others—where there could be abuse in connection with fees. What control is there over this? By some vague indirect way the hon. Prime Minister of this province tried to bail out the hon. Minister of Health and say that there will be control, in some respect, over it.

I could go on—I would be quite happy to do it, and I may just do it—taking section after section of this bill; a bill that is full of leaks; a bill like a bucket with holes which cannot hold water. I would suggest that, from our point, we have tried to appeal to this government through reason. I appealed myself to the hon. Prime Minister, at one point, and what did I get as a reply? “I do not go for that.” This was the reply of the hon. Prime Minister of this province when we were discussing a bill on the health of the people.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Stop playing to the gallery and get down to business.

Mr. Thompson: I suggest to you, sir, that we wish you had got down to business. The fact is, that with the arrogance of a massive majority on all sides around us, this government is going to push this through. It is going to push it through and people have said: “You have fought hard, you have tried to make reasonable requests to them. Surely you have appealed to their sense of rationality; surely you have shown them the Hall commission; surely there are one or two of them that have read it; surely they will give some recognition to the most comprehensive coverage; surely the government has not rejected the Hagey commission.”

I said: “Well, they have, really, because they do not mention it at all.” Then they

say: “On what basis have they built the structure of this bill? On what principles have they based it?” I had to answer them: “They laid this—they produced this child—and instead of thinking that they might try and help to give it some limbs, or to help in some way this freak child they have produced, they are holding tight with their heels dug in.”

These people say to me: “Well, do not these men realize that they are going against the desires, and the aspirations and hopes of the people of Ontario?” I said, “You do not know them; you have not seen them on the police bill; you did not see how entrenched they were until there was a break in party ranks.”

I would agree now there is a break. Look at the absenteeism; 30 of their members had a conscience and have left.

Sir, because of the inadequacies of this bill; because of the shame which this brings to any government with the wealth and the affluence of Ontario; because of the fact that it shows a disregard for the health of the people; because of the fact that it shows a disregard for the scholarship and for the study which has been done—the most comprehensive study across Canada; because it is based on no facts; because we, sir, have not even heard of the most fundamental aspects of this bill; because the hon. Minister of Health has dodged the facts about premiums, has dodged the facts about appeal, has wiggled, weaved, turned and has finally wiggled himself so far that we do not know where he is right now—he must be under the desk or something; because of all these reasons I move, seconded by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), that Bill No. 136 be not now read and be read a third time this date six months hence.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition moves, seconded by the member for Downsview, that Bill No. 136 be not now read but be read a third time this date six months hence.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I suppose one could say the controversy regarding health insurance—as it used to be called; medical care insurance as it is now called—has been going on in this country for at least a generation. I found it rather melancholy tonight, Mr. Speaker, to reflect that it is still a political football; it is still regarded in many quarters as nothing but a cheap dodge in order to get votes.

The hon. leader of the Opposition delivered what he no doubt considered to be an inspir-

ing oration with regard to the position of his party on this matter. This is the position, I suppose, as of about three months ago—

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): How be if you get on with your own position?

Mr. Bryden: I was rather interested to note, Mr. Speaker, that he apparently accepts fully and wholeheartedly the plan in effect in the province of Saskatchewan. We all can recall, at least those of us who can remember beyond yesterday can recall, that the Liberal Party fought that programme right down the line from beginning to end with everything possible to sabotage it and allied itself with the most extreme far out right element with racist overtones—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I am afraid I will have to call the member for Woodbine to order. There is an amendment before the House that this bill be not now read but read six months hence. If the member would endeavour to speak to the contents of the bill; why he thinks this bill should be read six months hence instead of now, rather than going over the Liberal position on the bill, I think perhaps the House would appreciate it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, it is rather remarkable to me that the hon. leader of the Opposition was allowed to range all over the lot for half an hour and I am on my feet for two minutes and—

Mr. Speaker: I must say that I tried my best to try to keep the leader of the Opposition within the contents of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I must point out to you that there was no intervention from you at all for at least half an hour, and I think it is remarkable that there should be such a rapid intervention in my case. I am perfectly prepared to act within the rules, but I think they should be applied equally to all speakers. However, Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point with regard to the Liberal Party on this matter.

Mr. Sopha: What was your point?

Mr. Bryden: As a matter of fact, my point was well stated by a famous organ of Liberal opinion, the *Toronto Daily Star*, which stated that the Liberal Party must accept responsibility equally with the Conservative Party for the fact that we have reached the melancholy state in Ontario where we have not got a Medicare bill, not even a step toward a Medicare bill, but a step away from

such a bill. The Liberal government at Ottawa, with which my hon. friend should have some standing, has flatly refused to move on this matter for nearly 50 years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sopha: Forty-six.

Mr. Bryden: Forty-six, the hon. member for Sudbury tells me. Now we are told that the hon. leader of the Opposition thinks that the hon. Prime Minister ought to go down and tell the people at Ottawa that they finally ought to get on the rails. Mr. Speaker, I think it is regrettable that this matter has been reduced to this situation. We have a poor bill in Ontario for third reading tonight, mainly because both of these parties have been playing "footsy" with this issue ever since World War I. When they are in Opposition they are in favour of medical care insurance, and when they are in government they are against it. That is the size of the matter.

Mr. Thompson: Give us a chance and we will show this House.

Mr. Bryden: I am sure that nobody would be so bereft of his senses as ever to give the hon. member a chance.

Mr. Sopha: And the same goes for the hon. member for Woodbine.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): For once they are both right.

Mr. Bryden: The apologists for the government have argued time after time during the discussion of this bill that this is a first step towards medical care insurance. They have even alleged that it is in line with the recommendations of the Hall commission, in that the Hall commission proposed that we should advance toward a complete health plan by stages.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be made clear that this is not a step at all in the sense in which the Hall commission envisaged it. The Hall commission was thinking in terms of a total health plan similar to the one in Britain covering all phases of health services: hospital, medical, nursing, dental and so on. It regarded hospital care as one step, which we have already taken, medical care as another, dental as another, and so on. But here we have the Tory government coming before us with the proposition that it is taking a first step in a first step. It is not putting in a medical care insurance programme, it is just taking what it calls a step in this direction.

I found a certain consolation even in hearing them put forward that argument, Mr. Speaker, because previously they had claimed that the kind of bill that we have now before us is the answer to the problem of medical care insurance. Now apparently they think it is only a first step. They think that we may take further steps in the future. Heaven only knows how far in the future. I would suggest, however, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to meet the objective set forth by the Hall commission of achieving in this country a complete health programme by 1970, we must in this year of our Lord 1965 make a much larger step toward medical care insurance than is represented by this bill.

I would not try to claim to the House that we can provide medical care insurance for a premium of \$24 a year. The programme is not provided in the province of Saskatchewan for that amount; the programme that the Liberal Party fought against so vehemently is not provided for \$24 a year. No programme could possibly be provided for that amount. I would, however, suggest that it is possible to provide complete medical care insurance coverage for the people of Ontario much more economically than is proposed in the legislation that is before us.

I would refer, for example, to the proposal that this party has put before this House on more than one occasion—which has been well substantiated by statistical analysis and supported in effect by the analyses of the Hall commission—that it is possible to provide medical care insurance for all the people of the province for a basic premium of 30 cents per week for a single person and 60 cents per week for a married person with or without children, plus — and I will quite openly state the “plus.” I do not go in for the kind of deception of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not claim that the Saskatchewan programme is provided for \$24 a year. I do not claim that what we are proposing would be provided by a 30-cent or a 60-cent premium. It would be provided by that plus additional contributions scaled to income, which for low income groups would amount to little if any more than we are proposing, but for high income groups would amount to substantially more.

Just compare this with what the government has before us tonight. It has a bill under which the public will take responsibility for providing medical care insurance, or medical care coverage at any rate, for the lowest income group—the high risk medical group—and this, according to what the hon. Minister of Health told us, is going to cost

the public Treasury \$180 per year per family. The taxpayers of this province, including all taxpayers who have a taxable income of more than \$1,000 a year, are going to pay for that coverage, and in addition, if they want similar coverage for themselves, they are going to have to pay an even higher amount to buy a policy from a private insurance company. This is the kind of plan that the government is now trying to foist off on us. Unfortunately it has become easier to foist it off because the Liberal Party, over even the past two or three years, has had five different policies on this matter.

We have never been able to mount a real offensive for a proper complete medical care insurance bill similar in principle to that enacted by the New Democratic government in Saskatchewan, similar in principle to a plan which undoubtedly will be established all across this country within the next ten years.

It is only regrettable that at the moment, and not for very long, I believe, we have a Tory government opposite which does not take advantage of the opportunities now available to go ahead in this province with a plan similar to that in Saskatchewan. I would suggest that if such a plan were introduced in Ontario and came into effect, it would be no time at all until it would be in effect all across the country. The federal government would be unable to stall any longer; it has been stalling for 45 years—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Forty-six.

Mr. Bryden: Forty-six years, thank you. It would be unable to stall any longer, and other provincial governments would then come into line if there was some leadership from the federal government.

The critical province is the province of Ontario. If it would follow the lead of Saskatchewan as it did after a 12-year delay with regard to hospital insurance, then I think we could get proper medical care insurance for the whole of Canada. I hope it does not wait 12 years to follow the Saskatchewan example in this case. Indeed, I am sure Ontario will not wait 12 years because we will not have this government in office for 12 years, or for even much more than three years.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): What happened to the one in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: I notice that the Tory party in Saskatchewan supports the Saskatchewan Medicare plan right down the line.

Mr. Speaker, that is with regard to some of the general features of the bill. I would like to deal with some of the details in it now and the significance of what happened when we got into committee consideration of the detailed provisions of this bill in this House. Oh, I know my hon. friends who are always yapping from these benches along here—the Chicago corner, is it, they call it?—think that the Opposition should have nothing to say at all, but we did take quite a long time considering this bill in committee—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: I think the time was well spent. I think it has now come across to the public that there is no merit in this bill at all. When it was first introduced on first reading and even when it was debated on second reading, the press accepted the government propaganda blurbs about it as if they were the whole unvarnished truth, as if everything they said was totally correct.

The government line was that this was an important step forward in this field. It did not matter what we on this side said, that was the press line. There was no more news in it, they said; there was hardly any reporting of the debate on second reading of the bill. The story was finished. And yet, when we got into committee session and started to analyze the clauses in detail; even the press began to see what a total phony this bill is, Mr. Speaker.

Even a paper such as the *Globe and Mail*, which is basically Conservative in its philosophy—I would agree it is independent in its commentaries, but undoubtedly it is Conservative in its philosophy—even it has turned against this bill. It can see little or no merit in it. The *Globe and Mail*, when the bill was first introduced, followed the popular line that it was a desirable step forward. No doubt everyone in this House noticed the editorials it has been writing recently, to the effect even, that this bill—these are not its words, but the import of what it said—the bill is a sell-out of Conservatism. There is nobody really that has any good thing to say about this bill now that the full import of it has come across to the public.

Just to emphasize the total inadequacy of the bill—not only in terms of its principle, Mr. Speaker, and I think we have made it abundantly clear that we object to the bill from stem to gudgeon in principle—but even within its principle, in its execution there is little or no merit in it. It is so full of loop-

holes than even the people who support the principle cannot support this bill.

I would like to summarize some—not all, but some—of the basic objections to the details of the bill, accepting its principle and just taking the implementation of the principle. I attempted on an earlier occasion to present to this House what I called a bill of indictment against the detailed provisions of the bill. I was not able to do so as it was not the proper time, but now, I think, when we are finally reviewing our positions on this bill, it is in order to indicate some of the fatal flaws in detail, as distinct from principle in this bill.

1. No provision at all is made for the large number of people who will not qualify for government subsidy and yet will not be able to afford the high cost coverage available from private carriers. We talked about these people before. I will not belabour the point now, Mr. Speaker, but anybody who has a taxable income just in excess of \$1,000 a year will not be able to afford insurance for himself and he will not qualify for the subsidized coverage provided by the government, yet he will have to pay taxes to provide coverage for other people who are somewhat worse off than he is. What kind of justice is that? Could even the Tories say that is a just situation?

2. The provision that a private carrier must make a standard contract available to anyone applying for it is unenforceable. This is one of many pieces of window dressing in the bill. It is claimed that a private carrier must make a standard contract available to anyone applying for it, but there is no effective way of enforcing that provision and thus there is no guarantee that people not in the subsidized groups will be able to get standard contracts even if they are willing to pay for them.

3. The coverage provided by this standard contract is unduly limited in the bill and can be still further limited by regulation. This is one of the most objectionable features of the bill, Mr. Speaker. The standard contract, in my opinion, is quite restricted as set forth in schedule A of the bill and yet there is power under regulations to limit its coverage still further. The hon. Minister said that no regulations would be passed except those that amplified the coverage of the standard contract, and yet anyone who reads the bill can see that the regulations can only be interpreted to limit the coverage. There is no way of interpreting them to amplify the coverage.

4. The people who need medical care

most, the so-called "bad" insurance risk—that is the jargon of the insurance industry in its approach to human problems—will be discriminated against in the premiums private carriers will be able to charge for standard contracts.

5. Since the maximum premiums which the government is to set by regulation will necessarily be calculated in terms of the bad insurance risks, there will in fact be no effective maximum at all for most of the people. In other words, the government has the power to set a maximum, but it has to make that maximum high enough to cover the bad risks. Thus for most of us there will be no maximum at all, it will simply be permanent open season for insurance companies on the public.

6. The payment of 100 per cent of the Ontario medical association schedule of fees for services rendered under standard contracts will result in a huge subsidy to the medical profession, which is already the highest paid group in the community. We in this group have already suggested that the extra income that the medical profession as a group will get out of this bill will be at least \$20 million per year. Yet the average income of medical doctors in Ontario exceeds that of the next highest paid group in the community by \$3,000 per year.

7. As a result of this, the cost to the public Treasury of providing standard contracts to subsidized groups will be excessive, as will be the premiums that non-subsidized groups will have to pay. In other words, this is essentially a raid on the public Treasury.

8. To add insult to injury, there is nothing to prevent extra billing by doctors. Under this bill a doctor can get 100 per cent of his fee schedule which will probably result in a substantial increase of his income, and then he can send extra bills to the people, presumably covered by standard insurance contracts. In other words, even though doctors will be exceedingly well paid, they will still be able to send additional bills to patients.

9. The medical fees to be paid under the legislation which will be determined unilaterally by the medical profession with no machinery for ensuring that the public interest is protected. As a matter of fact, the bill right now contains an open invitation to the medical profession to raise its fees before the bill comes into effect.

Presumably the bill is to come into effect on July 1, 1966. It is provided that payments under the bill will be according to the OMA schedule of fees then in effect—not the schedule now in effect, but the schedule then in effect. In other words, it is an open invi-

tation to them to jack up their fees before the bill comes into force—and do not suggest that they might not think of doing it. They have shown themselves to be completely without conscience in the way they will set their schedule of fees at the highest possible level. Just a year and a half ago they jacked up their schedule of fees by about 20 to 25 per cent, even though at that time too they were the highest paid group in the community.

10. Because of this carte blanche given to the medical profession to set their own fees there is no possibility of effectively controlling costs under the bill. If the Ontario medical association decides to increase fees, the cost to the Treasury of covering subsidized groups and the premiums paid by non-subsidized groups will have to be increased willy-nilly.

11. Private insurance companies and the medical profession are given a preferred position in advising the government in the administration of the legislation, and little or no provision is made for hearing the views of representatives of the consumers of medical services. This is, from beginning to end, Mr. Speaker, a bill that is set up for the benefit not of the public, whose interests are little considered and whose views will not even be heard. They are not represented to any significant degree on any of the machinery under this bill. It is not a bill for the benefit of the public, it is a bill for the benefit of insurance companies and of the medical profession.

During the committee consideration of this bill, my hon. colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) proposed an amendment to change the title of the bill, which is now The Medical Services Insurance Act, simply by changing two words—striking out "services insurance" and putting in "carriers benefit," so that it would be called The Medical Carriers Benefit Act. The Chairman, for some reason that escapes me, ruled the amendment out of order; he suggested that it was frivolous.

Mr. Speaker, so far as we are concerned the amendment was not proposed frivolously at all. That is an accurate description of the content of this bill, subject perhaps to one modification. I would differ from my hon. friend from Riverdale in this respect. It is not really a medical carriers benefit bill, it is a medical practitioners and carriers benefit bill. That would be a fair title for it. It is a bill for the benefit of private insurance carriers and medical practitioners and it is not a bill to provide medical care insurance to the people of the province.

The government has quite obviously got off on the wrong foot in this bill. It listened only to the insurance industry and the medical profession. It did not listen to the people of the province. The voices of the people are being heard more and more now, in many ways, as they understand the full significance of this bill. They are opposed to it. I think the government, if it had a chance to reconsider it and had not got its neck stuck out on this bill, would also be willing to reconsider it. In fact, there is not much doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if there were no party discipline in this House, and I am not complaining about party discipline, but if there were no party discipline and members of the Legislature were able to vote on this bill strictly in accordance with their consciences, this bill would be defeated in this House.

Some hon. members: Oh, no, it would not.

Mr. Bryden: All 30 of the Opposition members are opposed to it, the Liberals by a recent conversion, the New Democrats by long conviction.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): You might change your mind.

Mr. Bryden: The one thing I am a little doubtful about is that even between now and the vote, the Liberals might change their minds, but I am hoping that they will stand firm up until then. Assuming that they will, Mr. Speaker, there are 30 Opposition members who are opposed to this bill. It is no secret at all that there were at least 30 members on the government side who, in the privacy of the government caucus, were opposed to the bill, believing that we should have a proper programme in this province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Take those 60; that is a majority of the House of 108. Unfortunately, the Whips will prevail; these hon. gentlemen once again will line up to vote for something they do not believe in, and I have no doubt that the amendment will be defeated and that the bill will carry on third reading. It will be a sad day for Ontario, Mr. Speaker. It would be much better if the government would accept the proposition that third reading of this bill be deferred for six months, so that it could think about the matter and reconsider it in the light of all the adverse comment. If it did so, I think it would withdraw the bill of its own volition.

However, I will suggest to you, Mr.

Speaker, that this bill will never become law in the province of Ontario. It will pass here tonight, and it will be assented to by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor either tonight or tomorrow, whenever that is arranged. But the government is so lacking in confidence in its own bill that it is not willing to bring it into force until a year from now. I would suggest that within the next year its total inadequacy will be so thoroughly demonstrated that the government itself will withdraw the bill, just as it, in effect, scuttled The Pension Benefits Act of a few years ago, which it brought into this House as a solution to the problem of portable pensions. I realize that it has retained a secondary portion of that bill, but the main portion it scuttled of its own free will. I think the same thing will happen to this bill and it will be a great day for Ontario when this bill is scuttled, so that we can clear the road for a genuine medical care insurance programme in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member wish to speak on third reading?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, this is the night of crisis in the province of Ontario as this bill faces the Legislature. Today we have seen outside the House a demonstration—a mobilization of public opinion and the growing concern of our people about the bill. We see there a group of clergymen who are marching up and down in front of the doors, meeting people who are coming in and going out, handing them—

An hon. member: NDP literature.

Mr. Young: They can do no better, but in any case, they are handing them a sheet of paper outlining their objections to the third reading of this bill. The church, or a section of the church at least, is becoming concerned about this, and I would only hope that that small section of the church could sit over here on my left, and that as small sections of the church down through the ages have shown the way to civilization, this group will show the way not only to this province but will also show the way to the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick and Newfoundland, to name three specific provinces where Liberal governments are now in power, so that those governments may also hear the message which their brothers here in this House are talking about tonight.

It is encouraging to see this change of heart. I would be much more encouraged, Mr. Speaker, if these people could also make

their protest in these other places, so that our hon. friends here could understand the message and would be permanent in their persuasion. The men who are on the steps tonight are the men who are pioneers in this movement, and I think they are going to light a torch which will sweep across not only the church, but across the citizenry of this province, until they understand the implications of this bill, because they understand the needs of the people of this land.

As a matter of common courtesy, I think, Mr. Speaker, the message which these men are presenting to us—

Mr. Speaker: I really do not want to be too restrictive to the member and I know the message that he is endeavouring to get across, but I must inform him that he is really outside of the contents of the bill by trying to get across the message from another group at this time. I have given him quite a little bit of latitude up until now, because he really has not referred to the contents within this bill and third reading must be on the contents of the bill. I wonder if in the few remaining remarks that he is going to make that he would endeavour to stay within the scope of the bill.

Mr. Young: I will do that then, Mr. Speaker, since I have been persuaded by these gentlemen outside the door that their case is relevant. I am going to present their case as my case for opposing this bill and for supporting the hoist motion which is before this House tonight.

I believe, as these men believe, that a medical health insurance programme should be universal, covering all citizens. This does not cover all citizens. In the province of Alberta, which has a voluntary plan, 210,000 citizens of the population of 1,400,000 are not covered. It is believed that these are marginal income families who are too proud to sign a means test or are unable to pay the premiums even with subsidization as provided for certain income brackets. On the basis of the operation of the Alberta plan, it is estimated that 900,000 citizens of Ontario will not be covered under the present Ontario medical health plan.

In the second place, I submit, and the gentlemen submit, too, that family premiums estimated at \$180—this is the figure the hon. Minister has given for the subsidized part—are excessive. A medical health insurance programme should be state subsidized with a basic minimum premium for all citizens. The average family should have the responsibility of paying a modest premium, the remainder

of health costs must come out of the public Treasury.

Third, we protest and I protest that the Ontario plan will discriminate against bad health risks, the elderly and the ill. We believe that a medical health plan should provide for a basic uniform premium for all citizens.

Fourth, I note that the Ontario health plan does not cover certain health needs such as drugs, psychiatrists and dental care. We believe that a health plan should be comprehensive in coverage.

Fifth, I oppose the inefficiency, duplication of overhead and excessive costs of coverage implicit in the Ontario medical health plan with its employment of private insurance carriers. The Hall commission report estimates that the cost of servicing health insurance policies in Alberta with multiple carriers adds 27 per cent as compared to 7.5 per cent in Saskatchewan with a government agency.

We believe the administration of a medical health programme should be by a government agency. We believe that the medical profession should remain in complete charge of the areas of their medical professional competence. We hold that the treatment of sickness is not a commodity to be traded in the market place.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are all interested here tonight in the matter of human welfare, just as these men are interested in the matter of human welfare. We must remember this, that when we propose a programme such as we are proposing here, when we back a programme such as these men are backing, that we are pioneering a field which is desperately in need of pioneering. It has been said, you know, that a Conservative is a worshipper of a dead radical and how true this may be. So, when we hear objections to men who are pioneering, as these men are doing outside the door, these men are so-called radicals today, but eventually the efforts of these men will be recognized as having borne fruit.

Those of us who are pushing the idea of a universal plan, of a low-cost plan run by government—which has already been pioneered not only in this country, in Saskatchewan, but across the democratic world—are not talking of something new and untried. We are talking of something that human experience has hammered out and that we must eventually adopt in this province.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I stand in this rich province of Ontario and ask that we undertake a comprehensive plan; not a plan such as we have before us in this bill, but one

which is worthy of the rich province of Ontario, blessed as we are with great resources.

This Act is wrong, and because it is wrong we stand against it. It is because it is wrong that these men are marching up and down in front of this building tonight. They have a conviction and we have a conviction. So we ask that this House take the time to consider this amendment. We should take the time to take another long look at this bill, and when this Legislature meets again, at that time perhaps we will see what public opinion asks for.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that almost every submission to the Hagey committee asked for the kind of health plan which we in this group have been advocating. Public opinion demands it. Yet in spite of that the government seems determined to jam this bill through and to pass it tonight.

So tonight I ask again that this House seriously consider its duty to the people of Ontario, seriously consider taking the step which is right to provide all our people with the kind of medical coverage which we in this province can afford, which we know how to set up and which in good time we are going to adopt. Let us not delay. Let us take the time to think about it and let us give this amendment our full support.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would not wish to allow this opportunity to go by without offering one or two short reflections to this House on the quality of this bill on this particular occasion.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is rather fitting that at precisely the end of this session the competing political philosophies of this House should be arrayed, naked as it were, across the Chamber. There is not even a diverting fig leaf to hide the difference in political opinion. I for one, Mr. Speaker, am deeply depressed by what is happening this evening. That may be political naivete which is given to young and inexperienced members of this House, but I am frankly depressed by the quality of the bill and its stark deficiencies.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is no need for that kind of irrelevance from the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions.

I am depressed by some, let me say, government back bench interventions because of the primordial qualities of Toryism which have injected themselves into this debate. The content that has been placed from the Opposition tonight has been placed in good

faith and with deep earnestness and it need not be ridiculed.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government will be haunted by this bill and by its content; that the hon. Prime Minister, who is usually a man of inordinate wisdom, has made a profound error in political judgment; that he has misjudged the tone of the provincial and public relation; that, as is well known in this Legislature when the bill was first introduced, on initial reading and on second reading and we discussed its substantive features at that point, there was a qualified agreement in the press and in the response of the public. And then we came down to the forthright intricate hammering, clause-by-clause analysis in this Legislature. It was revealed in all its glaring inadequacy and notoriety. It was at that point that the match was struck. The fight was on, the battle raged and the people in this province began to respond. I think it fair to say that the hon. members in this House began to respond. Indeed I think it fair to say that even some of the government hon. members of this House began to respond, because there were certain things which emerged that shocked the conscience of any hon. member, regardless of this political conviction.

I would agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is basically a difference in political philosophy at the crux of this bill. The hon. Prime Minister has been on television, he has been before the media, he has been before the press and he has said that he basically agrees with the principles to which the Opposition adhere, that he basically agrees with the long-run objectives about which we have spoken at length.

Let me say to him, Mr. Speaker, that I, for one, believe him. I have no doubt that he speaks with an absolute conviction. I say to him merely that he is waiting too long, that a great many people are suffering in the interim and that it does his government no credit to wait until his social philosophy catches up with his social convictions.

Now our fight against the features of this bill, Mr. Speaker, does not stop on this, the third reading. It will be maintained in every subsequent session of this Legislature; whenever the estimates of The Department of Health appear before this House, whenever a private member can put a resolution before this House, whenever an amendment to a bill can be moved that is relevant to the substance of this. We will continue the fight because I think that in the long run the bill can be reversed. We say on this side of the

House that it is at root a pernicious bill; that it was conceived in irresponsibility and that it has been sustained in infamy and that one day, I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite, it will bring them down.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on third reading of this bill I do so with the same sense of depression as my hon. colleague from Scarborough West. We had endeavoured, as a responsible Opposition in this House, for several days to fight, to put forward in a responsible and a reasonable way, what we conceived to be the inherent defects in this bill. We think that we achieved our objective with everyone except the hon. members of the government, who stubbornly and persistently would permit only two or three very minor amendments to the bill. The government was not prepared even to consider the validity of the viewpoints which we expressed day in and day out in this Legislature.

The government has attempted to indicate that if the federal government were prepared to foot the cost of 50 per cent of Medicare for the people of the province of Ontario, in some way the Ontario government would then move the next step forward to make the kind of provision which we, in this party, deem essential for the welfare of the people of the province of Ontario. I say that we here are in the richest province in Canada; we here are constitutionally responsible for the provision of Medicare and other welfare benefits for the people of this province, regardless of the action of the federal government; we cannot sit idly by and allow this government to suggest that in some way its responsibility is shared with the federal government, because its responsibility is not shared with the federal government. Its responsibility is shared directly with the people of the province of Ontario. And the people of the province of Ontario do not like this bill.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I just bring to your attention again, sir, that the third reading has to do with the contents of the bill, and my point of order is that the hon. member is just a million miles away from the contents of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: How would the hon. member know the difference?

Mr. Cowling: Oh, is he not the smart wisecracker. There is that great big fat mouth again.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the contents of the bill are deserving of so little comment, that I would devote the last brief remnants of my remarks on this bill on this occasion to the contents of the bill.

We object to a medical council established by this bill which gives the people of the province of Ontario, for practical purposes, no say in the way in which this bill will be operated.

We object to a medical carriers corporation which, in essence, is the originating body that will originate the recommendations that go through under the mechanism of this bill to the council, from the council to the Minister of Health, from the Minister of Health to the government, and which will ultimately determine, having originated it at the level of the medical carriers corporation, the maximum subscription rate to be paid by the people of this province for their medical coverage. We recognize, as everyone else in this House recognizes, that it is wrong for people to be charged different rates for the same insurance coverage under any modern, up-to-date scheme, whether it is administered by the government or by private insurance carriers, and we think that the government should seriously consider this particular aspect of the bill.

We think, in addition, Mr. Speaker, that the government should open up to all the people in the province of Ontario who wish it, the opportunity to subscribe for a standard contract of medical care insurance directly to the government itself, and to pay the premium which the government will charge, if they choose to do so.

We suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be withdrawn and reintroduced in the same way in which the hospital services bill was originally introduced, to make certain that in its own way the government can bring itself to make certain 99.3 or 99.4 per cent, at least, of the people of the province of Ontario are covered for the kind of services which they are entitled to.

We are not here for some idle political advantage this evening, we are here asking the government, before it brings this bill into effect, to take unto itself the obligation of bringing in the group insurance principle, of making this universally applicable, of making it compulsory in the same way in which it makes primary and secondary school education compulsory throughout this province, so that in our way, in our time, we can, through the health of the individual citizen of this province, contribute to the welfare of this province, its economic ability to live

and survive, and ultimately we can lead the way to the kind of Medicare insurance throughout the Dominion of Canada which will be acceptable to all people.

It is essential this evening that the hon. Prime Minister take it upon himself to take this bill back out of this House now, and to make those changes. There is nothing unreasonable about them, and if the hon. Prime Minister is not prepared to do so, I reiterate what my hon. colleague has said, that the crack in the superstructure of the Conservative government in the province of Ontario has appeared and will widen until such time as this government is swept away.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, the debate on the second reading and on the clause-by-clause discussion of this bill revealed for all of the public in Ontario to understand, the position of the united Opposition—it was united at that time, sir, as you well recall. The stand of the united Opposition was against this bill, and sir, in order to reiterate, so there shall be no possibility of misunderstanding, except perhaps among the most droll of my listeners, our stand was based on three main contentions.

In the first place, sir, we said that this was not a health measure, it was a sickness measure and the hon. Prime Minister—a man of very acute perception normally—departed from his quality, highly developed on that score. He said, I think in an attempt to get his supporters to bang their desks, which is the last refuge of an insupportable argument, that he did not understand our position.

We said time and time again that we did not believe his first-step thesis, because if this is a first step, as he wants the public to think, through his remarks in this House and his remarks over the electronic medium, then it is a first step in the wrong direction. In order to be a valid first step, in other words, it must be a first step in a direction of promoting the health care of the Canadian people, in the way that is outlined by Mr. Justice Hall in the 2,500-odd pages of his report.

Second, we said that no one has the moral right to make a profit out of sickness. That is the philosophical cleavage between us, which my hon. friend from Scarborough West refers to. That is the difference in philosophical approach that separates the Opposition from the government on this score. No one, I repeat to you, sir, has the right morally to make a profit out of the sickness or the health of our people.

Of course, in upholding that philosophical

principle, indeed an ethical principle, a religious principle, if you like, we are supported by no less an organ which has its ear tuned to public opinion than the *Globe and Mail*—a journal in this province and of this country which I have always respected very greatly, and ever will as long as it continues its high standard; an organ, let it be said, that has done a great deal to shape the public opinion of this province and of this nation. In fact, I heard the predecessor of the man who occupies the post of first citizen, say in this House one day, "I get some of my best ideas from the *Globe and Mail*." And I suppose that was true. Indeed, not only from the *Globe and Mail* but other organs of the press of this province.

My friend the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) told me as recently as tonight that a Thomson newspaper of Guelph started off with a qualified support of this bill and has during the clause-by-clause study ended up with two editorials in denunciation of it. I say to the hon. Prime Minister in the context of some remarks that he will appreciate later, that ever since the bland announcement was made by the hon. Minister of Health that the sick and the aged would pay higher premiums, there has been a great shift of public opinion in this province.

I said during second reading that Medicare is a political matter. Of course, it is a political matter; it is a political matter in the sense that just about everybody who is alert to public events has an opinion about it. I can only report, and I am sure it is the experience of hon. members in all corners of the House, that when a constituent is asked what he thinks of the system of Robarts care that we are to have, his first reaction is to that announcement of the hon. Minister of Health about the higher premium for the very people who deserve it most, the people who need it. That is the very comment that one gets.

I report to you, sir, that during the last two weeks I sent out a questionnaire containing 10 questions. One of the questions was: "Do you favour government operation of medical care insurance?" More than 200 answers have been received and they are overwhelmingly in the affirmative. Once again I say in the affirmative in the context of our history and development of higher institutions; because I say to my dear friend, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) who looks at me, that we Canadians do not fear government.

Government in the 20th century has become the agent of human happiness. It is the agent through which human happiness can

best be secured. I got the impression from his contribution to the debate that any further entrenchment of government in the private sphere of operation was something akin to Marxism, if not indeed communism.

That was the second ground on which we resisted this bill, and we feel tonight that we are doing a service to the people of Ontario by making a last ditch attempt to have this bill killed on the order paper.

The third one is that we pointed out beyond all possibility of contradiction, of intelligent contradiction, that the Act is an administrative monstrosity, that bureaucratically speaking—and once again I say I do not use the word bureaucrat as a term of opprobrium—that from the point of view of efficient bureaucracy the Act is almost impossible to administer.

I do not need to go into the details, but one I reflect upon that I referred to the hon. Minister of Health was section 7 that deals with the rights of people unemployed for 30 days to make application for partial or total subsidy. The government tells us they start off with at least 1,800,000 residents of Ontario, more than 25 per cent of our people in what is claimed to be the richest province in Canada, in need of total subsidy. It is a pocket of poverty that the hon. Prime Minister will not put in his vest pocket.

Beyond that, we are going to add a large number of people who work seasonally and who can claim the benefits of section 7. At that point the hon. Minister of Health agreed with me. He agreed with me that there was a fear that people would make use of that section who were not morally entitled to make use of it. That is to say they had \$50,000 in bonds under the mattress and ought not to be coming to the public purse for assistance.

There are three bases upon which we took our stand. Now we intended, I might say to you, sir, we intended that the magnificent speech made by the hon. leader of the Opposition tonight ought to be enough to be said from our side. Then we looked with some dismay on the activities of our hon. friends to the left; who made their points and made them very well, made them very eloquently. I do not detract from their participation in the debate in the various stages in any way. I will say this, sir, that my hon. friends to the left, no matter what our differences in political approach, come to the House exceedingly well prepared; but then again they are full-time politicians and have the time to prepare themselves. Their contributions are commensurate with the efforts that they make.

Mr. Bryden: We take our job seriously.

Mr. Sopha: Well, yes, it is the only job you have; people offer me a number of them.

We were content to let the very eloquent statement of the hon. leader of the Opposition stand, but of course politics is always the art of the possible and it became necessary that one of us stand up to indicate that we have by no means lost any of our fervor for the support of this motion.

I hope it will soon be the end. We want to say this; I thought it quite a remarkable thing. I watched you, Mr. Speaker, and I would not be so presumptuous to anticipate what you were going to do, but I thought that you were getting ready to call the vote on this motion. If so it became apparent that no one from the government side was going to participate in the debate on this motion at all.

If that be the case, then I think it fair to say that notwithstanding the public protest, notwithstanding the activities of our friends from the clergy outside the House today, notwithstanding evidence of dissatisfaction in the public press of the province, that the chief citizen is content to say in respect of this bill: "I have the large majority, I have the 77 behind me, we feel this is the best means of social advance in this sphere that is possible at this time; the public be damned."

That, of course, is a hallmark of power which often attends people with large majorities; people with unbalanced majority, because after all we never forget that the 30 of us on this side represent more than 50 per cent of the people of Ontario. We have 30 members as against 78 of those who support the government.

Finally, sir, I want to make a prediction; and I am willing to stake my political future on this prediction. I predict to you—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Provincially or federally?

Mr. Sopha: Well, I was going to say—I am glad the hon. Minister raised that—I was going to say that when my hon. leader was talking about the shortcomings of the Liberal Party in Ottawa—and they are grave on this score, they are grave—I was going to suggest that it is time that somebody in this House went down there.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We have been waiting for that.

Mr. Sopha: It is time somebody went down there to carry the message, and I will leave it at that.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: We are going to miss the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I want to make this prediction. I predict to you, sir, absolutely, that this bill in its present form will never become law. The last section but one says that this bill shall come into force on a day to be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in his proclamation, so that leaves entirely in the realm of the arbitrary when this Act is proclaimed.

This bill will never become law in its present form. The groundswells of protest in this province against this approach, against the inequity and the injustice of this so-called bold first step will swell into such a crescendo that you will hear me say at the next session, if the Lord preserves me to attend another one, you will hear me say, not in so few words, when the hon. Prime Minister and his hon. Minister of Health, who has given him a large assist—the hon. Minister of Health has given the first citizen a large assist into the ways of error—they will be back next year, the two of them, with substantial amendments to this statute before it is adopted as a faulty means of attending to the health needs of our people.

Let me repeat, sir, this bill in its present form will never become a law of this province. The hon. Prime Minister is too acute, he is too sharp a man, for that. He has the editorial of Arthur Ford to sustain him today: "Stature of Robarts Increasing Steadily."

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What has this to do with the content of this bill?

Mr. Sopha: Just a little sideline. Does he object to those words: "Stature of Robarts Increasing Steadily"? Are those words a defamation? Maybe this Ford is a Liberal. I continue:

Premier John Robarts will probably not thank me for this column—

It must be defamatory.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I have always felt that I was very naive and I suppose there is something I am missing in that. However, I will deal with that tomorrow when I make a few remarks to the House—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Later tonight?

Mr. Sopha: Well, perhaps later tonight if you are ready to sit here until about two in the morning.

However, sir, all we can do—we are under no illusion on this side of the House that our motion is going to carry—is to stand right

until the last moment, taking the last opportunity as the hon. leader of the Opposition did, to move this amendment. We demonstrate to the people of Ontario, I think beyond all peradventure and beyond all possibility of misunderstanding, that we in the Liberal Party are saying: "This Bill 136 so far as it attempts to concern your health needs, you the citizen, is not good enough and that we, acting as legislators with the exercise of reason and good sense, could devise a plan that could better suit the needs of our people in this the year 1965."

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, in rising to oppose the motion that this bill now be read a third time and to support the amendment that it be read six months hence, there is little to be said, I must admit, after the speakers who have gone before, but I feel that it is the obligation of each of the Opposition members to do everything in his power to bring to the attention of the public the inadequacies of this particular bill—Bill 136.

I would think that I have spent as much time in the House during the debate on second reading, as well as in the committee of the whole House when we dealt with the bill section by section as anyone here. As we proceeded through the bill section by section, I began to feel that the hon. Minister of Health did not fully understand the bill he introduced himself; nor did he understand the substance and the main principle in the Hall commission report.

More than once the hon. Minister stated that Bill 136 was not the end-all of the medical health insurance programme for the province of Ontario, and he tried to indicate to the Opposition that he was following the recommendations of the Hall commission report inasmuch as it—in his words—called for a medical insurance programme in stages. But I would suggest, as I understand the main recommendation of His Honour Justice Hall, that the report stated that the provinces should proceed with a comprehensive medical insurance programme in stages and the first stage should be medical insurance for all the people of a province under the auspices of the particular government; not that there should be medical insurance in stages and only covering sections of our society.

Certainly this government could have introduced the type of medical insurance coverage that would be, in some sense, in keeping with the Hall commission report; medical insurance coverage covering all the people at one premium without regard to

their ability to pay or their medical condition and, as the Hall commission report said:

One stage should not be entered into and concluded unless the second stage has been introduced and ready for implementation.

And it mentions a priority in the need for medical personnel and medical services, and one of the most important factors was the need for drug coverage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, certainly the speakers in the Opposition tonight have indicated that the hon. Prime Minister of this province has some responsibility in regard to this particular piece of legislation. I am sure that the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister have noticed the lack of support for Bill 136 by the public in general. One does not have to repeat the opposing forces to this piece of legislation.

I know, personally, that the hon. Prime Minister has received from the Hamilton area many representations in regard to Bill 136, asking him not to have it go through this Legislature. I know that he has received over 3,000 signed names on petitions from one local union; a group of people who have what might be considered the best medical insurance coverage in this province, but a group of people who believe that there are many in this province who have not the same type of coverage and should be entitled to a medical insurance programme on equal footing with others.

I noticed in the press in the last two or three days a statement by the parliamentary secretary to the hon. Minister of Health and National Welfare in the federal government, saying that a comprehensive health insurance programme for Canada in the near future was inevitable, stating that medical insurance would be on the agenda for the federal-provincial conference on July 19. With this being a statement in the press, one would have thought that the hon. Prime Minister of this province would have made a statement saying that he was prepared to hold his bill until he could meet with the federal authorities in regard to medical health for the people of this country and to find out what kind of a financial programme they had in mind.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, that did not get much official support from the government, and I felt that they were running away from it as fast as they could.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say to this House that I read the federal *Hansard* of the last couple of days and the

hon. Prime Minister is right. The hon. member was accused of making statements that were not government policy, but certainly the fact that there is a federal-provincial conference on July 19 and medical insurance is on the agenda should have been enough for the hon. Prime Minister to hold this bill until he found out what kind of a financial deal was in the bag. At least he could have put the federal Liberals on the docket to tell us what they intend to do.

I urge the House to support the motion that this bill be hoisted for six months.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal very briefly with the amendment and, of course, I am going to suggest that this House not vote in favour of it. There are one or two points that I would like to make. I might say that this debate really follows the debate that has taken place in connection with this bill in the last two or three weeks, because I am not aware of hearing anything tonight that I have not heard before during the discussions of this bill—both in second reading when the principle of the bill was debated very fully and when it went through committee of the whole House, during which time it was examined item by item and section by section. I may be repeating myself, but perhaps it is time that there was some repetition, and that some of these points should be made again.

I have been very concerned with the efforts—and I might say that I was extremely disappointed to hear the leader of the Opposition indulge in it again tonight—to mislead the public concerning this bill. After all, as I have said before, what we are proposing here is just another part and another piece of a total health plan that has been developed over some long period of time in this province. I might point out to you that, in reading the Hall commission report, which has become the absolute bible—the ultimate authority—to say that this government, as of this moment, instead of this bill should be introducing a compulsory universal medical services plan is wrong. The Hall commission report has been used as an authority to say that is what this government should be doing at this moment, but every man in the Opposition who has read that report knows that the Hall commission says it cannot possibly be done before 1971; that there are some very important things that must be done first.

Mr. Bryden: All this talking for a total health programme—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. Prime Minister has conceded the floor—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a point of order? I do not recall—

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out to the hon. Prime Minister that he was quite wrong in his interpretation—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is a kind of interjection—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, unless the member has a point of order, he cannot intervene. And, in intervening on a point of order, he must state something that the Prime Minister has said, "That is out of order," and I do not recall that he has said anything that is out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to you, sir, that on occasion the hon. Prime Minister has interrupted when we have spoken. We have conceded the floor and he has been permitted to make a comment. Now, the hon. Prime Minister has been kind enough to concede the floor. My comment is simply this, that the Hall commission report talked in terms of a total programme, including not only medical services, but dental, optical, drug services and so on.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I agree completely with my hon. friend, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objection to these comments when I am speaking. I would much rather sit down and hear it, than have it shouted across the floor and end up without the vaguest idea of what the hon. member is trying to tell me. But I quite agree with him.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I also have a point of order on this question. At no time have I suggested that the total health programme as outlined by the Hall commission is going to be implemented, but as we have stated in our own outlines—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I fail to see the point of order. My hon. friend would not yield the floor to me and at this time I am not yielding the floor.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Would you state your point of order.

Mr. Thompson: My point of order is that the hon. Prime Minister has misinterpreted what I and my hon. colleagues have said. We

have had a phased-in programme for the Hall commission, and we had petitioned for optical and dental services for children receiving public assistance. We have worked out this theory and for the hon. Prime Minister to suggest that we are saying that all the health services should come at once, we did not—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am glad to hear it, because it is the clearest I have heard that said in this House during this entire debate. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader of the Opposition at last, in this final debate on third reading, has come to the point where he admits that he could not and would not put in a compulsory, universal medical services plan tomorrow, if he sat in this seat.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to indulge in a debate with the hon. member who is jumping up and down at the moment. I sat and listened to him; I am quite prepared to listen to a point of order, if you require.

Mr. Thompson: On a point of order, the hon. Prime Minister has said this is the first time I have stated this. I suggest to him that he might do me the courtesy of reading my first Budget speech, in which we outlined this completely clearly.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that if I have misinterpreted the hon. member's position in this debate I will go back and check and see what he has said during the course of the debate and what he has also said outside the Legislature.

In any event, I will get back to my point, that what we are proposing here with this bill, is only part of a total plan. I just reached the point where I was reiterating that the Hall commission report says that by 1971 we could have in this country a compulsory, universal medical services or medical health plan. But, says the Hall commission report, certain things must be done first, and I have these listed. I am not, repeat not, going to go through them again, because I have gone through them once in the course of this debate, but nonetheless, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I have heard nothing from the other side tonight I have not heard before, so perhaps the hon. member would like to sit and listen to something which he has heard before, in order that we may keep the record completely straight.

I pointed out a number of recommendations made. The basic one, of course, is that the Hall commission report said that in effect we simply have not got enough nurses, we have

not got enough doctors, we have not got enough paramedical people in this country at this moment to produce and be able to provide the services that the universal, compulsory medical health plan would have.

The report suggested the establishment of various things, such as a nursing planning committee, which we have already done. It suggested that the federal government should provide 50 per cent of the cost of new medical schools. We have gone ahead in this province, because we cannot afford to wait. Nobody has offered us the 50 per cent and the recommendations contained in the Hall commission report have not proved acceptable as yet to the federal government. They may in the future, but that remains to be seen. But this government said, "We cannot wait." It is one year—it was last May or June—since the Hall commission report was made public, and nothing has been done. But between June and October, in pursuance of other plans we had, we became the only jurisdiction in Canada that has done some of this basic implementation of the Hall commission report.

Instead of sitting around talking about it, we have the plans for the medical schools underway; we have plans for the nursing schools underway; we have plans for research facilities in our hospitals; we have plans for teaching facilities in our teaching hospitals. All these matters are at present underway and they are going to take some time.

Mr. Sopha: What have they been doing for 20 years?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It takes just about ten years to create a medical school, from the time you start planning it until the time you get your first graduate.

Mr. Sopha: And they have been in power since 1943.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening, as long as I have sat in this House, to these complaints and when I hear the Opposition say "Too little and too late," I know we have done the right thing—every time—because without a shadow of a doubt, that is the weakest and the most hackneyed argument I have been listening to about one department or another ever since I have been in this House.

Mr. Sopha: It hurts, does it not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, it hurts terribly. I was just pointing out to the hon. member, and I am making these arguments in support

of my position, that what this bill represents is just another step. We propose through this bill to provide assistance for those in the province who need it most, and we propose to provide this starting next June, and that is a relatively short time. It is very simple to say that there is too much time expended between now and then, but these matters are not as simple when you have to arrange the administration of them. In any event, we will be providing care for people in this province in 1966, which we think they need.

I have said on many occasions that if we can work out satisfactory arrangements, and if the federal government comes to accept its responsibility and if it can make certain arrangements with the province of Quebec which I feel will be absolutely necessary—because believe me, at this stage in the history of this country it is not a simple thing to work out any national plan, and just think on that for a while—there will have to be a great deal of arranging and organizing and sorting out before we can hope to have what might be termed a national plan. I do hope that we will find it possible to do it on a somewhat more rational basis than when we worked out the Canada pension plan, and I doubt if there is anybody in this House who would disagree with me in that respect.

These are the things that are going to take time and these are the things that we have already started. I am not going to speak about dental teaching facilities and so on because I believe that the hon. members of this House know what we have set up. We have a plan which we estimate will cost about \$112 million; it will run upward from that. Already, from the figures which have come in to us, I would say that the estimates of what our medical education plans in this province are going to cost, are low, very low. It seems that with all these facilities, whatever price is put on them, when it comes to creating and building them they are more expensive.

I want to go to a couple of other points and I would just say once again that as far as we are concerned, this bill will fill certain gaps and we do not feel that it will, in any way, prevent us from co-operating and working with any other jurisdiction in Canada if it is possible to work these things out. To date, we have no indication that it is.

I would not have the vaguest idea of what is going on in the province of Quebec, for instance, in this particular field. I know that the Quebec government is working out a pension plan and that, in itself, will be a very large project for it. I do not have any idea

whether Quebec would be in any way receptive to the idea of joining a national plan, but I can tell hon. members from my experience to date, that I would say that they would not be, and I would say that there will have to be some sort of arrangement if we are to have a national plan.

But in the meantime, I am just saying we are going ahead and we do not think that this bill will, in any way, prevent us from working in co-operation with the federal government and, as I say, with any other government that may be involved.

Now, I just want to make a couple of comments. I do feel, and I repeat, that a very great effort has been made to mislead the public of this province.

For instance, in all the debates in this House I have not heard one hon. member of the Opposition mention a non-profit plan nor mention in any of these debates the co-operative medical societies which are providing medical care. No!

Hon. members opposite stand up and they say, "You are giving it all away to the insurance companies." This is their plea; this is the impression they are trying to leave; this is where they are trying to deceive the people of this province. Why, the Liberal Party itself—I cannot remember which one of their schemes this was, but in the last three did one not rest firmly based on PSI?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I really must again object. I recall very clearly, for example, that the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) enlarged on this at great length. I am sorry that the hon. Prime Minister has either not attended to what we said or else—and I do not want to say this, because I think he is fair—and I do not want to say that he is purposely ignoring what we said but certainly we have spoken on co-operatives.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it runs in my mind that the hon. member for Bruce did have something to say about this. I do not remember what the hon. member had to say about it. Has he told the people of this province, for instance, that at the present time there are 2,600,000 people covered by non-profit plans in this province? They do not pay anything to insurance companies. Nobody is gouging them—this word "gouge" has been used here in reference to these people.

We have a system in the province developed on a co-operative basis, and the co-operative was developed by the associated medical services, and various groups of

doctors. These are non-profit organizations and they are presently supplying service to 2,600,000 people in the province. Every insurance company in the province must compete with these co-ops, so that if they cannot compete I suppose they will do no business. That hardly agrees with the picture hon. members opposite try so hard to paint of the Conservative Party supporting only the insurance companies. I must stand up and say that I think they tried to do it deliberately.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I point out to the House that there will be not one penny, not one penny of public money paid to any insurance company. I make this point, because I must present the other side of this coin. There will not be a single penny of public money paid to any insurance company.

Mr. Speaker, it may be, as the hon. member for Sudbury says, that there is a great deep philosophical point here about not allowing any insurance company to handle insurance for anyone who is ill, and one can translate that into trafficking in illness, if they please.

All I say is that we are making them compete. If they can compete with the non-profit organizations and sell health insurance cheaper, I claim that the person who is the consumer, who wants the insurance, should be allowed to buy it. If they cannot compete then they will not do any business.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: These are a few of the points I would like to reiterate tonight.

I would like to finally make one comment. I am very disturbed at the attempt made by my hon. friend to compare the premium in Saskatchewan with the proposed premiums in this province. This is intellectual dishonesty at its worst. I am quite certain that he knows that there is no comparison, and I am quite certain that he knows how that plan—

Mr. Thompson: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker; or on a point of order then, if that is how I do it.

I am not going to stand in this House and have any hon. member—no matter who is—suggest to me that I am intellectually dishonest. I suggest that when they pay \$26 as a premium and they also pay for other services; and we, sir, are paying—is it \$180 for the premium—and will also pay for other services, then the hon. Prime Minister is

being intellectually dishonest if he is calling me that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Well, I will withdraw that the hon. Prime Minister is being intellectually dishonest.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. leader of the Opposition's point of view. Certainly if he meant something else. But he did not mention anything about any other services tonight; all he said was that there was a \$26 premium in Saskatchewan and a \$180 premium in Ontario. That is all he said, just the two things.

If he left out something that he intended to say, then I will accept that from him. From where I sit it sounded like a pretty intellectually dishonest comparison, but I realize that he did not mean it that way, so I accept his explanation.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Prime Minister like me to go into the benefits in Saskatchewan?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I am not going to beat any more of this old straw. We do not think that this bill is the be-all and end-all; I do not know how many times we need to say that. I listened with some interest to my hon. friend's comments, and they were also made by the hon. member for Woodbine, that this bill in its present form would never become law. I want to make one comment. I hope that I will never have such a closed mind that I will not be able to make a change if I think it is necessary for better legislation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we get on with the business, pass this bill and proceed to add a few more bricks in the structure we are building.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, it looked for a while as though we were not going to get a government spokesman on this bill. However—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, playing the numbers game, there is no question but that the government can have the last word in this debate, but playing the numbers game is

not going to help them in the province of Ontario because the last word in this debate is that what they have produced is a failure.

The hon. Prime Minister talked about intellectual dishonesty and he rather hurled the words around loosely. I recall, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. Prime Minister, and I am sure he remembers vividly, the fancy advertisements that appeared in every newspaper in the province of Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he is going to talk about intellectual dishonesty, I think these facts must be placed before the people again.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the hon. Prime Minister does, the little dots in the advertisement with a square and a tick mark and it said, medical care for all the people of Ontario—and this was in September of 1963—done.

Mr. Speaker, the chorus of trained seals is in good voice tonight. If this was true in September of 1963, what do we need Bill No. 136 for tonight? We had it all in September of 1963.

Who are the intellectual hypocrites? Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised we have not heard about that tonight, I really am. I am rather shocked that the hon. leader of this government stands here with the cloak of self-righteousness and dignity about him, and rather than defend his bill he attacks the critics. What have the critics said? What has come out in this House about this bill in the last several weeks that we have debated it?

An hon. member: Hot air.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Prime Minister tells us—

Hot air! Which of the hon. Ministers says—oh, the Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). Yes, I could expect that comment from the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, who is the authority on all known subjects, but who did not get into this debate at all. I would like to hear his views, perhaps we will before this evening is over. But the hon. Prime Minister tells us, Mr. Speaker, that this really is not the Hall report, this is a step, this is a further step in the implementation of a health plan.

I suggest that if this bill carries this House tonight, and if contrary to the views of my hon. leader and my hon. colleague from Sudbury and myself and maybe others, it is implemented, we have taken a backward step which will never allow the Hall report to be

implemented in Canada. I suggest that once the government, having dug its heels in, has established this sort of pattern for attempting to take care of the health of the people of Ontario, it will be in a position from which it can never retreat.

I suggest that in the whole process of this debate, as mistake after mistake was pointed out, the government dug its heels in further and further and refused to budge an inch from what was presented in the original draft. It finally emerges that the government that likes to say, "We are so fair," and "We are so honest," is going to charge the old and the sick more for health insurance than it is going to charge anybody else. Is that reasonable, is that honest, is that medical care for all the people of Ontario, as they said in September, 1963?

The hon. Prime Minister was quoting the benefits of organizations such as the associated medical services. Does the hon. Prime Minister recall the words of Dr. Hanna, the president of that association? Does he recall what Dr. Hanna had to say about this report? Does he recall the criticism that Dr. Hanna levied at the government? Does the hon. Prime Minister recall that Dr. Hanna said that organizations such as his would probably have to go out of business if this plan came into being? That is the sort of thing at this, the 11th hour of this bill, that we would have hoped the hon. Prime Minister would have talked about. And when we are talking about honesty and frankness and fairness, we would like to know the premium structure and we have not been told, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest there is no point really in labouring this issue any further. The only reason that I rose to my feet to take part in this debate now, sir, was because I could not let the hon. Prime Minister's words be the last word in this debate. I suggest that what the hon. Prime Minister has done tonight is to cloak under the protective umbrella of a noisy group of backbenchers—noisy uninformed backbenchers—a tale full of sound and fury that signifies really very little; a tale that this government took out onto the hustings in 1963; a tale that was at that time, sir, accepted by the people; a tale which obviously meant nothing in 1963; a tale that does not fit into the four walls of the Hall report; a tale that does not provide what the people of Ontario need, and a tale by which this government has dug itself into a hole from which it will never emerge.

I suggest to you, sir, there is no point in appealing to the good sense, to the fairness, to the equity, to the reasonableness, to the

sense of social justice, of this group who have been in power for 10, these 22 years. I suggest to you, sir, that the die has now been cast, but I think that the people of Ontario want to read at great length and with great care the hollow words that the hon. Prime Minister left on the record, as the last government contribution in this bill tonight.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), in the absence of the Minister of Health, moves third reading of the bill.

The leader of the Opposition, seconded by the member for Downsview moves that Bill No. 136 be not now read the third time, but be read the third time this date six months hence.

In accordance with the procedures outlined today, I shall now put the question.

All those in favour of the bill being now read a third time, please say "aye."

All those opposed say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

YEAS

NAYS

Allan	Bryden
Auld	Bukator
Bales	Davison
Boyer	Freeman
Brown	Gaunt
Brunelle	Gisborn
Butler	Lewis
Carruthers	(Scarborough West)
Cecile	Newman
Connell	Oliver
Cowling	Paterson
Demers	Racine
Downer	Reaume
Eagleson	Renwick
Evans	Sargent
Ewen	Singer
Gomme	Sopha
Grossman	Spence
Guindon	Thompson
Harris	Worton
Haskett	Young—20
Henderson	
Hodgson	
(Scarborough East)	
Hodgson	
(Victoria)	
Johnston	
(Parry Sound)	
Johnston	
(Carleton)	
Kerr	
Knox	
Lawrence	
(Russell)	

YEAS

Lawrence
 (St. George)
 MacNaughton
 Morningstar
 McNeil
 Olde
 Peck
 Pittock
 Randall
 Reuter
 Robarts
 Roberts
 Rollins
 Root
 Rowntree
 Simonett
 Spooner
 Stewart
 Thrasher
 Villeneuve
 Wardrope
 Whitney
 Wishart
 Yakabuski
 Yaremko—53

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 53, the "nays" 20.

Mr. Speaker: Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the procedure set forth in Lewis at page 61, which indicates that at this stage there is an opportunity to amend the title of the bill if necessary, I am going to move, seconded by Mr. Gisborn, that the resolution that the bill be now passed and intituled as in the motion, be amended by striking out the words, "intituled as in the motion," and substituting the words, "intituled, An Act respecting temporary and partial medical services insurance."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is a necessary amendment of the title to indicate properly the content of the bill. It is a bill for temporary and partial services and I think the title should so indicate. I so move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. I will have to rule the member's motion out of order. I consider this motion a complete negation of the bill, because the title of the bill has already been decided; we have had third reading and the bill has now been titled as in the motion. I consider this motion, at this time, completely out of order on these grounds.

Mr. Bryden: May I call your attention, sir, to Lewis' *Parliamentary Procedure*, page 61, which says:

When the motion for the third reading of a bill has been carried, the procedure is closed by the Speaker putting to the House the resolution, "Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion." This gives an opportunity for the amendment of the title if necessary.

I believe, sir, that this is in accordance with what Lewis says is the proper procedure. We believe that it is necessary to amend the title and we would like to put that proposition to the House—

Mr. Speaker: I consider that the title has already been carried and at this time I would have to say that the member's motion is a complete negation of the bill, as I see it, and I would rule it out of order.

Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963.

Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act.

Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 142, An Act to provide for the establishment of regional detention centres.

Bill No. 143, The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965.

Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on the consumers of tobacco.

Bill No. 146, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

On Bill No. 147, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to propose this motion, may I say to this House that, since the last time I spoke on this bill, I have received scores of letters from all parts of Ontario and I have read editorials in the press supporting the stand I have taken.

In effect, the intent of this bill is to spend \$7 million, as outlined by the hon. Prime Minister, to give more mobility to one-third of the people of this province and to ask four million people to pay for mobility for two million people. Now this bill, the hon. Prime Minister repeatedly said, will divert more money to the rest of the province for other commuters' mobility.

Now the people of Ontario are paying the freight for this iniquitous and kite-flying legislation. We ask the hon. Prime Minister, how will he equalize or how will he offer the rest of the province equal sums of money?

In effect, we are giving \$7 million, which is not spelled out in this bill, and \$2 million a year for maintenance. Is this to infinity, or how long is it for?

The hon. Prime Minister says that he does not believe in giving on the same ratio to the rest of the province—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not say that; it is so far from the truth that it is ridiculous.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister will check *Hansard*, he will find that he made a statement that he did not believe in giving grants on a "ratio" basis? Is that not the word he used then—on a "ratio" basis?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I said on a "regional" basis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What I said was that we do not make a practice of giving grants on the basis of the amount of tax revenue that may be raised in any one area. I pointed out to the hon. member that, in the area to be served by this commuter service, it is very easy to prove statistically that it produces large sums of money in taxation from the people who live there—and those sums of money are spent in other areas of the province.

We do not do our taxation and spending on the basis of who produces, or how much, and that it must be spent in that area. We have large tax-producing areas and we have small tax-producing areas and we spread the tax revenue evenly across the province, and according to the ability of the communities to pay.

You know that this is so in our grants for schools as far as school taxes are concerned. We have formulas which take into account the relevant wealth of the community in looking after assessments. The lower the assessment, the higher the grant.

I realize that the hon. member for Woodbine is getting a little excited, but this is between the hon. member and myself.

But that is what is said in essence; that we do not allocate the tax revenues across the province on the basis of where they come from, but on the need of the people generally.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but when every transit system in the North American continent is losing money, and every one in Ontario is losing money, how can we justify spending \$7 million belonging to the rest of the people of Ontario to create a greater growth in the Metropolitan Toronto area? How do you tell the four million people living outside Toronto that this is a good deal?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to the hon. member that the building of better roads here just creates a bigger problem all the time, and you are offering nothing to the rest of the province on an equal basis.

Now, clause 4 of the bill—

Mr. Speaker: I must ask the member not to refer to a particular clause, but speak on the whole of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: The \$7 million the hon. Prime Minister mentioned was to acquire rolling stock, leased or otherwise, and the second clause is to create a maintenance fund of \$2 million.

The hon. Prime Minister does not say if the term of this \$2 million is to infinity, or would he guarantee that the amount will be \$7 million? In other words, the amount of money that is in the air—the amount of \$2 million each year—is to infinity. There is nothing to say that there is any term agreed there. Here we have a bill that is blank at legislation; it gives this government the right to dig into the provincial Treasury and to spend money with no set amount specified. The hon. Prime Minister says that it is \$7 million this year—to take his word—and \$2 million to pay the operating costs. In other words, it could be the same as the subway—a \$20 million gift. In no other jurisdiction could they operate this way. They must spell out the amount of money they were going to give, the terms of the deal and the money involved; but here no amounts are mentioned at all.

This is giving this lop-sided government—the steamroller government—the right to sign a blank cheque, and what I would say is for a political slush fund.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: When one has the right to pass a bill asking four million people to give two million people \$7 million.

In Boston there is a comparable commuter service. They were subsidized up to \$10 million a year and they had to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I will wait, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: As I said, Mr. Speaker, in Boston they have a like system; it was subsidized up to \$10 million a year and they had to increase the subsidy to increase the revenues. The figure submitted by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is about as realistic as his performance in this House tonight—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: He said that there would be—if I read his figures right—6,000 commuters a day coming from Burlington, and from the scuttlebutt I hear there will not even be 400 a day from Burlington.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is wrong, not because we are opposed to any mobility for transportation for commuters down here in this area, but because the government does not tell the rest of Ontario, the four million people outside this area, what they will get.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Ask the hon. member for Sudbury what he thinks about "ratio spending"!

Mr. Sargent: We figure the bill is wrong because it is not stated how much will be spent this year. What we have in this bill is a blank cheque, and in spite of the hon. Prime Minister's "guesstimate" of \$7 million—and it is a guesstimate—

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Actually it is \$7.5 million—

Mr. Sargent: He is the big thunder there; he would know about that.

It is wrong because the government does not tell us how long it is going to spend \$2 million a year on the subsidy. Every transportation system in the province of Ontario is losing its shirt, and the hon. Minister should know that. If this government, in its grab for votes in this area, says to all the rest of Ontario that it is going to tax the people \$7 million to fly a kite for a commuter service down here and is not going to tell the rest of the province how much it is getting, I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he should put a bus system along 401 and save the rest of Ontario \$7 million or \$20 million—how much is it?

As I said before, this bill is a blank cheque to let this government spend an unspecified

sum of money for an unspecified term of years and no one in business could operate this way. What it is asking us to vote for in this legislation—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): He can vote against it!

Mr. Sargent: Some day we will.

Mr. Sopha: I wish there was a gigantic television to show the people—

Mr. Sargent: If those government hon. members who live outside this area—and there are about 50 of them—can vote for this without specifying a like amount for their own home areas, then they are going to have a tough time explaining this to the people where they live.

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he take back this bill and make it a fair bill; make the same amount of money available on a 3-to-1 ratio. All we ask for is a fair deal. If he wants to give \$7 million for Metro and \$2 million in subsidy, then give outside of Toronto \$14 million in capital and \$4 million subsidy. In other words, make it available to them—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Where would we give it? To whom, would the hon. member suggest?

Mr. Bryden: Give it to Owen Sound; that would solve it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I am going to ask the members to desist from so many interjections. I think the debate is getting out of hand at times on third reading and I respectfully ask your co-operation to allow the member for Grey North to complete his remarks on third reading, which he is entitled to do. As long as he keeps fairly relevant within the scope of the bill, I shall allow him to proceed.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I think we should spell out in the bill the amount and the time limit for subsidy and maintenance, because this is not good legislation and we all know it. It is a piece of junk.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, the hon. Prime Minister said that it appeared to him that I was getting excited. It may have appeared that way but I can assure him that that was not the situation at all. I was consumed by curiosity and interest to hear an exposition of Liberal policy with regard to Bill 147. I take it that it is an official statement on behalf of the Liberal Party since the hon. member who made it

was designated earlier as the Liberal Party transport spokesman or critic. If this is Liberal policy, I am glad to hear about it. I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that it is not our policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid that the member is not speaking to the contents of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: I was just commenting on—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid it is not in order on third reading.

Mr. Bryden: I just want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we in this group do not in any way want to associate ourselves with those comments. Quite the contrary, we take the position—and I think it is one well supported by expert authority in the field—that the most efficient and economical way to move people is by public transportation. Furthermore, we believe that public transportation will not be fully utilized if it is required to pay its own way in the narrow sense of the term. It requires a certain degree of subsidization for maximum utilization.

We believe that this bill aims at that. We believe, therefore, that the bill will save the province of Ontario and all its people money in the long run. It will obviate the necessity of much larger expenditures on other forms of transportation, and what is probably even more important, it will prevent the destruction of our cities through cars massing into them when the cities cannot accommodate them. We are wholeheartedly in support of this bill, and in view of the very strong exception to it that has been taken by the Liberal Party, we think it important that our position should be on record.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I want to make very clear the position of the Liberal Party. We have agreed in principle with this bill, but I may say that we do not naively say that just because public transportation is going to be the method of travel, therefore we will not ask any questions. I would think my hon. friend—who seems to worship a god when we say public transportation—a man with his experience—

Mr. Bryden: We do not ask questions on third reading.

Mr. Thompson: —a man with his reading, and a man with his experience on financial aspects, would discern clearly the very pertinent questions which my hon. colleague was raising. I say this for the reason that we know—and so does the hon. Minister and he is

deeply concerned about it—that in Boston the federal government did subsidize the public transportation to the tune of \$10 million. In order to try and attract the public transportation to keep going, they increased the rate of travel over a period and they also reduced the rates.

The hon. member for Grey North, Mr. Speaker, is simply raising questions about this. He has a concern about public finances, which perhaps others do not have. I look on it as a responsibility in this House, as the hon. member for Grey North does, that we should ask these questions; that it is not out of place.

He said there are situations in public transportation systems in other cities on the North American continent, and he asks, naturally, when these questions were raised, why do we choose Burlington? Are we assured that there will be 6,000 people on the train that will go every half hour from Burlington?

These are natural apprehensions. He is concerned about public expenditure and he raises the question. I hope, as I am sure he does, that the questions that we raise, the apprehension that he has, will not be justified. On the other hand, I would say he would be remiss in his duty if he had not stood up in the House and raised these questions. The fact that the new party in their approach, tried to twist the Liberal Party's philosophy and did not raise these questions, I say is a dereliction of duty.

We are for this bill, but we wanted to have more clarification.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, if I may; I do not know if this is the place to answer questions or not.

I think we have had ample opportunity, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, to ask questions. I think many have been asked and many have been appropriately answered. I leave it to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

As I recall it, this bill, in the last words of the hon. member for Grey North, was described as a pile of junk.

Mr. Sopha: That is his opinion.

Mr. Eagleson: That is his way of saying he is for it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well. I would like simply to ask through you, Mr. Speaker, if it is the policy of the Liberal Party to refer to this bill as a pile of junk.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is how he described this bill, as a pile of junk.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, any bill that does not give equal treatment to all people of Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, but the member has to point out how the Minister is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: If the interpretation of the government is as the hon. Minister says, it is a pile of junk.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I thought that was what the hon. member said; now I am sure of it. This is well established again. If he is speaking for his party, we know what the Liberal Party thinks about the bill; they regard it as a pile of junk.

Mr. Sopha: Who said he is speaking for us?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, nobody said he was not.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have stated that the policy of the Liberal Party has been that in principle we agree with the bill, that we will vote on it, but I have also said that the hon. member for Grey North has raised many discerning questions and he is concerned that unless you run this efficiently around this province, it will end up like a pile of junk. He is concerned that you will have equal distribution throughout the whole of Ontario, and that to me is something that is justified by the hon. member.

Bill No. 147, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services.

Bill No. 148, An Act to amend The University of Toronto Act, 1947.

Bill No. 149, The York University Act, 1965.

Bill No. 150, An Act respecting Lakehead University.

Bill No. 151, An Act to amend The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 152, An Act to amend The University of Guelph Act, 1964.

Bill No. 153, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 154, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 155, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-63.

Bill No. 156, An Act to amend The Department of Public Welfare Act.

Bill No. 157, The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Bill No. 158, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Bill No. 160, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Bill No. 161, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 162, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Bill No. 163, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Bill No. 164, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 165, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 166, An Act to amend The Emergency Measures Act, 1962-63.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the Budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.20 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Motions to reappoint and appoint select committees, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	4501
Statement re 700th anniversary of Simon de Montfort's Parliament, Mr. Auld	4504
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Whitney, Mr. Young	4505
Recess, 12.30 o'clock	4518

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1965

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests: In the east gallery, students from Maywood public school, St. Catharines and Centennial Road public school, Scarborough; and in the west gallery, New Dundee public school, New Dundee and Ryerson public school, Owen Sound.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, you might also like to add a word of welcome to the students and teachers from Bedford Park public school. They are in the Speaker's gallery.

Mr. Speaker: I wish to thank the member for Eglinton. I did not have the name of the students in the Speaker's gallery.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves, seconded by **Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer)**, that the select committees on youth, aging, and mining appointed at the session of 1964 be respectively reappointed with the same powers and duties as heretofore.

That changes in the membership of the said committees be as follows:

Youth: Mr. Edwards and Mr. Rowe substituted for Mr. McKeough and Mr. Welch;

Aging: Mr. Whitney substituted for Mr. Carton;

Mining: Mr. Beckett and Mr. Letherby substituted for Mr. Eagleson and Mr. Henderson.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by **Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary)**:

That a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and review The Corporations Act of the province of Ontario

and related Acts and regulations, including The Corporations Information Act and The Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, and to consider the principles of the incorporation, operation, management and dissolution of corporations, including co-operatives, together with the legislation of other jurisdictions relating to the same matters.

And that the select committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to employ counsel and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendances before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

And the said committee to consist of ten members to be composed as follows:

Mr. Lawrence (St. George), chairman; Messrs. **Carton**, **Eagleson**, **Henderson**, **Reilly**, **Renwick**, **Singer**, **Sopha**, **Thrasher** and **Welch**.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make brief reference to this committee. I consider it to be a very important committee which has a very large task to do.

The present Corporations Act of the province came into effect on April 30, 1954, and it was the product of two years work by a select committee of this House. I think we could say that the legislation resulting from that committee's endeavours has been the most advanced in the country and has served as a model for other jurisdictions up to the present time.

In the intervening 11 years since that committee sat, we have witnessed an unprecedented economic growth in this province, and this has been accompanied by an unprecedented increase in the number of new incorporations. During the period since the committee reported, more new corporations have been incorporated in Ontario than in the

whole previous 160 years in the province's history since its founding in 1792.

I therefore feel that it is particularly appropriate at this time that this important legislation be subjected to the scrutiny of a select committee.

It is anticipated that the committee will devote its efforts not only to recommending whatever amendments may be necessary to bring the legislation up-to-date but will also enter upon a full examination of the fundamental principles of the corporation law in all its aspects, a task which has never yet been undertaken by any legislative body in Canada.

A study of this magnitude, it is to be expected, would not enable the committee to bring in a report by next spring. The report of the committee on securities legislation, commonly known as the Kimber committee, which was tabled in the House at this session, has recommended a number of amendments, both to The Corporations Act and to The Securities Act. The government is of the opinion that legislation embodying such recommendations should be introduced into this House at an early opportunity and the necessary examination for drafting is presently going forward. Accordingly, it is felt that such legislation should not await any report of this select committee which has been appointed this morning.

No doubt the examinations envisaged by this select committee will touch on various aspects of financing and investments. However, I wish to make it quite clear that we intend to proceed with legislation in the securities field at the earliest opportunity, based on the recommendations that are before us.

I just want to make this clear because there will be some overlapping in the functions of the committee and as far as we are concerned, we want to proceed with the securities legislation at the next session. Now this may mean that subsequently there will be other adjustments after this committee reports, but they can come along in due course.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management):

That a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and review the provisions of The Conservation Authorities Act and such other Acts of this Legislature relevant to the powers exercised by conservation authorities as the committee may deem appropriate.

And that without limiting the generality of the foregoing to inquire into and review the following matters:

(a) the constitution and powers of conservation authorities including the number and method of appointment of members; (b) the system of financing the work of conservation authorities and the ability of local municipalities to pay for their share of conservation schemes; (c) the power of conservation authorities to acquire or expropriate lands and the methods used therefor; (d) the administrative practices and methods of conservation authorities in carrying out their responsibilities under The Conservation Authorities Act.

And that the select committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to employ counsel and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things and to examine witnesses under oath, and the assembly doth command and compel attendances before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings and deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

And the said committee to consist of 13 members to be composed as follows:

Mr. Evans, chairman; Messrs. Hamilton, Harris, Hodgson (Scarborough East), Kerr, MacDonald, McKeough, Nixon, Olde, Oliver, Paterson, Pittock, and Reuter.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make brief reference to this committee as well.

In the Speech from the Throne, notice was given of the intention of the government to undertake a complete review of the operation of conservation authorities and determine what administrative or legislative changes or improvements might be needed to meet current and future requirements. To understand this, I think we must go back and look at the conservation authorities and some of their history.

The concept of conservation authorities as they have been developed in this province arose from a meeting held in the city of Guelph in 1941. The achievement of that particular conference was the formation of the Gawaraska survey, conducted under the joint auspices of the government of Ontario and the government of Canada. The report of this survey contained a very significant

recommendation that legislation be enacted which would enable conservation work to be undertaken within the natural boundaries of a river valley. It was this report that established a pattern for the future development of conservation authorities.

In 1944, the conservation branch was established in The Department of Planning and Development and in 1946 The Conservation Authorities Act was passed. At that time the government of this province established three basic principles underlying conservation authorities: 1. The best unit on which to co-ordinate conservation is the watershed. 2. The initiative must come from local people. 3. The government of Ontario is prepared to provide technical advice and financial assistance.

While most authorities were brought into being originally because of the urgent need for correcting flooding within their areas, all are keenly aware of the necessity for water conservation. Water conservation includes not only the construction of large reservoirs but also such supplementary measures as the preservation of swamps and wetlands, the creation of small reservoirs, improved methods of land use and reforestation of sub-marginal lands. The Act was passed in 1946, and 33 conservation authorities have been established. They now cover 23,000 square miles and they embrace 487 municipalities.

In the 19-year period that they have been in existence, the conservation authorities have proved to be very effective agencies for the undertaking and administration of comprehensive water management programmes. There is no question in anybody's mind that the authorities have done an outstanding job in this field. Indeed, the conservation authorities have evolved one of the most useful and productive agencies for co-operative action at the local level and I am sure that all the hon. members of this House agree with me that the philosophy which underlies the existence of the authorities is sound in principle.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province owe a vast debt of gratitude to the hundreds of dedicated public-spirited citizens who have devoted many days, months and years of their lives entirely gratuitously to the work of the conservation authorities. Without people of foresight and people who are prepared to give of their own time and effort, the conservation authorities programme would never have flourished and developed as it has.

As with any developing organization, how-

ever, changing demands and circumstances have placed many strains on the administrative procedures and on the financing of the conservation authorities. It is essential that we view the conservation authorities realistically and recognize that as these institutions have developed, new problems have emerged during the quarter-century since the Guelph conference. Expanding population, rapid urbanization and other factors have all given rise to new and increasing pressures.

Many authorities, for example, are faced with the necessity of building and operating multi-million-dollar projects which were not envisaged at the time the authorities were formed. As a result, the scope of water management programmes carried out by the conservation authorities had to broaden to meet these demands.

In recent years, the conservation authorities have demonstrated a growing awareness of the public need for recreational areas, their acquisition and preservation. As a result, outdoor recreation has steadily become a more important function of the authorities and we look to them for even greater accomplishment in the years ahead.

To ensure that they are able to meet the heavy demands put on them, we have decided that the time has now come for a complete review of conservation authorities, the legislation relating to them, and their activities.

Mr. Speaker, this is the background and basis for the appointment of this committee and the terms of reference which it has. I would only say in conclusion that while I recognize the enormity of the task and know there is a great deal of work to be done, I would hope that this committee will proceed with due despatch to conduct its investigations and make its recommendations, in order that we may have a basis for making whatever changes appear to be necessary in the whole setup for conservation authorities. I would like to say once again how important the work has been of the many volunteers, because it is a voluntary organization, and I think we all owe a great deal of gratitude to the many men and women who have served these conservation authorities over this 19-year period.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to make a brief announcement on behalf of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) on a subject that in his words is of considerable interest to all members?

The hon. Minister's statement is as follows:

During the presentation of the estimates of my department I placed considerable emphasis on the success of our efforts to widen and stimulate the overseas food market both in the United Kingdom and on the continent through the Ontario food council.

To further consolidate and intensify our efforts in widening the overseas market I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Earl Mighton to assist Mr. Ted Marritt, marketing development specialist and vice-chairman of the overseas division of the Ontario food council at Ontario House, London.

Mr. Mighton brings to the department a wealth of experience in the marketing field. Born on a farm near Elora, he graduated from the Ontario agricultural college in 1931 with a BSA degree. Following graduation he was appointed research assistant on the staff of the department of botany and was actively engaged in research work.

On February 1, 1940, he joined Campbell Soup Company Ltd. as a fieldman in the purchasing department and was responsible for the procurement of contract crops and the purchasing of fresh vegetables. In 1945 he was made manager of the newly created agricultural department of that company and remained in charge of this department until December, 1959.

During this period he was responsible for the development of an agricultural programme for the company's contract growers and worked closely with growers' associations and with the provincial and federal Departments of Agriculture. He also participated in many of the negotiations for price and terms of contract for the various processing crops, under the terms of the farm products marketing legislation. In 1959 he was appointed senior purchasing agent for the company, responsible for the direction of all procurement in Canada.

On January 1, 1964, he was appointed personnel manager of Campbell Soup Company Ltd., the position which he has retained until the date of this appointment.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture further states that he is confident, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Mighton will make a valuable contribution in our efforts to widen the overseas markets.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement before the orders of the day.

Today, as perhaps many hon. members are

aware, a special ceremony is being held in Westminster Hall, London, England, to mark the 700th anniversary of Simon de Montfort's Parliament of 1265. On this occasion both Houses of the British Parliament will present addresses to Her Majesty, the Queen, in the presence of the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada and other Commonwealth leaders. It is an event of great significance to all of us who value the well-tried system of parliamentary government.

De Montfort's Parliament of 1265 was particularly important because it was the first known occasion when representatives from the "communities of the realm," both the towns and the country, had been called to attend together. It may be regarded as the nucleus of the "Commons," and set a precedent for the future development of a popularly elected and representative House.

Ontario's interest in these celebrations is vital, Mr. Speaker, since our own legislative assembly, a provincial Parliament is a direct lineal descendant of the "Mother of Parliaments" at Westminster.

Our province was first established in 1791 as a result of the passing of The Constitutional Act in that year. Named "Upper Canada," provision had been made for a provincial Parliament and members of the legislative assembly were duly elected following the arrival of our first Lieutenant-Governor, John Graves Simcoe, in 1792. The legislative and executive councils were appointed, and the first session of the provincial Parliament took place at Niagara and was opened on September 17, 1792.

Colonel Simcoe, a distinguished soldier, was also an experienced parliamentarian, having represented a Cornish constituency in the British House of Commons. He was familiar with the British parliamentary system and did much to establish its essential features here in Upper Canada. All freedoms and privileges of Parliament, for which English parliamentarians had fought for so long, were transferred to our provincial Parliament, and provided a strong foundation from which our present system of government has evolved.

In recognition of these important celebrations, a special congratulatory message has been sent from the legislative assembly of Ontario to the House of Commons, to mark the occasion. In addition a permanent exhibit of documents and other historical material is being collected and will ultimately be displayed in our main Parliament building.

We consider it highly appropriate that Ontario should make its own contribution in

connection with the important events taking place today in London. The benefits of parliamentary government are manifold, and are appreciated by all the nations of the world using this system. Despite its imperfections, no better substitute has yet been found. We may do well, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion to recall the words of that outstanding British parliamentarian and statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, who said:

Without parliamentary connection parliamentary government would be impossible; it would be at the same time the weakest and most corrupt in the world.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It has been submitted to him.

Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer please advise what were the findings of the inquiry ordered by Mr. Tupper Bigelow into the Ontario racing commission with regard to suspended racing drivers?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I did not know about this question until 10.25, at which time I was at a Treasury board meeting and so was not able to get the information for the hon. member this morning.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, seeing that the hon. Minister of Highways is answering questions for the hon. Minister of Agriculture—are you?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will try.

Mr. Sargent: Would the hon. Minister please advise what steps are being taken to assist farmers in the drought areas of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, in replying to the hon. member, I should say to him and to the House that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is unable to be in his seat today because he is fulfilling a previous engagement. It is my understanding, while I am not in a position to go into great detail, that he will be addressing a gathering in Arnprior today and will be commenting—I think it is fair to say, making statements—on the subject matter of the question of the hon. member.

An hon. member: He told us about—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He has done that already, that is true, and he was right.

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Before the orders of the day I would like to make a brief announcement. You may recall

that about a month ago I had the pleasure of introducing to the House a group of visiting fellow legislators from the state of Michigan, who were studying methods and seeking the best possible way of indemnifying victims of motor vehicle accidents. Subsequent to their visit here, senior officials of our department attended, as witnesses, before the Michigan state Senate judiciary committee.

Hon. members will be proud and happy to learn that, largely as a result of these two visits, the Michigan Senate has approved legislation that is patterned after Ontario's Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the orders of the day, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister if he plans to table answers to questions 26 and 115 on the order paper?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that before we are completed here I will be able to answer practically all the questions. There was one put on the order paper in the last four or five days which might be a little difficult timewise, but the machinery is in motion and I hope to have those answers before we are finished here today.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Prime Minister whether the private members' resolutions will be debated during this session? There are a number on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to call any of them. When we complete this present debate it is my intention that the House would rise.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you at this late time in the current session I will not make any lengthy remarks. However I did not want to let this occasion pass without adding my own congratulations to those that have already been uttered in respect to the way in

which you conduct the business of this Legislature—with dignity, with courtesy and with great credit to yourself and the riding from which you come.

Before dealing with other subject matter, I would like to advise hon. members of the Legislature that the hon. member for Hastings West (Mr. Sandercock), who we all regret has been ill, is having an operation today in Belleville general hospital. I am sure that the good wishes of all the hon. members of this Legislature will go to our hon. colleague and we all wish for him a most speedy recovery.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whitney: One of my reasons for wishing to make a few remarks is the fact that I happened to have the honour to serve on the select committee dealing with municipal affairs, and it just so happened when the report of that committee was discussed I was unable to be present in the House. I do want to mention my personal appreciation of the work of the chairman of that committee, and also our great appreciation to those people—familiar with municipal matters as they were, whether from the level of municipal councils, boards, commissions, or in many other capacities—who came before us and expressed their views. I am sure it is heartening to any government body or to any committee when the people do come forward and of their great experience tell us of that experience and thereby give us ideas with which to carry out our task and make recommendations to the government of Ontario.

I would like to comment briefly on the report of this committee, namely, in respect to suggestions regarding regional government. I would say that we should pay great tribute to those early settlers and legislators of our province who established the county system as they did. I can think of certain counties, perhaps particularly counties such as Prince Edward—which by itself constitutes a fair economic area—and other nearby counties such as Hastings, Lennox and Addington, also Frontenac.

These three counties, and probably others, were established in such a way that along the waterfront there was an area where a town or village was established at or near the mouth of a river or stream. Logs could be cut in the north and floated down the river, creating an industry and employment for both those living in the north and south. Also, near the waterfront there was good land which could be developed for agriculture. In point of fact, there was an economic

unit; the resources to the north, the agriculture for the supply of foods, and the lumbering and manufacturing industries along the waterfront, the products of which could be shipped out by water.

However, those conditions have changed. Manufacturing increased; the towns and villages grew and many of them became cities and separated towns. The result was that the timber from the north disappeared and people pursued various different interests. Of course, there were not the same mutual interests as when the resources of the north and the production of food and products of the industry to the south all contributed together to provide an adequate economy for all of the people.

In this present day and age, we have seen the expansion of cities and towns so that they have separate governments. Sometimes the industrial enterprises are located in a city or town, and many of the people working in those industries reside in rural areas which are faced with the cost of providing local municipal services without receiving in return any of the municipal taxes paid by the industries. In this day and age there have been difficulties; there have been inequalities; there have been annexations and there have been hard feelings as a result; there has been competition where there should have been co-operation.

We feel that it is in the best interests of the people of this province that a good hard look be taken at all of these local conditions and that people of goodwill be persuaded to consider these things themselves. Our ancestors had enough courage to establish units of government to serve the people and we believe that the people of Ontario in this day and age, as required and where necessary, will give study to the adjustment of local government units in a way that will best serve their interests. We do believe that by so doing, the people of this province will assist themselves, and where, of course, industry does not have a great effect on local living conditions as it does in other areas, both rural and urban, or perhaps we will say large areas of scanty population, we do believe that this policy would enable the government to provide greater assistance where needed, thereby helping to equalize the opportunities for all people throughout Ontario.

I would like to continue my remarks by speaking of our local parks in Prince Edward county, namely, the Outlet Beach park and the Sandbanks park which are now being developed. I might say that the Outlet Beach park has performed a magnificent service;

it is well attended and I believe that on Sunday last, according to CJBQ radio in Belleville, there were some 5,000 visitors to this park. It was formed of sand dunes and its magnificent beach is used for swimming, camping and so on.

There are those who criticize the fact that it was not left in its natural state, and there are those who feel that by being put to park use, some of the natural condition was lost and that sand was being lost. They did not have too much to say publicly about this until the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) proposed to establish the Sandbanks park, which is also composed of sand dunes some five miles in length and of which there is a corresponding five miles or more of beach on the West Lake side.

Truly these are magnificent natural assets to be enjoyed by the people of this province, and I certainly do appreciate the determination of the department to develop them and make available to our people the pleasures that may be derived by the people who visit them and camp there.

However, a year ago, when the Sandbanks park was proposed, Dr. Pimlott and a group of people, belonging to a conservation or naturalist association, came to Prince Edward county. They walked across the dunes of the proposed Sandbanks park and had pictures taken which appeared in a Toronto newspaper. They were very critical of this proposal, stating that a great deal in natural benefits which should be preserved would be lost by the general public, and, in point of fact, attempting to urge all possible public support against the proposal of developing this park.

Again this year, before our committee dealing with conservation, and so on, Dr. Pimlott appeared and made much the same argument. At this time, the hon. Minister presented some argument against his statements and I added to the hon. Minister's remarks, but the newspapers gave very little acknowledgment, if any, to what our hon. Minister said and no acknowledgment whatever to what I said.

I feel, in all honesty, that both sides of these stories should be told. Consequently, I obtained some statistical information from the Tweed office of The Department of Lands and Forests. I would like to compare some of the statements made by Dr. Pimlott with the facts as presented by The Department of Lands and Forests, and I think the people should be allowed to judge as to which is true conservation—that being carried on by our own department, or that suggested by

someone who casually walks across a property and who appears to be totally unfamiliar with what has been done over the years.

I would say that in regard to the Outlet Beach park, Dr. Pimlott is quoted by the *Globe and Mail* as follows:

I camped there two years ago. The only signs were those that warned of fire. There was not a single sign which suggested to the campers that dunes are fragile things and that digging in stabilized dunes can be extremely injurious to the plant community and to the dunes. In addition, the integrity of the area was being destroyed by the planting of exotic species and by the massive trampling of the fore dunes.

In point of fact, when the Outlet Beach development first started, the chief growth there was poison ivy. That poison ivy had to be destroyed before the area could be developed. Some areas where there was natural plant life and so on were not developed for the use of the public. Also, there is a directive issued to everyone who camps in that park and Dr. Pimlott must have received it the same as anyone else.

Here are some of the directives contained in that pamphlet:

Sand is a wonderful attribute to bathing and romping feet; however, owing to the constant threat of shifting sand interfering with the movement of road traffic and parking lot facilities, we ask that you help preserve all vegetation that is so important a factor in controlling sand movement. A step taken aside will preserve for tomorrow a tree that nature, or a man with a spade, provided today.

We might also say sand-crossing steps have been provided, which encourage people to walk over these steps. These are marked, and there are a number of them which encourage people to just walk over the dunes in specified places. I can assure you, in my visits to the parks, it appears that this is being done.

In regard to the Sandbanks, reference has been made to leaving it in its natural state. Dr. Pimlott does not appear to realize that anything has been done in these parks. Since 1921, when The Department of Lands and Forests first assumed control of the Sandbanks, which Dr. Pimlott said should be left in its natural state, a total of 2,100,000 trees have been planted in the southern section where sand movement was threatening adjacent private land.

In conjunction with this reforestation, the sand was first mulched with straw or hay,

following which several thousand feet of various types of fencing was erected to protect the planted areas from wind erosion.

Second, in regard to the Outlet Park, since 1958 the department has mulched this with hay and straw and planted a total of 103,000 trees. The pamphlet notes:

Placed over 25 sets of dune-crossing steps made from slats and old fire hose in key dune-crossing areas adjacent to the Lake Ontario beach. These dune-crossing steps make it much more convenient for people walking over the sand dunes and lessens disturbance and trampling of vegetation. Maintained during the past three seasons, from fall to spring, over one mile of double-spaced snow fencing on the Lake Ontario beach, which has helped considerably in cutting down wind velocity and sand drift. Have stressed in our Outlet Park hand-out pamphlet over the past six years the importance of preserving park vegetation to help control sand movement.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that rather than the promotion of these parks being in opposition to conservation, my belief is that they support conservation. This sand would be drifting from there had it not been for the work and the snow-fencing that The Department of Lands and Forests has done.

I know that it is the intention of The Department of Lands and Forests to preserve some parts of the Sandbanks in their natural state where desirable, and yet at the same time make other areas available for the people of Ontario to enjoy.

Therefore, it rather irks me when one side of the story receives publicity. The pictures are repeated; the same pictures are again published this year as were there last year. But the other side of the story gets no publicity, and I think it is time that The Department of Lands and Forests received credit for what it has done, rather than such statements as this. We can appreciate people having different views, but we do believe that there are a lot of facts to support the opposite position. That is what I am trying to outline at the present time.

By the same token, we do have some instances where we feel that statements in the press and elsewhere in regard to agriculture do not present as accurate a picture as they should. We feel that one side of the story does not get told to the general public. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) gave a very excellent speech on agriculture here a few weeks ago. We saw no recognition of it whatsoever in the press.

In line with this remark, I would like to point out that two or three months ago the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation presented a programme on Country Calendar entitled "The Farmers' Image." I wrote to the CBC and the producer, Mr. Murray Creed, was kind enough to forward me a copy of the script from that programme. Here is something that I would like to call to the attention of the hon. members of the Legislature, namely, that many people may feel that the farm people are not doing a good job. It would seem, in a portion of the press at least, anything that would promote that idea is given considerable publicity; whereas there does not seem to be too much that tells the true story of what the farmer is endeavouring to do and the difficulties he has in carrying on farm operations.

However, strangely enough, these reports in the press do not seem to have too much effect on public opinion, because in the late summer of 1964 an organization known as MRC, or Market Research Centre Limited, called on its field staff of over 1,000 qualified interviewers to discover the true urban image of the farmer. Fifty preliminary interviews of a cross-section of city dwellers from coast to coast set the pattern approach for a further 500. The results were analyzed, causing considerable surprise.

Then a further survey of a second set of 500 cross-Canada interviews functioned as a check on the unexpected results. All three sets of interviews brought identical findings. These findings were analyzed with the aid of electronic computers, and interpreted by MRC's staff of experts in sociology, psychology, statistics and economics. The following quotations are from this report:

Eighty-nine per cent of the city dwellers reported to us that they felt that the farmer is harder working than the city dweller himself—a very surprising finding and very different from what some of the farmers themselves had thought. Then we went ahead to talk to them about government support for farmers. It was very interesting; 65 per cent of the city dwellers reported that the government does indeed give the farmer either some support or a great amount of support.

When we went ahead and asked them how much support the government should give the farmer 80 per cent of the city dwellers reported that the farmers should be given a great deal of support.

And why should they be given this support? Because as the farmer goes, so goes the nation. This was the thinking

behind the average city dweller's belief that the farmer indeed should be given subsidies. We then went ahead to discuss the question of what contribution the farmer is making toward our Canadian growth and prosperity. Sixty per cent of the urban dwellers felt that the farmer is making a very important contribution to the Canadian economy. A very different and surprising finding in contrast to what the farmers themselves have believed.

For example, 18 per cent of the urban dwellers did think that the farmer was paying less taxes than the city dweller. We then discovered that 72 per cent of the urban dwellers felt that the farmer earns less than the urban dweller and that is why he pays less taxes. Surprisingly enough 80 per cent believed that the farmer is a better citizen than the city dweller and only some four per cent or five per cent felt that the city dweller was a better citizen.

I mention these things because sometimes I feel that perhaps newspaper reporters look at things and write as they feel the policy of the newspaper's editorial staff would indicate. It seems to me, sir, that perhaps when the papers send out someone to write on farm conditions, they should send someone who has some sympathetic knowledge and understanding of farm problems, not someone who has in the background a desire to look at some of these things with the jaundiced eye prevalent at the editorial level.

I do feel that here we have people who, faced with drought and with many adverse conditions, do everything possible, nevertheless, to help themselves. We know of farmers who of necessity work at other occupations in what is known as "moonlighting." Sometimes their wives, according to qualification, teach school, nurse, or engage in other work, but nevertheless it is with the objective of preserving their farm and home under difficult conditions so that when the time comes that they can no longer work, or when they can afford to do so, they will be no charge on the people of Ontario.

Sometimes, true, their homes do not look attractive and perhaps they have what appears to be rubbish in the back yard, but it may be fuel that could be used in the late spring or early fall. The true story behind some of these conditions is not apparent to the average city dweller who views these things. I do feel that instead of criticizing these people who have done so much to develop this country, and support themselves, others should look on them with a more sympathetic eye. I am very happy indeed that the CBC programme

illustrated that many urban people do look with this sympathetic view and are not led astray by many of the viewpoints expressed in newspapers.

I would like to say also that sometimes these things carry over into other matters such as government policies, and I want to mention briefly the Budget. I have heard it said that—and I think it is rather a contradictory statement—"the fondest recollections are the memories of things long since forgotten." I think perhaps that sometimes in the past some of the remarks that have been made concerning provincial budgets are remarks that the sources from which they come would like to be forgotten. In fact when they are not forgotten, they are not always recalled very sweetly.

I would mention that in the old days the late member for Brant, whom we respected so much, could not conceive of the fact that progress was taking place and Ontario was progressing to the point where our debt should be as high as it was. He really felt that we were on the verge of bankruptcy. We honour him for his opinions and believe that he acted in good faith and according to his conscience.

Then we had a former leader of the Opposition who suggested contra-cyclical budgeting. His suggestion was that we were reaping a great deal because of good times and therefore we should tax for a lot more so that we would have a fund built up to stimulate the economy when the buoyance decreased. The good times, however, have continued in many ways. The revenue of the province has continually increased and therefore we feel that that policy has fallen by the wayside.

Then again we have heard of "cooking the books." I would not want to make any suggestions, but we just wonder if that was not a "half-baked" idea too. The economy of the province, under present policy and the present government in Ontario has been strong and has meant steady progress without looking back.

In conclusion, I do feel that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the government of this province are making a great contribution to the people.

I would say that everything can be criticized, and as our hon. Prime Minister and other hon. Ministers have said: "We do not say that any legislation or anything that we propose is the ultimate. Rather it is a progression." I believe that our progression is in good hands and that nothing is being done that will jeopardize our position of sound

financial standing, that is encouraging industry and expansion in this province and at the same time permitting progress to be made in regard to welfare measures and supplying the needs of our people.

I will conclude my address with a quotation made by the late Theodore Roosevelt, a former President of the United States. He said:

It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement; and who, at the worst, if he fails, fails while daring greatly.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the end of a very long and very talkative session and I suppose, as the man who just spoke, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney), has said, I suppose it does not behoove us to make long speeches at a time like this. At the same time there are some things that perhaps should be said, and in reviewing this session as a fairly new member in the Legislature, I want to make a few observations.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have appreciated the kindly smile on your face when you have been trying to smack us down from time to time. You have carried out your job with dignity and aplomb, and though we quarrelled with some of your decisions here and there, we realize that what you have done has been in real sincerity and we believe that you have done an outstanding piece of work here.

I would recommend to you, sir, that a stronger chairmanship should perhaps be looked into at the committee level and this might solve some of the problems which this House has faced over the past year.

We have gone through a tremendous amount of business. A province like Ontario just cannot expect to operate today on the kind of basis which we operated on 20 or 30 or even ten years ago. This province is larger now, in population and in wealth, than Canada itself was not too many years past. So I think we have to face the fact that the business of this House must be ordered and

must be planned in a more rational way than we have done up to the present time.

During this past session we have seen a sort of hit-and-miss approach, which we in this party have criticized from time to time. We have seen very important legislation come in very late in the session and we have seen the kind of legislation, such as Medicare, which has universal appeal and universal interest, introduced almost the dying part of this session of the Legislature.

This should not be. I think over the next few years we should think in terms of the Legislature being a year-round proposition. For a long time this group has been advocating that we should think of longer sessions than the ones we have carried out, and I think this year has demonstrated the absolute necessity of this thesis.

So, Mr. Speaker, it would seem logical that we start to plan for the year as parliamentarians; that we think in terms of the winter session with a fairly lengthy recess at Easter; that we think in terms of a summer recess, of a fall session and a fairly long Christmas recess. As we think of that kind of timing we must order the business of this House in a rational way. Legislation should be prepared so that the Ministers concerned will introduce that legislation as early in the session as is humanly possible. That will give an opportunity, first of all, to the government caucus to scrutinize it. This year, the government caucus was meeting very late in the session to look over very important legislation. This should not be, and that legislation should be prepared as early as possible in the session.

More than that, in addition to giving the government caucus a chance to look at it, it also gives the caucuses of the other parties an opportunity to study this legislation carefully. It should go to the committees of the House as early as possible, and as many pieces of legislation as possible should go to those committees. There is a great deal of public interest in many of these measures, and if we want to mobilize public opinion behind them—or in the case of the Opposition, perhaps against certain features—and this is democracy—then time should be given to do this job.

With the committees meeting as early as possible and the legislation in hand as early as possible, we can move forward to do the kind of business which this House ought to do—the careful, detailed study and assessment, and the careful, detailed discussion of the clauses and of the general principles of the legislation.

I think one thing which has struck me this year, Mr. Speaker, is that the more leisurely pace of this session has been good and if we combine that more leisurely pace with the advance planning and with the kind of programme which I have outlined, I think we will be well on the way to doing a good job for this province in the future.

This has been a year of talk and a year of revelation in this province, a year when we have come face to face with many of the problems of the people of Ontario. The dry season again this year accentuates the problems we have with the Great Lakes levels and with the agricultural industry. Some of us were privileged to hear Mr. Kierans, the engineer from Sudbury, as he outlined his plan for the grand canal scheme to bring certain waters from the north down to solve part of our problems. Whether or not the Almighty is going to solve this problem before this kind of planning can get off the drawing board, I do not know. But if this happens, it is only going to be a temporary solution.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): You put more faith in Him than the government.

Mr. Young: It seems to me that this is the kind of challenging venture that this province ought to be undertaking and that we ought to look forward to stabilizing our resources in the lakes and rivers by the use of other resources which can be spent and used again, according to the Kierans report. It just seems that this is the imaginative kind of thing which we can address ourselves to, and if the water is not needed, the solution is there for that, too. But in a time of drought, we have this solution and we can do the job.

Over this last year, according to the economic surveys, the gross national product of this nation has risen remarkably—about nine per cent, if I remember. At least, across the nation, our gross national product has gone up by about \$4 billion. This is a remarkable increase and I suppose certain government hon. members would say, "Well, that is because of good government." We give them the opportunity to say that if they want to, but the fact remains that this has been brought about right across the country, and it is a Canada-wide phenomenon, so that even places that do not have Tory governments are sharing in this prosperity.

Two things perhaps have contributed to this more than anything else. One is the sale of our surplus wheat to the communist world, and even though we do not like com-

munist and sometimes look askance at trade with the East, we do find that the buying of our wheat has pumped purchasing power into our economy here and brought that purchasing power to the farmers and the railway workers, and has spread itself right across the board.

We also have the tremendous pressure of the baby boom from right after the war, which is now pushing and forcing us to build and to develop in the housing field, the educational field, all the fields across this nation, to prepare for this burgeoning new crop of young people who are now hitting the universities and who will be looking for homes, and are in fact, looking for homes right now, as this generation grows.

These are factors in the economy which likely will continue for some time. We do not know about the purchases of wheat, but we do know that this generation is here and it is going to demand services whether we plan to give them in a logical way or not.

In spite of this increase of wealth, an increase which I suppose averaged last year about \$1,000 per Canadian family—we have about four million Canadian families and we had an increase of around \$4 billion—that increased wealth, I am afraid, is not being spread around as it ought to be, Mr. Speaker. One of the significant revelations which occurred in this House was the matter of widespread poverty which still exists in the province of Ontario.

During the early part of this session, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) pointed out that according to recent studies there are 700,000 people, over 11 per cent, living in destitution, more than one million people, over 19 per cent, living in poverty or destitution, and two million people, over 32 per cent, living in deprivation, poverty or destitution. The immediate reaction, of course, was one of derision from the government benches and I remember that derision vividly from my left. But then later, both the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) gave us some details of this destitution and we were told that 17 per cent of Ontario's civil servants were in receipt of less than \$3,000 a year and a further 18 per cent less than \$3,600 a year. More than a third of the provincial government's employees are earning so little that they are eligible for a subsidy on their medical insurance.

Then we saw the hon. Minister of Health make that startling revelation, that one million of the people of this province are eligible for total subsidy in the health plan

because they pay no income tax whatsoever, and that another 800,000 are eligible for partial help, meaning that we have a tremendous backlog of poverty and want in what should be one of the most prosperous provinces in the land.

Along with this revelation of figures, in the civil service particularly, came the revelation of the loss of efficiency and morale within many provincial institutions. We found that Mercer, for example, cannot find a new superintendent because this is not the kind of job and the kind of situation which is challenging to the kind of person who is needed and demanded in that position. Many of our other institutions in the reforms field are having the same difficulty to secure top staff and hold adequate staff within their institutions.

We saw, too, how some of the employees of our institutions came right here to Queen's Park and marched up and down and around and about in front of the doors in order to bring to this government and the people of this province their desperate plight of low wages and lack of proper fringe benefits. I think when that situation arises within a province like Ontario, then we should be asking ourselves very serious questions about the adequacy of our treatment of our own civil service.

It is all right to give our people who work for us a pat on the back—and I am one who would say that these people, in spite of the situation, are doing a good job within the limitations set for them. Our civil service perhaps deserves a tremendous pat on the back, and the hon. Cabinet Ministers who have rushed to their defence and have said that we were criticizing the civil service were just whistling against the wind because we were not criticizing these people as people. The fact is that we would like to see within this province a wage scale and salary scale which will demand the abilities and the training which these jobs ought to have, so that we can get the people to do the job. There is no question that it is an extremely expensive business to pay too low wages and get inefficiency within our civil service. So within the next year or so I hope that the hon. Provincial Treasurer and other people concerned with him will meet these people realistically and will do the job that ought to be done in this field.

We have seen in this House over this past session the passing of legislation, as I said on one other occasion, with the Opposition blindfolded. We have seen the introduction of community colleges, to use one example. We are not sure where these colleges are going;

just what their function is within the educational framework; and whether they are to be terminal facilities or whether they will be part and parcel of an on-going university structure. This has not been determined and perhaps all the details cannot at this time be determined, but it seems to me after the study and the experience that has gone into this type of institution we should know more clearly where we are heading as we set these colleges up.

On the Medicare plan, as has been said so often within this House, and I do not want to repeat it today, the Opposition here—perhaps the government members too, I do not know—have been voting blind because we have no idea what this plan is going to cost and what the total picture involves. So we have passed, and this government has rammed through, a Medicare plan which is inadequate and which is now catching the imagination of the people adversely because they are now commencing to understand what it all means.

After probe, after probe, after probe we have discovered the weaknesses of this plan; and the people of this province are just now realizing that it is not, as the hon. Minister himself has said, a Medicare plan but only a step toward something better. But when we realize that another province, without the resources of this one, can set up a Medicare plan which can adequately serve the people of that province, then Ontario should be hanging its head in shame.

We have seen, too, a government which has passed legislation demanded by a certain section of the population; legislation which is not generally needed, in my view. We saw the situation where the threatened hospital board refused to negotiate with its union. The government, instead of moving in and saying: "You must negotiate in good faith," because of a breakdown of the situation there, rammed through this House compulsory arbitration for all hospitals because of the intransigence of that one board.

We saw later, in the Toronto Hydro situation, where the government—in spite of the fact my leader (Mr. MacDonald) had taken steps and worked with the union and others to bring about what seemed to be a logical conclusion to this problem; in spite of that fact and because the Hydro board refused to accept what seemed to be a logical conclusion in this dispute—again rammed through compulsory arbitration. In this picture I must say that the official Opposition party here played a rather sorry role—having made up its mind that it would vote for the bill. Then the leader of that party used very

violent and very unfair words against the leader of my party because he had stepped in and had tried to find the solution. It was wide open for the hon. leader of the Opposition, if he had so desired, to get in and do the same kind of mediating work to settle this dispute and to bring before this House a practical solution to it.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member suggests that I had made up my mind that I was going to vote for the bill. This, sir, shows some kind of insight that he had which I did not have. What we wanted was to have the facts of the case presented to us; then, having got the facts, as a responsible Opposition we would make our decision. That is exactly what we did.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Speaker, we accept the hon. leader's assertion that his insight into this situation was minimal and that he was not exactly clear on what he expected to do when he came into this House. We accept his word that he had not yet made up his mind.

Now, in a position like this, if a responsible leader of a party and a responsible party comes right down to the last minute not knowing what it is going to do in a situation like this, then there is something drastically wrong.

I was very interested in this morning's press, Mr. Speaker, to learn when a friend of his—Mr. Martin P. O'Connell, I understand it was—was nominated last night in some New Democratic territory, which he is now invading with some hope that he can win in that area—

Mr. Thompson: Hear, hear!

Mr. Young: He had the hope, I said. There is going to be a little bit of disillusionment for Mr. O'Connell a little later on. But it was interesting to note that Mr. O'Connell had headed up, according to the morning paper, a squad of 150 researchers who have been helping the leader and others to get their speeches together. Well, this is good. I am delighted to see volunteers of this calibre who are doing a job, but it seems to me with 150 researchers this party should have had a little more stability through the session and have shown a little more dynamism and a little more leadership throughout the whole time.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Maybe the researchers did not agree with each other.

Mr. Young: Well, that is the situation. I think one thing has been made plain in that party, that one Charles Templeton has now been relegated to his proper place. I do not know just where he is now—we have not heard of him lately—but not being at the leader's side yet, we are just wondering where that gentleman is. However, if he is coming back, fine; this is all to the good, I suppose, as far as the party is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having taken that little sideswipe here, I come back to the main basis of this speech, and I want to direct our attention for a few minutes to a very important report which has just been tabled in this House. Unfortunately I was away last week on an assignment which I had to undertake, but the Goldenberg report was tabled and I had a chance to look into it to some extent, and I have not been too impressed by its recommendations.

It seems to me that this report is simply an abortion of the possibilities for the area. It does not set out in clear detail what the possibilities of growth and development can be for Metropolitan Toronto, and it stops short of giving the kind of lead and the kind of framework within which the area can grow over the next two or three decades.

I think, for example, of the boundaries which it outlines. Now I was frankly disappointed when he outlined the boundaries of present Metro. I know that he talked something of an extension northward if that is necessary. I can see where his argument stands up east and west. Because to the east, that area might well be part of a regional government centred on Oshawa. On the west, it might well be another regional government. But to the north, for the life of me I cannot understand why, at this stage, Mr. Goldenberg has not recommended that the boundaries be pushed up to include the railway line which is a vital part of a planning area of Metro and to the watershed, which is going to be vitally affected by the sewer and the water complex in the whole of Metropolitan Toronto. It is just unrealistic to think we can plan effectively in that kind of a situation.

As far as the new city complex is concerned, it is simply Toronto-centred. I think the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) might applaud a bit here, when I mention this fact. The Smallwood report, issued three years ago, says this on page 29:

A similar, although not as dramatic, imbalance has become apparent with respect to the city's position. Whereas in 1953 the city had to be given half the council seats on the ground that it contained 57 per

cent of the area's total population, by 1961 the city had dropped to 40 per cent of the area's total population and yet it still retained its 12 council seats.

Well now, what has happened? As far as Mr. Goldenberg is concerned, he has simply increased the size of the city of Toronto so that it again has half the population, and then he has cut off the other three cities and combined the smaller municipalities into those cities. But the same imbalance will remain in the days to come. He may redress it to some extent now, but that imbalance is still there potentially. The Smallwood report again says:

Any governmental federation must depend upon a meaningful degree of co-operative action between its component members if it is to realize its full potential. Yet the prospect for such co-operation can be diminished significantly if these members are separated by fundamental disparities and basic resources especially in the economic sphere. If this imbalance is overly drastic it tends to act as a cancer which can spread throughout the entire body politic, weakening the unity of the federal government and inhibiting its ability to act decisively.

In this case he applies this to the Metro government, of course. Then he shows something of that imbalance. The fact is that the new situation in Metro is better than it was before. The taxable assessment per capita in 1964 in these areas of Toronto, North York, Etobicoke and Scarborough is as follows: In Toronto an assessment per capita of \$2,786; North York, \$2,568; Etobicoke, \$2,563; and in Scarborough, \$1,969.

This means that an attempt has been made in three of the new cities to bring the per capita assessment into something near balance, but Scarborough is left away out on a limb in this regard. To make this picture complete we have to recognize that Scarborough particularly is a dormitory township with many large families. The Smallwood report points out that the assessment per pupil enrolled in public schools for the new city of Toronto will be \$23,700. For the Etobicoke city it will be \$17,000; for North York, the new city, \$15,000; and for Scarborough \$9,600. So that the imbalance of assessment per pupil enrolled in public schools remains.

I know that Mr. Goldenberg made some attempt, by a hodge-podge of school boards, and school board jurisdictions, to right this balance, but that is another story. He just cannot do it with these recommendations.

When we look at the burgeoning population of these new cities, the new city of Toronto is the central core. Its growth will be upward. There will be apartment redevelopment, I suppose, so the population will grow. But in the outer suburbs, with great areas of vacant land, the population will burgeon over the years to come and thousands upon thousands of people every year will be added until, within the next few years, the imbalance again will be something akin to what it is today.

So this kind of report, establishing the four-city complex with each one semi-independent, will not do the job that should be done. I appreciated the recommendation of the Goldenberg report that planning ought to be on a comprehensive scale; that there should be an official plan for the whole area in a hurry. Metro Toronto has been playing with this for a long time and we still do not have an official plan for the area. Also, he recommended that district plans should fit into this Metro plan. This is a consummation that must come very quickly if proper planning is to be done. But then he separates some of the planning devices from the Metro government, the Toronto transportation commission, for example.

Transport and rapid transit are as important a function in a metropolitan complex as the trunk sewers and the trunk water mains and the trunk streets. So transportation should be a vital part of planning. Transportation should be planned for the new subdivisions and the people who move into those subdivisions should know where the transport is; it should be there for them. This means that the suburbanite will get used to using public transit rather than his own motor car for much of his travel. In this way, transit becomes part of the warp and woof of a whole area.

Instead of simply putting the chairman of Metro Toronto on the TTC board, it would seem to me far more reasonable and sensible to make the Toronto transit commission a committee of the Metro government. Then it is part and parcel of the planning of the whole development of the area and its servicing.

In another respect, he has given the Ontario housing corporation almost complete control of housing development, that is low cost housing development, within the Metro area. This may be the only logical step at this moment, I do not know. I want to look into this thing a little more carefully, but again we come to the planning aspect of this matter. Ontario housing is undertaking to buy and to build housing for problem cases,

large families and low income people. But if they are to plan efficiently as to where these houses ought to be in Metro, then they should be part and parcel of a planning process of the metropolitan complex. The Ontario housing authority is not part of the Metro government. So while there may be very close co-operation—and certainly the hon. Minister (Mr. Randall), I think, will see to it that there is—the fact is that these municipalities will drag their feet as they have in the past when it comes to low cost housing within their borders, because these kind of houses do not bring good assessment.

So when the hon. Minister and Ontario housing present plans, all kinds of road blocks will be put in their way, as there have been in the past. The hon. Minister is going to have a tough job to use all his good nature and all his persuasive power to get the houses where they ought to be, not just where he can find a bit of land and where, finally, he can bulldoze the individual city to accept them.

One other point which is serious in this matter of imbalance is industry and industrial development: I do not think any of us are naive enough to think that industry is going to be planned properly in an area where you have four municipalities fighting for industrial assessment. Industry does not demand schools and many other services. So the fight has always been on, right across this province and right across this land, to bring industrial assessment within the bounds of the municipalities. So each municipality has its own commissioner of industry, or whatever you want to call him, it has its committee and they try to get industry to locate within their borders.

This will continue, and instead of industry being located within the Metro complex where it ought to be and the housing spotted in relation to that industry, we are going to find the same old struggle for industrial assessment. North York, Etobicoke, Scarborough and Toronto fight for assessment and send their emissaries out to talk to industrialists who are thinking of setting up plants and put before them the importance of coming into this municipality, rather than another. The overall planning of industrial assessment and overall planning of the housing related to that assessment is going to be a very difficult thing.

When I look at the education setup, I see that it is perhaps the one place where Mr. Goldenberg made a real attempt to overcome this imbalance and this problem of a struggle. He says, as far as education is concerned,

that taxes are going to go into a single treasury and out of that treasury, as far as I can understand it from the quick reading I have made. Then they are going to go back to the 11 various boards which are going to be set up, and those 11 boards will have no relationship whatsoever to the municipal boundaries.

One of the first problems that comes to the mind of an active politician, and I see the problem in Scarborough as well as other places, is how are elections going to be conducted for the board of education? There are going to have to be two sets of election officials. There will have to be two sets of ballot boxes. In other words, there are going to be two separate election organizations for the municipalities and for the school districts.

As if this is not bad enough, when we look at what is happening clear across the board on this matter of political divisions, then we become appalled. The province is dividing up Metro into various provincial ridings. Last week we had the announcement that the federal government is carving up Metro in another way, without regard whatsoever, it seems, to the provincial boundaries. Now the proposal is that we are going to have a municipal boundary of one kind for the purposes of electing aldermen or councillors, we are going to have another setup for the purpose of electing Metro councillors, and we are going to have another setup still in the matter of boards of education.

What the poor citizen, who has to make his choice, is going to do here, I just do not know. It is going to be a bewildering array of choices which he must make in a jigsaw puzzle of overlapping and overriding jurisdictions. What Mr. Goldenberg did was solve the electoral problem of the city of Toronto as far as council is concerned, and he carved it out and he said for each ward, "We will have a councillor and a member of the metropolitan council." But then having solved that problem, he compounded the problem in North York and Scarborough and Etobicoke by saying, "We are going to have so many wards in each and then we are going to divide it up so that the Metro councillor is elected over two wards."

In my own municipality of North York, just a year ago, we raised the number of wards for efficient government from eight to 12. Now we are going back on the eight-ward system, with two members in each ward. I think the experience with two members in each ward led Mr. Goldenberg to say, "In the city of Toronto we don't like it." But he is going to give it to the suburbs.

Why? And then he is going to say, "You two get together and elect your representative on Metro."

And then in education, we have a completely different setup.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what is needed here is a different approach. Mr. Goldenberg has gone a little distance along the road to a solution. But the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts chaired by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Beckett) has done a far better job in outlining the direction which a solution of this kind ought to take. There is no question that if this is to be the pattern for new regional governments, then the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) is going to be in real trouble in Ontario. In my opinion, at least, keyed to a new system of regional metropolitan government, call it what you will, his is the one treasury concept where all the income from industry and the property assessment and the business tax flows into the one treasury.

It seems to me more than four boroughs of equal size, or more or less equal size, should be carved out—more than four, at least five. Those boroughs, within their own powers, would draw up their budgets and submit them to the central council, and that central council would then deal with the budgets and would send word back to the boroughs that "This year your budget is so-and-so; you have made a good case for sidewalks [or sewers or roads]; you can have so much, and then you administer that budget and decide where the sidewalks [or sewers or roads] are going to go within your borough."

This gives ultimate financial autonomy to the local government and the boroughs have the power of detailed administration. This way, they can plan where industry ought to go or where housing ought to go, because it makes no great difference to each of the municipalities, financially, where these installations occur. So the whole area can be looked at as a unit and can be planned as a unit and can move forward as a unit.

But the report falls short of this; it goes part way and makes recommendations and then fails to give that ultimate power to a central authority for doing the job.

I know there are those who think in terms of total amalgamation. I am not one of those. But certainly a total amalgamation might be better than this, and certainly a borough system with a central treasury and with centralized administration, financial power in particular, would be far better able to do the job which has to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move on to one other matter and then I should be fairly well completed with my morning talk. During this past period, we have seen in this province a serious situation emerging in the field of public responsibility and public morality. Yesterday a question was raised in this House regarding a matter which has been much in the newspapers of late—I have a sheaf of clippings here dealing with it—and that is the matter of the expropriation in respect to the University of Toronto.

Over the years, this Legislature has given substantial powers of expropriation to various universities. We have now just passed a bill making the powers uniform, just in this session. This bill gives unlimited powers of expropriation of private property, subject to The Expropriation Procedures Act, to all universities in the province that are supported by public funds. In this group, we do not object to this statute; we believe that universities are performing a vital public function and need the same powers of expropriation as public authorities.

We normally object to delegation of authority by this Legislature where there is no accountability to elected representatives of the people in the exercise of that authority, but in this case we do not object to that feature of the statute. We believe that a wide degree of autonomy is desirable in the case of universities, and that it is not compatible with detailed scrutiny of their activities by the government or the Legislature.

I notice that we have had a new Speaker for the last few minutes. I congratulate him on his achievement and his elevation. We do not know whether this is—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: I do not like to disappoint my hon. friend but I doubt if he is going to sit there in the very near future.

At the same time, to continue with what I was saying, we believe that a clear responsibility devolves on universities to exercise the broad powers of expropriation granted to them by statute in a manner that will provide no reasonable ground for suspicion of impropriety. It is with great regret that we are impelled to state that in our opinion the University of Toronto has not met this standard of conduct in expropriation of certain properties on the Streetsville road for the ultimate use of Erindale college, and the controversy that has occurred over this would seem to add to that feeling.

All or most of the properties being expropriated have been built upon. In some cases

the buildings are extremely valuable. In fact, in one case a real estate firm has said it is worth \$200,000. One of the statements here says that the land in question was bought for about \$300,000, for land and building, and it is a fairly large estate.

On the other hand there is in the immediate vicinity a substantial amount of land that has not yet been built upon. I am in no position to state whether or not this vacant land would meet the university's purposes adequately, I do not know. I want to make it clear that I am in no way passing judgment on the merit of the university's choice. What concerns me, and what leads me to raise this matter here, is the procedure the university followed in arriving at this choice.

It retained the services of a company known as Don Mills Development Limited to advise it. This company is part of E. P. Taylor's corporate empire. The vacant land which the university might conceivably have chosen is owned by Erin Mills Developments Limited, of which E. P. Taylor is chairman of the board. It is asking just a little too much of human nature to expect that a company would not possibly be influenced in its recommendations by a consideration of the interests of a sister company in the same corporate empire. This might not happen, but it seems to me this is running into a dangerous situation when this sort of thing occurs.

The university's vice-president in charge of administration is reported in the press to have said that Don Mills Developments Limited performed useful services for the university in the assembly of land for Scarborough college. That was good. This company knows its job and did a good service there. But he is also reported to have stated further that the company made its possible interest quite clear to the university's board of governors before undertaking to give advice regarding the acquisition of land for Erindale college. It made it clear that there was land in the area which was owned by another subsidiary of the same industrial and commercial empire and it wanted that to be known to the board of governors, and so it did its duty.

It is my contention that at that point the board of governors should have thanked the company for its past services and engaged the services of another adviser who could not possibly be considered to have any interest in any of the land in the area concerned, direct or indirect, or any interest whatsoever in the ultimate choice.

It is not good enough for a quasi-public body spending public funds voted by this Legislature, in exercising its expropriation

powers under an Act of this Legislature, to act in a way that might be acceptable in the case of a private business, but cannot possibly be regarded as acceptable for a public authority. In a private business the possibility of a conflict of interest is of concern only to the shareholders, but in a public or quasi-public body it is a matter of public concern. Such a body should avoid like the plague even the appearance of such a conflict of interest.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that at least two other members of the board of governors of the university are directors of the same commercial empire concerned, which is the Argus Corporation, which is a holding company for the E. P. Taylor network of companies.

The university owes it to the public to disclose what role, if any, these gentlemen played in the proceedings leading to the expropriation of the properties on the Streetsville road. It may well be that these men declared their interest, and it may well be that they gave the advice that this other company should not be retained to act in the Streetsville situation. If that happened and is on the record it should be made known, so that the public is fully aware of the events which happened.

Another event of the past week which I bring before this Legislature, and which causes me some concern as well as many others, is the item in the *Toronto Daily Star* of June 16, 1965.

JUDGE ACQUITS EX-MAYOR AFTER TONGUE LASHING

County Judge Colin Bennett today tongue lashed former Orillia mayor Wilbur Cramp as he acquitted him of three municipal corruption charges. "You have seriously violated your public trust by accepting Northern Ontario Natural Gas shares and dealing in them. You had no business whatsoever accepting those shares," said the judge.

Cramp, 56, four times the mayor of Orillia, pleaded not guilty accepting \$1,436 worth of NONG stock as a consideration for granting NONG the town's franchise in 1956, blocking a rival firm's bid. As the portly ex-mayor stood blinking and red faced the judge continued: "You did offend the morality of your public office. I have to take this opportunity of condemning what you did in the strongest possible terms. The rule of English law that the accused is entitled to the benefit of the doubt is coming to your rescue. You stuck your neck out and you came very close to getting it chopped off."

In other words, no definite connection between the two events could be proved in the court and the judge was willing to give the defendant the benefit of the doubt, and this has happened in other cases. A present judge of the supreme court was involved in the same kind of activity in another city.

The time is here, I think, when we have to recognize that public officials, dealing with public funds and with public responsibility, need to have a code of morality and a standard of morality which is above reproach. I can understand, in view of some of these things why we have members of the clergy parading in front of the door this morning. They are concerned, they are the conscience of the people and they are concerned, about this and about the kind of Medicare plan which we have brought forward in this Legislature.

So it is that the time is here when I think that we in this Legislature have got to understand that these men have a right to say to us: "We expect a higher standard of the people in this body. We expect the people who are governing Ontario to use the resources of this great province first of all for the need of the people." As we see our gross national product and gross provincial product go up steadily, that surplus should come more

and more into play in building the kind of prosperity and the kind of comfort to which our people here are entitled. The time is here for the government of this province to use the Budget in a more realistic way as a planning instrument for prosperity, to eliminate this poverty which has been revealed this year, to give all our people a minimum standard beyond the poverty level. And particularly, see to it that our own employees are efficient and effective, because they have the training and the living standard which will make them effective and self-respecting citizens of this province.

I hope that we will mobilize our resources, and that in Metro and right across this province this Budget in another year will prove to be a more realistic and a more proper document for all of us.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Before adjourning the House I would like to take this opportunity of welcoming to the House this afternoon, students from Briarwood junior vocational school, Hamilton, in both the east and the west galleries.

It being 12.30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, June 22, 1965
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1965



CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Conclusion of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Robarts	4521
Resolution re grant out of consolidated revenue fund, concurred in	4549
Act granting certain sums to Her Majesty for public service, Mr. Allan, first, second, third readings	4549
Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts	4550
Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor	4554
Prorogation speech, the Lieutenant-Governor	4555
Prorogation	4556

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1965

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): May it please Your Honour, I am moved to say that surely in a lifetime there can be few pleasures as satisfying to the mind and the spirit as participation in the parliamentary process. One of the things that I shall remember about this session, Your Honour, let me say to you, in sincerity, is the unfailing kindness and courtesy which you have demonstrated through your personal attributes to myself, as your humble servant.

One of the other pleasures, I beg leave to refer to, Your Honour, is the association with fellow hon. members of the chamber, from all shades of political opinion. There are many shades of political opinion in each of the parties, and particularly do I deem it a privilege to be associated with the senior hon. members of the assembly. I do not presume to point any out, but it is a source of great inspiration and great personal gratification to be associated with such persons as my hon. friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver), my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Gordon), the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie), scion of the great family in the history of this country, as well as my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Noden).

It seems, sir, that through experience, the older and senior hon. members of the assembly have more time to devote to one than the younger ones do. Perhaps that is because the younger hon. members of the assembly are too busy striving for pride of place and guided by what sometimes appears to be an insatiable ambition to make their mark on the affairs of the nation.

One noticed, as a matter of fact I cannot help but advert to it, that when the great inspirational philosopher of the Conservative Party was in this chamber, none other than George Hogan himself, the source of all wisdom in the editorial pages of the leading newspapers, that the younger members of the chamber set up a veritable pilgrimage

to the lower Speaker's gallery to be seen sitting on his left. To occupy such a seat, I do not know, may provide some stimulus to advancement within the party circles.

Sir, this session has proved that if words were raindrops, Ontario would not be in a state of drought. It has been a long session and I beg your indulgence to devote the first portion of my remarks to some suggestions for the improvement for the procedure of this House. Not in order that we may shorten the session, for I am one of those who is content to stay here during any of the months of the year—though hopefully not summer, which is Canada's and Ontario's best season—from the point of view, your Honour, of attempting to encourage a more orderly handling of the affairs of this assembly.

The assembly, really, according to May—I cannot claim credit for the approach that I make—according to May the affairs of this assembly are denoted by three main characteristics, the first of which is what he calls the forms of proceedings. That includes the procedures in dealing with bills in their various stages, the process of debate by motion, question and decision and a whole range of proceedings for the control and direction of the administration.

The second characteristic is the machinery, which includes yourself there, as the guide of the House, the other officers of the House and the committees to which portions of the business are delegated.

The third attribute is the rules of procedure, the directions which govern the working of the forms of proceedings and the machinery of the House. I would beg leave to devote a portion of my remarks to each one of these attributes.

But I dismiss the machinery by saying a word, and I hope I do not sound pedantic. I have no wish to put myself on a pedestal, it is out of my love for Parliament which I have been studying from at least the age of seven or eight. My father, you see, your Honour, met Sir John A. Macdonald once and never let us forget it at the dinner table. He met him in Peterborough in the election of 1891. That marked my father's political

complexion for the rest of his life, I regret to say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Like meeting R. B. Bennett.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, something similar.

I just make this reflection that out of respect for the dignity of Parliament I would ask Your Honour to consider, during the interstice of the session, instructing your officers and your servants to require of the strangers who come to our galleries, and they are perfectly welcome, that they abide by certain rules of decorum and not give the impression that this assembly has some of the characteristics of a poolroom and would not drape themselves over the railings, as I have seen them so do so many times, and have felt a sense of resentment. I put it this way: If a gentleman is required to wear a coat and a tie and a shirt to get into the clubhouse at Woodbine racetrack, then all the more reason that he should be required to dress in a certain state of decorum when he comes into this very hallowed and very distinguished place, which is the seat of all government in Ontario. I leave that.

Now, sir, it would seem to me that a stranger sitting in the gallery, having been here all session, when he arrived at this, to use the word the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) likes, this penultimate stage of the proceedings of the House, the last but one speech, he would be indeed taxed in wondering just what we were doing in debating the Budget. After all, in dealing with the estimates of each of the several departments, the Budget has been passed, the Budget has been approved. The money has been voted and allocated to each one of the ministries. At this stage it is a "fait accompli"; the business of providing the money to carry on the administration of the government has been done. The money is provided. It is true the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) is not yet authorized to give that money to the various departments, but that, after all, is a mere matter of formality. Then at the very last stage of the session of the Legislature we get around to debating that which is complete.

I make this suggestion that in order to give the impression of the orderly conduct of debate, to render what we do in the style of true argument there ought to be, by agreement between all parties, a time limit on each of the important debates. We in the Opposition have the opportunity to present two amendments, to exercise our rights of protest in respect of the government's actions

in each or either of the important debates, the Throne debate and the Budget debate. I feel that I can say, on behalf of this party, that this party would be agreeable to coming to an arrangement whereby the Throne debate occupied six or eight days; that the speeches were more or less continuous, or continual, until it was finished; and then the vote on the amendment and the sub-amendment took place and we had done with it.

There is absolutely no excuse, in my view, for the Throne debate and the Budget debate going on at the same time, side by side. That seems to me to give the impression of a chaotic handling of our affairs. What all sides of the House would approve, I would think, would be a procedure whereby the debate went on in orderly fashion so that one member might rise in his place and advert to remarks from another member from some other corner of the House and seek to dispute and confute what had been said within a relatively short period before. As it is now, if one wishes to make reference to something the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Letherby) said, then he must get *Hansard* and refer the House's memory back to a period of ten or 12 days before. That sir, in no sense of the word, can be called properly a parliamentary debate. So I would suggest to the House leader, whomever he might be next year, that he consider that representatives of all parties meet and see whether some procedure might not be adopted whereby we would put a limit on the Throne debate.

I would further suggest, sir, that the Budget debate should be limited in the same way and the Budget resolution moved by the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) ought to be determined before we proceed to the estimates. Really, in my view, the Budget debate has become something of an obsolescent vehicle for protest. We have the opportunity over here, and really Parliament exists for us, to voice all our complaints and protests and make all our grievances in respect of government policy and the spending of our money during the estimates. Everything that can be said in that respect is said. We have the capability, the time and the opportunity to say it. I will show that is not so in respect of another important function that we are called upon to perform, but I think, and I make this suggestion to you in all seriousness, that next year we might try to end these two debates within some reasonable length of time in order to see how it will go, whether everyone will be satisfied with that procedure. By doing that and getting them out of the way we will leave plenty of

time to conduct the day-to-day business of the House.

Now then I turn to that part of our function, sir, which we do not have an opportunity to perform, and that is the part that concerns our duty to grieve—to make grievances—in respect of current matters which concern the body politic. We have a real responsibility to raise on the floor of this Legislature matters of grievance to the body politic, the citizenry of our province that are as fresh as the ink on the morning's newspaper. If we see something in the morning press that relates to a grievance of our people, then we have the responsibility to come here and confront the government with it and say, "What is your stand on that? What has such-and-such ministry done? What remedial action do you intend to take in respect of it?" Indeed to question the ministry in the performance of their responsibilities.

There is no vehicle presently that permits us to do that. It is an opportune time to show Your Honour how, at one time, there was a vehicle. I do it with some embarrassment, because I must expose to the public view something of the nature of a weakness in us, that neither we in this party nor our friends in the New Democratic Party were alert enough to see the disappearance of one of our hard-won rights—one of our hard-won rights—disappear before our very eyes in this chamber and we did nothing about it. This is the first time to my knowledge that this has been raised, when I advert to it. Until the emergence of the hon. member for London North (Mr. Roberts) as the leader of this government, it was common and usual practice prescribed by the rules of the House that on each occasion that you, sir, left the chair to resolve this House into committee of supply, it was done by motion. If you look back through *Hansard*, you will see that:

Mr. Frost moved that the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

You see, Your Honour; how you could get out of the chair on the intonation of the Clerk's voice is beyond my comprehension. How you can get out of that chair without a motion being put defies my understanding, because it took a Stuart king to send the troops to a House of Commons, in which sat one of your predecessors, to remove him from the chair.

Now you wander out—I do not use that as a term of opprobrium in any sense—when the Clerk of the House intones: "House in committee of supply." You pick up your hat and you make for the door. Until December of

1961, you and your predecessors only left your chair on motion being put, and that motion was a valuable one. That motion gave the Opposition the opportunity to amend it and to raise by way of amendment those things which were by way of current daily concern.

You see, sir, the affairs of this province are not ordered in the Speech from the Throne; things in this province are not as the Speech from the Throne says they are, and they remain that way until we get an opportunity later on in the session to discuss matters. We live in times of great change; there are matters that concern our people every day of the week. The procedure of this House, I am saying in my limited fashion, needs to be accommodated to deal with those things. That was the value of that motion: "That you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply."

In December, 1961, came the grey area. According to my researches, and going through the book, when the hon. member for London North became the leader of the government—I pick out December 5, 1961—the moisture had not yet dried on his cheeks; the moisture of tears of thankfulness for naming him as the leader of the Conservative Party. On December 5, Hon. J. P. Roberts moves:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

Then if we turn to December 7, 1961—I have not looked to see if that is the day that our right disappeared or not; that would be a significant day—but, Mr. Speaker, it says:

Orders of the day. House moves into committee of supply. Mr. K. Brown in the chair.

At that point the Clerk had intoned the 57th order, House in committee of supply. Then we look a little further on, and I call it a grey area because we come back to another time—I think it is December 17.

Hon. J. P. Roberts moves Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair.

At that stage, some days the motion was put and other days the motion was not put. Finally, in February of 1962, the old practice had disappeared. Our right had gone to amend that motion, and from then on down to this day it is done in the way I have described it. The Clerk merely intones: "House in committee of supply," and you go out of the Chamber.

It is unfortunate in the historical development that in 1961—the spring session of

1961—the former leader of the party had amended that motion, and it was an unfortunate amendment. I do not want to go into the details, but it was an amendment that did not suit the motion. The amendment had to do with second reading of a bill and, really, that is too much of a marriage of two distinct procedures in this House. There was great dispute about whether that amendment was in order.

But, sir, I merely end in this way. I say to you that, according to the custom of parliamentary institutions, our right must come back. There is no other vehicle of which I know that gives us the opportunity to raise current matters and gives us the opportunity to grieve. Because when all is said and done, we are grievors—that carries out our responsibilities. We are here to grieve on behalf of others; to grieve in respect of administration of the government; and to grieve in respect of what we feel ought to be the conduct of public business—that is a vehicle that we desperately need.

What is the other side of the coin? These things flow one into the other naturally; the other side is that the government has lots of opportunity to make statements in respect of current matters and, indeed, they abuse the right. Not only does the hon. Prime Minister permit the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) to wander in here—and I just picked one out of the air—and make lengthy statements about the appointment of some official to some position of responsibility in his department. Now how does that concern us? All sorts of people are being appointed by the government to various positions of responsibility. We are not concerned; we are only concerned if the individual appointed does not perform the tasks to which he is assigned, although we might like to hear of some spectacular demonstration of efficiency by some official. However, the mere appointment is of no concern to this House.

The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, in the case I cite, presumes upon our good nature and our time in order to seek a headline: The heading: "A news story." It gets him into the papers. Now, he is only an example. All the ministry does it. They come in with silly announcements that they want to make before the orders of the day. I say they have lots of opportunity to comment on current things. How much, sir, do they abuse their right to make a short statement about the introduction of a bill? That is one of the most unfair ones.

Bill No. 136 is an excellent example. The

hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), on first reading of that bill, delivered a polemic that would win him a master of arts degree in some obscure university in central Afghanistan. We must perforce sit silent and listen to it as he dealt with the advantages of private operation of medical care insurance. He raked the government of Saskatchewan over the coals, and Britain, and in passing took swipes hither and thither and yon. We have to sit silent and listen to it. I say to the hon. Prime Minister, do one of two things, require the Ministers to make a brief statement on first reading or adopt the procedure in the House of Commons and move bills by resolution. At Ottawa they have to have a resolution which gives all parties the opportunity to debate the principle surrounding a bill that is about to be introduced. Now, let us have one or the other.

Question period: here I am dealing with the forms of proceedings of the House. I ask the hon. Prime Minister rhetorically, why should not his high-priced help be required to answer questions? Why should they not be able to demonstrate that they have some knowledge of the machinery and the running of their department? Why should they not be required to do it on an impromptu extemporaneous basis?

At the risk of repeating old jokes, the main reason is of course that some of the Ministers are so ill-acquainted with the affairs of their department that they would not dare tell you the time of day unless the Deputy Minister telephoned the Dominion observatory first. That is true. Some of them you would not let out at night without a keeper. There are exceptions. I was disappointed in one of the exceptions the other day, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner)—a man who can field questions and answer them because he has the administration of his department in the palm of his hand. But the other day I watched him as my friend, the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisborne) was asking him a question, and he was sitting on the edge of his chair, just waiting to get up because the question invited a single word, "No answer," and he could hardly wait to get up to say the "No." One word.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): "No answer" is two words.

Mr. Sopha: And then he licked his chops like a dog that has just had a can of Dr. Ballard's, because he had squelched the hon. member for Wentworth East. He thought it was smart to do it. He is one of the

Ministers who could have made an explanation surrounding the government policy which was being dealt with in that question.

The rules of the House provide for a question period. Hon. members are supposed to file their questions with the Clerk according to the rules, not with the Speaker. The questions are none of the business of the Speaker; they are filed with the Clerk, they go on the order paper. Then one or two days a week there is an hour-long question period in which the ministry, having had an opportunity to research the information, makes answer to the questions. One of the writers says it is a time eagerly looked forward to by hon. members of the House and indeed by the press gallery.

I remember being at Westminster, the "Mother of Parliaments," and watching the question hour when Winston Churchill had the honour of being the first citizen of the United Kingdom. I remember the sparring that took place between the two sides; the able people in the Labour Opposition sparred with him and with the other Ministers and it was a mark of a high development of parliamentary institutions. We should return to that. The question period keeps the ministry on its toes. I would suspect that the hon. Prime Minister would not object to that. He would not object to some demonstration of the competence of those who sit in the House by his leave, sit by his advice to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor. In other words, like every other employer he wants to see whether they are worth the pay that they are getting.

Why are we denied private members' time, unlike other Parliaments—an hour a week to deal with private members' public orders? We make many suggestions on this side, and we produce many bills which are eventually adopted and become part of the great body of law of our province. Why should we not have an hour a week on Wednesdays from five to six in which to call the private members' orders? Why should we in the Opposition be at the whim of the government in respect of that? The hon. Prime Minister late in the session set aside a few hours. I will say this, I deliberately absented myself from the House because my orders were high on the list and I had spoken on those subjects on many occasions. I had taken the time of this House. My numbers were high up and I wanted to avoid my bills being called so that my hon. colleagues might have theirs called, and in respect of a couple of them it worked. My hon. friend's (Mr. Reaume's) Remembrance Day Act was

called, as was my hon. friend's (Mr. Worton's) resolution on divorce, and the bill on the ombudsman was called.

Some day I know that we will do what justice demands and we will give recovery compensation, relief damages, to gratuitous passengers. We cannot be behind the rest of Canada forever. We have a banner province. Every other province gives compensation to gratuitous passengers. We will, some day, eventually.

Those are some of the things that concern me and some of the suggestions I put forward in an endeavour to promote the more orderly business of the House.

Sir, the rules are the property of the House; the rules of the House belong to the House, and the House may change them at any time that it so desires. The rules, of course, were adopted when this Legislature became a Parliament in 1867. They were adopted almost without change from the statutes of Westminster. Minor changes were made in 1868 and 1869. In 1875 we saw the first complete re-examination, but only minor changes were made. Minor changes again came in 1876, 1885, 1891, 1897, 1904, 1907, 1910 and 1914. Then in 1929 there was a second complete re-examination of the rules. None of the fundamental procedures of the House was changed but the Speaker was given more power. In 1939 there was a third general revision of the rules.

There have been no amendments to the rules of the House. The striking thing since April, 1939, is that there has been a complete lack of formal innovation, and, sir, I say to you—and it is no criticism of you; you inherited a system—there has developed a practice of ignoring the written rules, of relying upon precedent. Rule 42 of the House, sir, by your leave, refers to the very thing that I was speaking about, our right to amend that supply motion. Only one amendment may be made to a motion for the Speaker to leave the chair for the House to go into committee of supply or ways and means. I say, sir, if the precedents are valuable then they should be moulded into the written rules.

One thing an orderly parliamentary system needs is a codification of its rules and procedure. It is too unsafe, uncertain and dangerous to rely upon precedent because precedents may change. I say to you, sir, that I deeply regretted the interpretation of Rule 56, I believe it is, in respect of the second reading of a bill, so far as it affected the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden).

I held no brief for his position, but I regretted him being put in the position, by the interpretation of that rule, which required him to vote according to his conscience and against his party and indeed against every other hon. member in the House.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): It did not bother me.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member tried to get out of it. He did not object but he tried to get out of it, because he got up on a point of order and tried to avoid the necessity of voting as he did. He is a remarkable person. One cannot say anything complimentary about him. If one criticizes him he gets mad, if one compliments him he gets mad. He is a man of even disposition—he is mad all the time.

Therefore, sir, I draw your attention to the fact that this House was pleased to appoint a select committee to review the rules of the House, and I am unable to say in which year it was appointed. But it reported on March 11, 1947. That committee was under the distinguished chairmanship of W. J. Stewart, a former Speaker of the House. It was appointed April 4, 1946, and in its report, the attitude of whoever was responsible for the report was demonstrated by the fact that it is the only select committee report which I know of, of which no copy is available and which may only be found in the journals of the House of 1947. He made reference to the fact that that committee had the advantage of the advice of Alex C. Lewis, KC, and Arthur Beauchesne, Clerk of the House of Commons. L. R. MacTavish, municipal legislative counsel, acted as counsel and secretary, and a very thorough-going revision of the rules was attempted by the work of that committee. Do note one of the recommendations, sir, and I am now quoting:

In order to secure an orderly disposition of the session's business two old practices are made the subject of standing orders. The first is that the Budget is not to be presented until the debates on the address are completed; and the second that the estimates are not to be considered until the Budget debate is ended.

Then aside from the recommendation, there was appended a complete new set of rules under the new title: "Standing Orders of the House." I am not going to go into detail of what they say, but mark you, sir, they were a complete revision of the rules of the House.

Now my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) put a motion on the order paper standing in his name, and which of course will not be reached

this year, in which he suggested the appointment of a select committee:

Resolved, that a select committee of eight members of this House be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch a review with recommendations for the improvement of the rules of procedure of the House, with special emphasis on reorganization of the committee system and such other matters as the procedure for questions of the day.

I would therefore suggest to you, sir, with the greatest respect, that perhaps the time has come when an appropriate committee, and I do not say it need be a select committee of the House, but an appropriate vehicle be appointed in order to revise the rules of the House.

In that connection I make two comments, one of a very minor nature. With all respect to the author of the book I think the edition of Lewis is unsuitable for our needs. It has much in it of an historical nature, it contains statistical references and historical recounts of who was Premier and Speaker from time to time, but one must really dig into the book in order to find the rules of the House. The precedents which are relied upon are not in conjunction with the rules, you have to seek them in a different part of the volume. What I would recommend, sir, is that we have a very compact volume which would embrace the rules and the standing orders, perhaps with a reference to a precedent where the Speaker has ruled in connection with that rule.

The other thing I must say to you, sir, is that if we do not have a compact set of rules of ready reference to us, in order that at least two or three members of the House will become expert on the rules in the way that Stanley Knowles and Allan MacEachen and Paul Martin are experts on the rules in the House of Commons, then we are always in danger; and especially we in the Opposition. There will always be a tendency, sir, for you to be the target of gratuitous advice.

That I conceive to be your greatest danger in carrying out the heavy responsibilities on you. You are the target and the object of gratuitous advice which you do not need. You are a man of uncommon ability, as I observe you, and you are a man who can make up his mind in respect of most situations which you confront. You are a man who is deeply conscious of your responsibilities to all sides of the House, and after two years in the chair that you now occupy a set of rules, really, sir, and a volume of May, is all that you need to hand.

I leave that, hoping that I have made some minor contribution in respect of the improvement of procedure of this House. Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister over the summer when he has nothing else to do, when he is sitting up at his cottage on Georgian Bay, this will revolve within his entelechy and he will say: "We will have to do something about what Sopha said there on the last day about according more rights and privileges to the Opposition for them to carry out their onerous responsibilities." I say to him, mark you, prepare well for the day when you are occupying these benches.

Now, sir, I am tempted at this point, knowing the patience of my hon. friends, especially on the government benches, I am tempted, when I survey the 16 motions which remain on the order paper, to say a word in respect of each of them. I am tempted to do so. I happily inform the House that I am not going to do so, except in respect of one or two. I would happily have the one standing in my name discharged; that is to say in the opinion of this House the assignment of wages should be prohibited by law because the select committee of the House—I took an opportunity to go up and have a look at their report, which is not yet available—the select committee has recommended that all blanket assignments of wages be prohibited by law.

I am hopeful that the government will act upon that. A man's wages to me have a sacrosanct quality. The first charge upon his wages are food and shelter for his children, his dependants. They come ahead of the claims of creditors, far and away above. Creditors rank well behind those claims. Meat and potatoes, a roof that does not leak over their heads, suitable and decent clothing on his children's backs to go to school. Those are the first things, not the claims of finance companies or other financial institutions.

We have a disgraceful situation in this province where sometimes a man will have three or four assignments. We ran into one recently who had eight assignments against his wages. The assignments ranked according to the jurisprudence of the courts ahead of the claims of creditors. If you are a creditor, if you have advanced credit to that man and you sue him for judgment, you rank behind the wage assignments. The government is greatly influenced by the financial institutions; it is greatly influenced, this government. This government is greatly influenced by the insurance companies, the banks and the financial institutions. I will say something about that later.

It summoned its courage into hand and introduced a bill last year, did they not, to amend The Wages Act. Then lo and behold, it was three months after the session ended—I felt like an absolute lout—three months after the session ended I first found out that the Clerk stood at the end of that table when asking for Royal assent from the Lieutenant-Governor and skipped that bill.

I did not even notice that he had. Supposing the bill was 146, the Clerk went from 145 to 147. In other words, he sank my ball on the table without me knowing it, until a judge of the district court pointed out to me that that is what had happened to that bill. I thought it was law, a control over wage assignments, only to discover that I had been euchred in this very Chamber where I am paid to be alert. That is what happened, that bill died. It has not yet been resurrected.

I hope the government will summon up enough courage to re-enact some sensible amendment to The Wages Act to protect a man's wages from the point of view of his responsibility to his family.

I am not going to refer to any of the other of the resolutions, but to the questions my hon. colleague from Downsview (Mr. Singer) who made such a remarkable contribution this year, in his criticism of The Department of the Attorney General. The public of this province will benefit from the scrutiny he made of that one government department. I hope he turns his attention next year to another department and gives it the same quality of criticism that he gave in respect of this one.

He asks me to refer to the fact that several of his questions, that have long been on the order paper, have not been answered. I am particularly interested in number seven. I hope the answer to number seven is tabled today, because my hon. friend from Downsview and I have asked that one each year that we have been here: How much are the downtown lawyers being paid, how much are the Conservative lawyers getting? Nobody need rise up and say this government does not hire only Conservative lawyers, because I know, my optics tell me that is all they hire. The Conservative lawyers fight between themselves as to who is to get the benefit of the government munificence. It is unseemingly in our profession to see them squabble in the market place about the crumbs that this government dispenses from the table. Something like \$500,000 a year.

An hon. member: It might be more.

Mr. Sopha: It might be more, more than \$500,000 a year.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Does the hon. member ever see it changed when the Liberal government is in power?

Mr. Sopha: I never cease to refer to the fact that I was hired by the Diefenbaker government on one occasion. It did not pay me very well, but it hired me and I had to work for it.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): It paid the hon. member what he is worth.

Mr. Sopha: One thing Diefenbaker did in respect of my account is, he taxed it. I have always wanted to say that the great difference between that civil service up in Ottawa and ours, is that our civil service is much more friendly, much more kind. That one up in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, is sometimes autocratic to the extreme. I recall that occasion when it taxed my bill, and it did not even write a letter and say, "We took off \$200"; it merely sent me the cheque with no letter, but with my bill reduced by that amount. Sometimes I believe that the federal government of this country, and those who serve it, treat everybody else as being about in the position of the equivalent of the county council. However, I leave that.

We would want to know who the beneficiaries of this legal business are, who are currently getting it and how much they are being paid. Of course I refer to the report of the public accounts committee under the able chairmanship of our recently married colleague, the hon. member for Kent West (Mr. McKeough), which recommends great changes in the method of handling the legal work of this province. I commend its reading to every person who is interested in that.

The hon. Prime Minister informed us this morning that these questions will all be answered, or most of them will be answered. I want to say in respect of question 116 that I did not put that question on the order paper in a moment of frivolity. That question was put on the order paper seriously, to find out how much it cost the public of this province to entertain the Shahanshah of Iran. I did not know; I did not go. I made the mistake of being so careless as not to reply to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor's invitation. I should have replied, and I regret that. I should have declined to him in writing. However, it was not done. I did not go for reasons I would not care to state. I would be embarrassed to state them, as to why I would not go. But the holding of that dinner

was a brazen act on the part of this government, in relation to the people whom they invited to it—a brazen misuse of the public funds of this province to entertain the faithful.

What status in our community has a defeated candidate in a political party? Who is he to be wined and dined? Indeed, H. L. Mencken, in a moment of humour, said that the best thing that could be done for defeated political candidates was to shoot them all. One of the penalties of losing an election would be that the defeated ones would be shot and the public would be relieved of the burden of hearing from them. Why should they be invited? The man defeated by the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) was there; the man defeated by the hon. member for Grey South was there, and the place was crawling, an advisedly used word, with executives from Conservative associations. We heard afterwards, indeed, that the hon. Prime Minister of the province had the presumption to furnish the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor with a list of 300 names of people he wished to see invited to wine and dine off the public purse.

On the day the question went on the order paper, when you, sir, and I had the dispute about it, I said we wanted to know how much it cost so we could prepare for inviting Haile Selassie to a dinner for defeated Liberal candidates and executives of the Liberal Party, but this has a serious aspect to it. This government perpetuates itself in power by the use of public funds in the public relations sphere. I refer to the moving of the desks by the hon. Provincial Secretary.

The hon. Provincial Secretary moved his desks from the south end of the building to the north end, just as if they ordered me to move my desk out of the room on the first floor and put it in some room on the second floor. That is about all he did. He invited 8,000 people to see his move. He invited every lawyer in the province of Ontario to come and see his new quarters, as if there is anything to be seen. My hon. friends and I went over to have a look at this, to have a look at these canapes, these hors d'oeuvres, anchovies and shrimps, to hear the light conversation and to see the public money being spent. I cannot prove it, but I am told by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) that he recognized quite a few of the people from the hon. Provincial Secretary's riding. He invited them, too, to come down and have a little tidbit off the public purse. And, of course, they do it all the time—any excuse to throw a ball, any excuse to go on

a junket, any excuse to get into the public relations way.

I am going to advert to another, and the hon. Prime Minister ought not to feel that this is a personal reference. I hope he does not; he is in the public domain, he is subject to criticism. I want to tell him a little anecdote about how this is done. Some of the techniques are developed to an extent that would put Madison Avenue to shame. I will tell him about one.

There is nothing quite so captivating as to come into this Chamber and hear those young ladies in red, those nice young ladies down on the first floor from The Department of Tourism and Information, make the political pitch. The hon. Prime Minister should hear it. They will have 40 or 50 school children here and they will stand up there and they will say this:

"What is the name of the Prime Minister of the province?" Some small voices say, "John Roberts." "Come on, you can do better than that," the girl says. "Altogether." And they all say, "John Roberts." The hon. Prime Minister should hear it. And then the girl goes on and she says, "How many members have the Conservative Party got?" I have heard it with my own ears. Somebody says, "Seventy-seven." "Come on, There are 77." They never say anything about the Opposition.

Mr. Reilly: Yes, they do.

Mr. Sopha: No, they never do. I never heard them ask what the name of the leader of the Opposition is.

Mr. Reilly: Oh, yes they do. The hon. member has obviously not heard the guide.

Mr. Sopha: We have shown during this session, time and time again, how this government has perfected the art of public relations. One of the great accomplishments of the session was the calling of the attention of the people of this province to the managed news, how they had gone into the electronic media and were making use of the press. In fact, they wanted the press to become harlots for the carrying of propaganda of their activities. Scarcely an important speech could be made by a Minister in the House but the Minister did not have to get in front of the television cameras and prerecord it for free dissemination throughout the province.

I say to you, sir, that a government that uses the techniques to that extent is hard to beat. It is hard to dislodge, because it has

the wealth of the province behind it and it does not shy away from the misuse of it for its own political ends. To borrow the word of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis), I think I have documented it sufficiently.

Sir, I turn to the final subject. I make no apologies for referring to the recent speech of the hon. Prime Minister. Indeed, I do not have to make any reference to it at all in advertent to it because he provided us all with a copy of it. When I took mine home I found it was in such demand in my constituency I had to give it away to someone and I had to come back and get another. But it is a strange thing—and I have said this before, and I give a little tip to the young and ambitious in this Chamber—that though the hon. Prime Minister of this province makes an important speech outside this Legislature and that speech is widely reported by the press and indeed, very effusive editorial comment is made about the speech, we never hear one of the hon. members make reference to the fact that he made the speech and discussed its contents with him. I say in all seriousness that one wonders if the young and ambitious around here really know what is going on. Do they really know? Or are they so busy that they really do not have time to be interested in what is going on?

What the hon. Prime Minister of the province says is of importance beyond any other subject concerning the management of the affairs of our citizens. He should be watched constantly and every word he uses in the public forum about our province should be weighed for its sagacity and for its reasonableness. That is the duty of the members on all sides of the House. Indeed, there is one person who does not miss a trick. That is Arthur R. Ford, the former editor of the *London Free Press* who, just yesterday, acting in emeritus fashion, wrote an editorial which the *London Free Press* put on the front page of its paper—widely read, I am told, in western Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: He writes one every Saturday. It is just the usual editorial; there is nothing unusual about it.

Mr. Sopha: I am told that this paper is widely read in western Ontario. I sometimes wonder about its impact because I recall just before the election of 1963—the federal election in April, 1963—when I was in Fergus, Ontario, speaking at a political meeting, the *London Free Press* came out with an editorial urging its readers to vote for Mr. Pearson—to vote Liberal. Somebody remarked that the

original owner—I think his name is Blackwell—turned over in his grave at that. However, one noticed that virtually all of western Ontario remained in the Diefenbaker camp, so the paper had very little impact upon the voting habits of its reader circulation in that respect.

However, to return to Mr. Ford, the head-ling is this:

STATURE OF ROBERTS INCREASING STEADILY.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: I am only going to read the first line of the editorial for two reasons: First, I do not want to burden the House with the effusiveness of the writer's pen; and second, it will become apparent. He says in the first line: "Premier John Roberts will probably not thank me for this column—" and at that point the writer takes leave of accuracy.

He and accuracy are never on speaking terms again throughout the rest of the piece. The second reason why I will not read it is because, really it is rather insulting—as I read it—to the hon. Prime Minister. It is rather insulting and I will tell you why, and I am serious. The writer says that when a group of his friends in London decided to put forward the hon. Prime Minister's name as Ontario leader to succeed the hon. Leslie Frost, they knew they were advocating "a young man of high principles, conscientiously honest, devoted to public service and with a charming personality."

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: Save your hands; do not bruise them—"But they did not appreciate the statesmanlike qualities which he has since developed, and did not realize his administrative capacity and his genius for getting on with people. He has the loyal support of his followers in the legislative assembly and has shown vision and courage in facing up to the colossal problems of a province which is expanding at a fantastic rate."

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sopha: Now those are remarkable words; and I call those words insulting—really I do. Because what they are really saying is that when a group of his friends put this man forward to be the leader of a political party, they knew he had such-and-such qualities and they listed them.

Look at the qualities again—"able to get along with people—devoted to public service." There is nothing uncommon about those

qualities, and what the editor is saying is: "Lo and behold, in spite of all those qualities that do not count, now we have discovered he has also got brains."

It is like going into a restaurant and ordering six oysters and saying: "My, those oysters are nice," and as you eat you discover a pearl. They had not looked for this quality in the hon. Prime Minister; they did not know he had it, so what a pleasant surprise to show to the people of London—to find out that this man chosen to lead our province also had some ability.

Of course the truth is—and I say it to him—that he was picked as the leader of this party because he was considered to be safe. Look at the two runner-up candidates; just look at them. It is significant to point this out: Robert Macaulay and the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), both very erratic; while the hon. Minister of Mines was in the second platoon, away back so far that he was almost out of sight. But the two runners-up were not safe people; they were uncertain. The business community could not rely upon their judgment and their performance, so they picked a safe man.

Now, Arthur Ford comes forward—and my hon. friend from Grey North (Mr. Sargent) appreciates that—and says: "Lo and behold, to the eternal credit of London, this fellow also has some ability besides being safe."

Now, what was Ford referring to? He is referring to the recent speech that the hon. Prime Minister made—the speech, and I blush when I say it, that I had something to do with. Because if you will look at pages 704 and following of *Hansard* of February 23 of this year you will see that I made quite a lengthy statement—a polemic almost—on the need for a national development policy; but what I say, I have to accept, is not important in the affairs of this province. But when those words find their utterance through the mouth of the chief citizen of the province, they become important.

The resemblance between what I said is further reinforced by the fact that he makes allusion in his speech to the letter from Laurier to Blake of 1894. I quoted that letter during that speech; the letter of foreboding and despair when Laurier said in the letter to Blake that this union was dissolving—it was being destroyed—the confederation that so much was hoped for was drifting apart. However, I am going to refer to parts of this speech.

The hon. Prime Minister spoke to the Canadian association of manufacturers on June 7 at Toronto. Now, that is a very august

assembly of people. I imagine that a lot of the wealth in this country is inherent in this association. I imagine, as I will refer later, that many members of the corporate élite—to use a phrase from Professor Porter's book that I am going to read a little later; those people who really rule this country; the people who really boss our affairs—would be in that assembly of personages. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development would know them because he was a member of the corporate elite at one time.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Pay the taxes and provide the jobs.

Mr. Sopha: Another aphorism, exactly. He said:

Is the concept of confederation outdated in the second half of the twentieth century? No! Confederation has as much meaning today as it did 100 years ago.

Now, I read that one because it typifies the large ovals, what they call on Madison Avenue, the large ovals with which he spoke. It is like a child chewing bubble gum; she has about four sticks in her mouth, as sometimes my daughter has, then suddenly there appears a large bubble of the gum.

That was the character of this speech. It was large ovals of big, huge generalities. Later on we are co-operating with the federal government in a review of fiscal relations and the advisory committee on federation established this year is looking at the broader aspects of confederation. Well, I say to my hon. friend from Grey South that, in the years that he has sat here when this government has been in power, there must have been appointed so many advisory committees to various departments of government that you would need a cemetery four times the size of Mount Pleasant cemetery here in Toronto to bury them all.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Your hon. leader asks for more research every time he gets on his feet.

Mr. Sopha: I do not ask for any more. One is minded of the economic advisory council. Whoever hears of the economic advisory council any more? It was under the distinguished chairmanship of none other than the Minister of Economics and the president of Algoma Steel was on it, as well as other distinguished persons. This was going to be the be-all and the end-all. The great panacea to advise this government on economic policy. Gone! Disappeared like the Arab. No, not gone in the sense that it is dissolved, but

gone in the sense that it has virtually no impact as far as we are aware and has disappeared like the Arab into the gathering sandstorm.

There was great fanfare when the Ontario advisory council was appointed. The Premier got up and read off the names of the people, and it sounds like a page from *Who's Who*, the social register. I made my remarks about his reference to a couple of them being Rhodes scholars, I will not repeat that.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: One of your pet prejudices.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I am prejudiced in favour of Canadian scholarship, I am prejudiced in favour of everything Canadian, though like the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) I am not a professional patrioteer. But he reels off the names. They have become a group of name-droppers, professional name-droppers. Everybody that makes his mark on the social and political life of our country, it seems, they want to appoint to some council.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Give credit where credit is due.

Mr. Sopha: The status symbol, it becomes nothing but a status symbol. We have not heard whether the advisory council has had any meetings, we have not heard if it has advised on anything, we have not even heard whether it has been asked to advise on anything.

The thing that disturbs me about it is that some of the people on it are some of our best critics, some of the best critics of our way of life. I am just afraid that this is a means whereby the teeth of those people are pulled.

For example, Bora Laskin. Bora Laskin could not be sold on the validity of the Fulton-Favreau formula. He would be the first to criticize this government's endorsement of that formula; and indeed our own, though I regret I have some second thoughts about endorsing that formula. He is on it. Is this a means of doing away with the criticism these people might otherwise give and upon which the viability of our political life depends?

I wish, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe was in his seat so he could hear the excerpt I am going to quote of one of them and I will identify them. I am going to quote it without making any reference to the implications of it, because it would be too dangerous for me to make any comment. But I beg all hon. members of the Legislature, all hon. members within my

hearing, to listen to what this man says. Let me read it slowly. I think hon. members will find that it will have a profound impact upon them. He says this:

We Canadians have so far failed to enter fully into our legacy and this is our one great overreaching problem as our centennial approaches. On its solution everything else depends. We have failed to vest sovereignty where it belongs, in the people. Instead we have allowed it to remain in the British monarchy, and in doing so we have divided our country and inhibited our emotional and creative development as a people.

Now are those not startling words, when one considers the implications of what the man is saying? I wish my hon. friend from Dufferin-Simcoe were here, because the type of speech he makes—my hon. friend from Downsview has called “fossilized” old moss-backed Toryism. That type of speech he might be able to sell in Dufferin-Simcoe. He could only sell it to a very few people in Sudbury. We live in times of great change.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Does the hon. member agree with the author's conclusion?

Mr. Sopha: We live in times of great change and I merely say this—I am going to answer the hon. member's question—that we cannot capture the imagination of our young people by putting emphasis on those things which are only connected with tradition. We must emphasize those things on our national life that have a viability to them, because our young people are no longer interested in many of the ideas of their fathers.

Mr. White: Does the hon. member agree with the major premise of that article?

Mr. Sopha: We cannot commend their loyalties. That quotation—who is it by—a member of the advisory council, Professor Conway, who has the chair of the humanities at York University.

I had a letter from Professor Underhill about my stand on the flag, in which Professor Underhill referred to many of the same things, but Professor Underhill has never made any secret of his resentment of the WASPs, the people he has called the white Anglo-Saxon Protestants and their hegemony in the life of our province within the recluses of their private clubs—the York and the Toronto and the National and the Albany and the Carleton and the Rideau and the St. James, and the Richmond and all of them—

the profound impact that they make on the political life of this country.

Not many months ago the members of this assembly marched out of the assembly and went down in front to pay their first homage to Canada's new national flag. Then a few short months later the Premier of this province deprived me of the right of being Canadian. It is my greatest resentment about this session, that I am not permitted to be a Canadian; that the hon. Prime Minister must take hold of me by the scruff of the neck and must direct my eyes to a foreign country to pay homage to a symbol which no longer commands my first loyalty. I had to split with my party about that, but at least we have the freedom that I can split with my party on a matter of deep principle and I can still at the end of the session sit with them.

It has a ludicrous side, it has a humorous side. Hon. members must never lose their sense of humour in this business. We started out on the fateful day when Canada adopted one flag, the national flag with the maple leaf. We started out with one flag. Now on June 22, 1965, we in Ontario have the great benefit that we now have five flags. We now have five.

I will list them to the House. We have Canada's national flag; we have the flag that Queen Victoria granted us in 1868 which never has been repealed or altered; we have Ontario's new flag, the Red Ensign; we have the Commonwealth flag decreed by the Parliament of Canada; and indeed His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has one. We now have five, so there are enough flags to go around for everybody in this province.

May I say just in passing, it is in no sense a criticism, some day when you are speaking to the Lieutenant-Governor would you do me a favour, Mr. Speaker, and tell him that he is not vice-regal. He is in no sense the representative of the Queen in this province. For the sake of accuracy, he is the representative of the Governor-General. When he was appointed in 1867, the Lieutenant-Governor was thought to be nothing more than a job-boy for the federal government to come into the province and act as a spy.

He was a spy to watch the provincial government and report back. He was a fink. If you do not believe me, look at the Confederation debate of 1865, page 42.

I was deprived, and I continue to be deprived, but I am going to speak up against it, of the right to be a Canadian first. Many people bemoan the fact that we have not got a Canadian identity, that is what Conway was speaking about. We have no sense of

Canadian identity and we will not have a sense of Canadian identity until the hon. Prime Minister stops rattling the old bones of Governor Simcoe in the resting place in far-off Britain, leaves those things alone and emphasizes the traditions that really count, the traditions of liberty, of humanity and responsibility.

Those are the traditions that really count. Yet the Lord Simcoe hotel was permitted to bastardize the name of Sir John Graves Simcoe. They could have called that hotel General Simcoe, Governor Simcoe, Sir John Graves Simcoe; but the one thing they could not have called it with historical accuracy they called it, Lord Simcoe. He was in no sense ever a lord. Now I should say in all fairness that when Leslie Frost was asked down to open the blessed place, he told them so, he told them. But the government might have a responsibility to intervene.

These things are important to me; whether they are to anyone else I have no way of knowing. The real nub of the hon. Prime Minister's speech to the association of manufacturers was that he called for the return to a national development policy. Here is what he said:

Today we need the same broad and bold approach to national economic development, the same type of political commitment to a concept of the Canadian economy. The greatest challenge facing the federal government today is, therefore, to create a truly national policy which will capture the allegiance of the people of Canada, one which will incorporate our aspirations and ambitions. Too often in recent years the federal government has adopted policies without prior consultations with the provinces, which more properly should be carried out by the provinces only after due consultation.

I use the phrase "large oval" in describing it—a phrase of great accuracy.

When he rises in his place I challenge him to tell us what areas he wants the federal government to move in. What does he want the federal government to do? He speaks in generalities, but where are the specifics? Let him tell us. In what area of our economy is the provincial government of this province deprived of the mobility to move? It has control of our resources, it is not inhibited by our political system. I will sit down right now if he will get up and tell us, in answer to that question, in what specific area does the federal government inhibit this government from having a national development policy of its own. The difference

between the hon. Prime Minister and me is that when we speak of a national development policy he uses vague generalities and I refer to specifics.

What does the federal government do to prevent this government from utilizing the resources of the great northwest of our province? What have they done? What about the steel mill that should be located at the Lakehead? We have every attribute that is necessary for the establishment of another steel industry. We have the iron ore; we have the hydro; we have water transportation; we have a labour force and, indeed, we have markets. I wish the hon. Minister of Economics and Development would realize that two-thirds of the surface of this earth does not need to manufacture products that he is peddling in every place from Vienna to Formosa, that what is needed is transportation, what is needed is steel rail. Two-thirds of the land mass of this globe needs the necessities, the attributes, of the transportation system. Why should not this government take the step, like the government of Quebec did, to establish an indigenous steel industry?

A couple of years ago the hon. Minister of Mines got up in the House—the hon. Minister who deals with a \$1 billion industry. Did he talk about a steel industry, the utilization of our own resources to provide jobs for our own people? No. He talked about collecting rocks as a hobby. If I did not observe the proprieties I would have brought my lunch up right in the midst of the assembly. To think that he would waste our time when what the world needs is the materials to shape a decent standard of living, materials which we in this country can supply to the world.

I said before if the hon. Prime Minister would put some flesh on these large ovals that he talks to, the manufacturers that he spouts to, he would say something along the line: "Do any of you know Cyrus Eaton? Will you say to Cyrus Eaton, 'You are a Canadian, you were born in this country. Come along with us and let us establish a steel mill at Port Arthur, and use the ore which you have at Steep Rock Iron Mines, 50 or 100 miles away?'" But instead—and I throw out the challenge again—I hope when he rises that he will tell us the areas in which the federal government inhibits the national development of this country, and to be specific, let us hear about his representations to the federal government. In what way has he made his complaints known to it, about its inhibiting activity? He said, "Too often in recent years the federal government

has adopted programmes without prior consultation with the provinces." What policies has it adopted?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: All right, I will tell the hon. member of a couple that were debated in this House, if he would only use his own memory. What about that fund that was established to assist the municipalities? We had to go to a federal-provincial conference and simply say to the federal people, "In Ontario this will not work." So what happened? After the event, the federal government changed the Act and now it works very well. There is a glowing example that has been debated on the floor of this House—with the hon. member present, if he was here—of precisely what I was speaking about. I have others.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Give us the story of Algoma using Ontario iron ore.

Mr. Sopha: What is the hon. Minister of Mines muttering about? I thought we were talking about national development policies. I thought we were talking about—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am making my speech when the hon. member is finished. Just wait.

Mr. Sopha: I thought that was what national development meant, the contributions to our economy. He gets up and he says they need loans to municipalities. I am not talking about municipalities. I am talking about the Keirans scheme to replenish the Great Lakes. That is what I thought he was talking about when he talked to the association of manufacturers. Must I conclude that when he was talking to the manufacturers he did not know what he was talking about? Probably, probably. He says the greatest challenge facing the federal government is to create a truly national policy which will capture the allegiance of the people of Canada. What policy? What specific has he in mind? Otherwise, unless he puts in specifics he stands there as a great emblazing generality that means nothing.

I want to make reference to one more instance. One could spend all of his time studying what the hon. Prime Minister of this province says out on the hustings. Such as:

I would ask you to consider the sudden and abrupt economic, social, cultural and political upheaval—

his speechwriters really let the adjectives get away on them there:

—the social, economic, cultural and political upheaval that has taken place in the province of Quebec. The government of Quebec

has been able to harness the creative forces in the "quiet" revolution in the formulation of a progressive policy of economic development. The people of Quebec identify themselves with new steel mills and factories.

Is that not wonderful? That is the end of the quotation. What an indictment. What a self-indictment of himself and his government to say that, to point to the intellectual, cultural and spiritual activity that is going on in a sister province, as he does, and to have an absolute vacancy about what is going on in his own.

The truth is, of course, that the people identify themselves with the ferment in Quebec because there are channels of communication between the people and the government of Quebec. Rene Levesque is looked upon as a true representative of the aspirations of the Quebecois. But this government has lost contact—there are no channels of communication between the people and the government. For 22 years the majority of the people have voted against the Tory party, and for 22 years the majority of the people of this province have got what they did not want—they have had to suffer the Tory party.

The one possibility of some contact and communication—that is to say, the criticism and the stimuli provided by our intellectuals—is successfully castrated because the first citizen appoints those intellectuals to an advisory council, to which I have adverted before. He gives them a place of status and prestige. When he gets up I would like to hear more about this. He can occupy all of my time that he wants in telling me what the federal government has done to prohibit the development of a national policy.

A remarkable book has come out, a book that is very much at point in the light of the passage of the medical care statute. I thought it a rather interesting fact that the man who piloted the medical care insurance scheme through this House, who unhappily is absent today, should tell us that during his youth he heard three eminent personages in the political life of our nation speak. He heard J. S. Woodsworth, he heard Mackenzie King and he declined to follow either of them.

Surprisingly enough he chose to follow the one man, the one man who treated his Canadianism so lightly that he dispensed with it, he sloughed it off. The country that had made that man wealthy, the people who had made him wealthy, were relegated to a very distant place in his affection and that man, R. B. Bennett, having sloughed off his citizenship in this country, having achieved the

highest honour that his fellow citizens could bestow upon him, he chose to go and live the life in a foreign land in the guise of a country squire. I thought that rather remarkable, that the hon. Minister of Health should tell us during that debate that that man was his spiritual bellwether, the man who had guided him in politics—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): What foreign land?

Mr. Sopha: The foreign land? The United Kingdom, and if the hon. member does not like that description, he can lump it.

At this session we in the Opposition took on the financial institutions of this country. I said before that the financial institutions had great influence on this government. Of course they have. The insurance industry has written all the insurance legislation that we have on the books. It is there as the echo of their desires in the realm of insurance.

Once again the insurance industry—and when one speaks of that industry they are talking about all of the institutions of corporate finance. We cannot single out the insurance industry from the banks and the trust companies, because they are all parts of one piece, they are all parts of one mosaic, which is the title of Professor Porter's book, "The Vertical Mosaic."

The corporate élite imprinted its desires upon the hon. leader of this government and in some way or other said to him: "You will not remove medical care insurance from our purview. You will not deprive us of the right to sell insurance policies in respect of the health of our people."

I was one that appreciated the seriousness of the antagonists that we took on, because they are a powerful group. I came to the conclusion, sir, that though I was a member of this assembly, I was not the member of an assembly that really rules the province, this is not the place where real power resides. Real power resides with others.

Now I understand, having seen the events of this session and having had the opportunity to read Professor Porter's survey, now I understand why the members of the corporate élite do not descend into the realm of politics. They do not run for political office because they do not have to. There is no need to run for political office when you can control the government of the province without the necessity of getting into the arena and becoming bloodied and muddled by the dust of that arena.

Professor Porter hearkened, if anybody is still listening after 557 pages of study, to

those members of the Legislature who have not read a book for 20 years. I commend this one, read this one. His study is a scholarly study. After 557 pages he comes to a conclusion. Listen to it in its starkness:

Canada, it may be concluded from the evidence presented in the preceding chapters, has a long way to go to become in any sense a thoroughgoing democracy.

That is a remarkable statement, is it not?

—has a long way to go to become in any real sense a thoroughgoing democracy.

In the first part of the book we saw something of the way in which class differences act as barriers to individual achievement. Even into the 1960s Canadian educational systems have yet to become democratized through to the university level. The possibilities for upward social mobility are reduced and at the same time shortages of highly trained people for the new occupational structure continue. In this respect Canada is behind 20th century democracy elsewhere.

What a terrible indictment of our system. In 1965 this scholar, resident at Carleton University where he shares one of the important departments, is saying that we are not a democracy.

In a nutshell his thesis is this: There is no mobility of ability. Able people cannot get to the top in our system. Able people are held down and we know bloody well, we know damn well, that in many of the institutions, in many of the important institutions of this country, and I say it today, Anglo-Saxons only wanted. No Jews and hunkies and no central European and no wops; Anglo-Saxons only permitted.

That is true of the Toronto stock exchange. That is true of most of our private clubs. That is true of most of our philanthropic organizations.

The other day, because they treated my son so well, I sent a small donation to the hospital for sick children and I looked over their list of trustees. A remarkable institution. I just pick it as an example of philanthropic organizations which give the individual a place of status and prestige in our community if he is on the board; he is somebody if he is on the board. Anglo-Saxons only! What Professor Underhill calls the WASP.

No wops, no Frenchmen, no hunkies, nobody but the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant. That is true. Until we change that—and I do not know how we are going to change that in this country to allow mobility of ability. An Italian said to me recently that in some of

their private clubs, where they control the economy and the government and everything else that is important in this country in order to dislodge them, one would have to go in with a baseball bat. That is how entrenched they are, at the very least.

I hesitate to say it, but in all honesty I must say it, that one of the chief contact men between the "corps d'élite," those who really control power in this country, in this government, is Leslie Frost. Leslie Frost laid down the reins of office and hardly a day went by until Leslie Frost was embraced by the managers of corporate finance. He went on one board after another, and how brazen they can get. How brazen one of them got, in taking him on the board; you need only look at statutes 1950, chapter 33, to see the reason he went on one of the boards.

I saw him around here during the Medicare debate; I saw him with the hon. Prime Minister and a couple of other Ministers.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member never saw me with Frost during the Medicare debate.

Mr. Sopha: Forgive me. I saw him walking down the stairs to the Cabinet dining room and I thought I saw—perhaps I was mistaken—I thought I saw the hon. Prime Minister with Mr. Frost. He was with a couple of Ministers.

But he is probably the chief contact man: Canada Life Insurance Company, Bank of Montreal, National Trust, and so on.

It is the truth. I speak the truth. I point to these things and if they are not true, then they will be swept aside, but I submit to hon. members on the basis of Professor Porter's book, that they are true; power does not reside in this Legislature, power resides somewhere else.

Finally, to show what Professor Porter thinks of the government, I am going to read one more excerpt. I prefer the judgment of Professor Porter to that of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. This man is a scholar.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Does the hon. member agree with Porter?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. This man is a scholar. I will not use the fitting term to describe his antithesis. Listen to what he thinks of the government hon. members. Every private member of the Legislature should listen to what Professor Porter thinks of him.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Is the hon. member excluded?

Mr. Sopha: He says:

It is doubtful if members of Parliament or members of provincial Legislatures have important decision-making powers. In his collective portrait, Professor Ward has shown how short-lived is the political career of members of Parliament—about 40 per cent of each Parliament is made up of newcomers. Most members of Legislatures, provincial and federal, do what their leaders tell them or suggest to them as being the correct course of action. Collectively they may act as checks on Cabinets or sources of information about how the country feels on certain public issues, but they do not partake in any real sense in political decision-making.

That is what he thinks of the hon. members. They do not partake in any real decision-making, and we know that the Medicare bill was handed to the Conservative caucus as a fait accompli. We know that many members of the caucus cannot stomach it to this day—

Mr. White: That is entirely incorrect.

Mr. Sopha:—but it was handed to them as being the policy of the government and party discipline demanded that they support it. I do not know what the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) and the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) are going to do to be re-elected, having voted for that statute, and how they will be able to bail themselves out of that stigma, if it remains in its present form. Many of them have told us privately how much they revile it, how much they hate it. They would not say it on the floor of the House, but it is an example of what Professor Porter was talking about. The decision was handed to them by John Parmenter Robarts, who says, "This is the policy and party discipline requires you to support it." That is the way the Legislature functions.

I have talked a long time and I have said a good many things, but I say this to the hon. Prime Minister, in conclusion. He has not got the moral courage—let me repeat that, he has not got the moral courage—to dissolve this House and go to the people of this province on his Medicare bill.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is the biggest joke—

Mr. Sopha: We are willing to go to the people on that issue. This is an important social matter, the way the health of our people will be cared for. One sat in this House last night and watched two characteristics of the hon. members of the government in respect of that important social

reform. One watched arrogance among them. The other thing was buffoonery—the way they banged their desks, the way the hon. Minister of Highways sat there and banged his desk in order to demonstrate to the first citizen how loyal he is.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): The hon. member is a buffoon right now.

Mr. Sopha: They will bang their desks this afternoon, and when they bang their desks, I will remember the words of Sir James George Frazer, who wrote a better book than Berton's "The Comfortable Pew." The hon. Minister of Highways should remember this, and the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) should remember this. Frazer said:

Modern man's similarities with the ancient savage are more profound than his differences.

That strikes me, when I see them bang their desks at the slightest stimulus.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member is providing a striking example of man's similarity with the ancient savage!

Mr. Sopha: I say to the hon. Prime Minister that if he cares to summon up the moral courage, let us go to the people on this issue. At the very least we will test this issue in the Bracondale byelection, sometime this fall, if he calls that byelection at an appropriate time where we can put his Medicare policy to the people as against ours—public operation as against operation by those who pursue the private motive.

Unfortunately I will always be free to say these things. That is one of my qualities, in contrast to the hon. Prime Minister—I am free to say the things; he is not free, he is the captain of others, the real rulers of the province. But I am free to say these things. May the Lord preserve me in my freedom. That is a good test between us.

He spoke last night about our political cleavage. It is a long time since the people of this province have had the opportunity to choose between two competing political philosophies. They have the opportunity now.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is not even two years ago that they had this choice.

Mr. Sopha: They had no issue like this one.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Oh, they had a wonderful issue.

Mr. Sopha: They had no issue like this one. They had "done," the election of the "done."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and of course, was it on the television? He got on the television. Or was it in the paper that he said that he was sorry about that, because when all is said and done, he is an honest man and he was sorry that he allowed the Madison Avenue manipulators of his image to put him in the false position of appearing before the millions of our people and saying, "Done," in respect of a social measure that drastically needed action and was not yet touched.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): He meant it was done in respect of—

Mr. Sopha: But that now is very current. That was 1963. Now in 1965 the people of this province have the advantage of seeing what the government has done, and what it has done does not measure up, because at least half a dozen—a corporal's guard—of the clergy are outside picketing these buildings, expressing their discontent with the move that the government has made. They are merely symptomatic.

I walked out last night with one of the government hon. members, and there were people risking the regard that their parishioners hold them in. They risk that regard to come here and to demonstrate, and one of the government hon. members, an utter, absolute fool, looked at them, these people acting in sincerity, and he said, "Is it not a shame?" I said, "What is a shame?" He said, "Is it not shame that those clergymen would act in that fashion?" At that moment I could not reply, because there was no reply possible to him. That person so misunderstood what is going on in this country that he would not know enough to come in out of the rain, unless the Whip went to him and said, "It is raining out, come on in."

Sir, thank you for your indulgence and I bid you adieu until next year.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in this House in the last few years, I have had many very enjoyable occasions to follow what I have come to term the gospel and the fables according to Saint Sopha, and today I think that we have been treated to just about as undisciplined an exhibition as I have heard in this House for many years.

I will say nothing about his comments on Mr. Ford's editorial other than to say it did

seem to me that the only thing that prompted him to mention it at all was the fact that I touched on something in that speech that he had touched on and he felt I might have intruded on his preserves.

I will tell the hon. member that I am glad to share his desire for a national policy and I think that the writings of Sir Wilfrid Laurier are, after all these years, in the common domain and the public domain and he really has no right to build a fence around them so that no one else can use them.

I noticed very carefully the parts that he did not quote as well as the parts he did quote, and I felt that the whole performance really related right back to him personally as an individual, because he was a little miffed.

With that I will leave those comments, except to quote from the speech I made—and I have no desire whatsoever to repeat this speech in the House of Commons. The hon. member quoted some comments I made about the ability of the government of Quebec to harness the creative forces in the quiet revolution in the formulation of progressive policies of economic development in the province of Quebec. I said that the people of Quebec identify themselves with new steel mills and factories and that there is a sense of participation that they feel in this revolution which is going on in Quebec, industrially, culturally, educationally and socially.

I see nothing wrong with the adjectives I used. They seem to be pretty reasonable examples of the English language; perhaps not quite so exotic as some my hon. friend uses, but perhaps a little more understandable to average people.

He stopped at that point, having quoted from the speech, and then lashed out at me personally to say, "What kind of man is this who speaks thus about a neighbouring province?" I must admit that he stopped at the bottom of a page, and like some of the explanations I hear from that side of the House; maybe he just failed to turn the page over, but on the next page I go on to say, and I quote:

Here in Ontario you can find the same sets of personal identification in the accomplishments of the past 20 years.

Now this is the part of the speech the hon. member conveniently left out:

There is, for example, a general feeling of pride among the residents of Metropolitan Toronto in the fact that their city has evolved a truly cosmopolitan centre which

has a rich and varied cultural life. In almost every city, town or village of Ontario, people will point with pride to new homes, factories, public buildings, schools and highways as physical reminders of their material and cultural advancement. The pace of growth in Ontario has been very rapid but it has also been spread over a longer period. I am convinced, however, that the people of Ontario are very proud of their achievements. There is, I believe, a deep feeling of confidence in the economic strength of this province.

I go on to suggest that:

This sense of identification and pride is recognizable in every province of Canada; where economic growth has taken place this feeling of the people is intensified.

Perhaps this should be put in association, just for the record, with the remarks that the hon. member withdrew from this speech and the comments he made about them.

As a matter of fact, perhaps you would really be interested to know—what I was saying in relation to the national policy is that, within our country today, these feelings are developing in the provinces as entities. What I was suggesting was a national policy, instead of allowing this sense of identification to be associated only with the province in which one lives, with a truly national policy developed by a federal government. These feelings which exist among our people now are directed particularly toward the province in which we live, and I think we have examples of this right across the country. They should be funnelled together, striving toward one common country rather than only the association with the province in which the individual may reside.

This really was the nub of my remarks concerning a national policy, and I believe it, and I think it is so.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Are you preaching for a call?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Not I. I am glad you raised it because this is another part of that editorial. I said I was not going to refer to it, but now I will read on from where you stopped. You will pardon my immodesty, but I live in London and read the London paper, so it would be natural that I would have read this editorial. I will read from it:

Premier John Robarts will probably not thank me for this column. He has definitely told me that he is very happy at Queen's Park. He feels he has a job to do in

Ontario and has not the slightest interest in moving to Ottawa to undertake the difficult task of leader of the federal Conservative party, if and when Right Honourable John Diefenbaker retires.

Now that part of it, of course, you conveniently left out. Then, in the face of that, you turned to me and said: "Are you preaching for a call?"

Mr. Sopha: I am not a press relations man.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I will just allow hon. members to make up their own minds.

Now I did want to go back to some of the comments that were made, not only by the hon. member for Sudbury but by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), concerning the proceedings in the House. I point out this particular session breaks itself naturally into two parts. There was the period from January 20 to April 14; we recessed from April 14 to April 27; and then resumed until today's date. Now the House has actually been in session for 101 days. Two of those days we did not sit in order to attend the regional development conference and one other day was devoted to trips that committees of the House wished to make.

This is the longest session that has ever been held and while that does not necessarily mean it is the best session, I think that the record of achievement here this year has been very high. Since I have the honour of leading the government and therefore being in charge of the affairs of this House, I have made a very conscious effort to bring more of the hon. members into the debates and activity of the Legislature and I am happy to say that, as far as I am concerned, I feel that we have achieved something.

I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Sudbury that there would be virtue in limiting the time of the large general debates that we have. The debate on the Speech from the Throne, for instance, lasted for 15 days. That is, it was debated on 15 separate days; but I do not think that on very many days it constituted the full business of the session. I would point out to you that, during those 15 days, there were 51 hon. members who participated.

Regional development, the Mercer reformatory—I had these things analyzed for my own information—education, automation, mental health, retarded and emotionally disturbed children and hospitals were all debated and gave hon. members an opportunity to make their contribution and put before the House what sense of foreboding they might have or

what areas in which they felt there was legislative need. I would hate to see those debates limited. I do not see any virtue in looking at some other particular organization and picking one aspect of it and saying that it would work well here.

If you are going to look at the rules of this House, in my view you have to look at them as a whole. In other words, you cannot pick the part dealing with those two debates and say if they are changed we would have to completely change our procedure when we are dealing with the estimates. That procedure has been built up over the years and while it becomes perhaps tiresome, particularly for the Minister concerned when he answers many times the same questions in a great variety of ways, nonetheless over the years this method of dealing with the examination of the functions of government, the administration of government, has come into being and in my opinion is quite efficient—even though it takes up a good deal more time than it used to.

The Budget debate lasted for 13 days as opposed to 15 days for the Throne debate. There were 33 speakers in that debate, and once again the same remarks I made would apply. I will not go into these other matters about speaking before the orders of the day.

There are two points the hon. member for Sudbury has made in this House on many, many occasions; that is, if you support the Progressive-Conservative Party you are supposed to disappear off the face of the earth. You cannot be recognized at any time as Progressive-Conservative, otherwise it is dirty politics. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are lots of Progressive-Conservatives in this province and they think they are just as much entitled to go about their business, to do as they please, as are members of the Opposition.

As for that discussion here about the young lady—and this is indicative of what I mean—asking these children who the Prime Minister of Ontario or Canada might be; it is as if to say in a schoolroom you cannot ask a child who the Prime Minister of Canada is because he is a Liberal and therefore that is a political remark. Now, if you are going to speak about the leaders of our country, and our provinces, and in all sorts of areas, you are going to have to name them by name and the political persuasion. What would the hon. member have this young lady say? What would you have her say as she stands here with these children? Would you have her say: "I cannot tell you the name of the Prime Minister of Ontario because that would be a political remark"?

Mr. Sopha: I would suggest that she would teach them catechism.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sopha: We do not permit it in our public schools—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a completely ridiculous argument. I can assure the hon. member that there is no policy on the part of this government which instructs these young ladies. I have not listened to one of them for some years. I used to come here fairly frequently when I was Minister of Education and greet these various groups. Frankly I was always impressed with the knowledge these young ladies had of the Chamber and the affairs of the province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I have not been in recently, but I can assure the hon. member there is no such policy. Frankly, I just have a feeling that the hon. member is ultra-sensitive in certain areas.

As for the question of statements before the orders of the day, I make no apologies for what the government does. We will continue to do it. We will continue to do it as long as we think that as a government we have positions to put before the people of this province upon which they eventually will pass judgment. I am sure that the hon. member would be the first one to complain if he could not find out what the policy of this government was. If there were not statements made here before the orders of the day upon which the Opposition for instance can base an attack—this is what many of their questions are for, they are seeking to find out what the government's position is in order to see if they agree or disagree with it. I think most often they disagree and this is quite proper.

But to stand and say that a Minister of the Crown and a man who is responsible for the administration of a department and a man who establishes the record of the government upon which the people inevitably and eventually vote; to say that he should be muzzled; to stand in his place here and not tell the people of this province what he is doing and indeed how he is doing it, would be in my opinion a negation of the rights of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sudbury asked a question and threw out some kind of a challenge about what the position was that we as a government put to the federal government concerning some of the economic matters that are being noised abroad at the present time. Perhaps just for the sake of the

record I will read to him a position that was put to the federal government on May 31, last. If the hon. members will recall, there had been a federal-provincial conference scheduled for that date which was to last for several days. Due to various movements of some of the Premiers, pressure of business here and there, the conference was postponed.

However, there was a federal-provincial meeting held to discuss the question of low employment areas. This is a policy being developed by the federal government in connection with what is called ADA—and, if I can just recall, it is area development agency. This is a programme the federal government is developing to replace the taxation incentives they have offered in the past in order to move industry into areas in which they think industry should be moved.

This discussion between the federal and provincial government took place at the senior service level. As a result the conference itself was postponed until mid-July.

This is the position that the Ontario government put. I do not know whether this particular document has been made public. I do not think it was released here in Toronto, it may have been in Ottawa. In any event I see no reason why it should not be released here at the moment. I want to disabuse the hon. member's mind of the idea that we do not have positions in this province and that I talk in these—I like the reference to the bubble gum. I sometimes feel that he blows out clouds and then gets on top of them and we have to look a long way up to find where he is. However, he always comes down with something of a smile.

But in order to assure him that we have positions and we do not always talk in generalities—I have analyzed some of his own remarks and it is pretty difficult to make a speech in anything other than generalities, unless one wants to turn it into a lecture and fill it full of statistics and so on. In any event here is the presentation we made, and the hon. member may draw his own conclusions as to whether it has had any effect on events since.

All Canadians are genuinely interested in the problems of economic development.

Now that is a pretty general statement but like all truisms it is true.

The Canada economic council has recently published target goals for 1970 which set out the economic growth which will be necessary if Canada is to provide growing employment and income opportunities for all her citizens. These goals provide an

excellent framework within which economic development across Canada can proceed over the next few years.

The real validity of the economic council and its goals for 1970 lies in stimulating Canadians to take up and achieve the challenge of higher levels of economic performance. The targets will mean nothing unless they are implemented at the practical policy level. Ontario believes in the validity and achievability of these goals and intends to utilize them fully in the design of public policy over the next five years.

Now I believe that this is nothing more than a repetition of what the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) said during his Budget debate, and the hon. member cannot have it much firmer than that.

Proposals, policies and programmes dealing with regional development in Canada need clarification over what is meant by the term "regional." Lack of agreed terminology may lead to overlapping jurisdiction and needless duplication of effort. This confusion is often an inhibiting factor influencing the growth and development plans of the public and private sectors.

Ontario interprets the role and responsibility of the federal government in regional matters as ensuring that all Canadians share in the opportunity to achieve and enjoy a continually rising standard of living.

That might be termed a generality, too, but I think it is a goal to which we all aspire and I do not know how else you could put it.

The federal government's economic point of view must be national and no erosion of power or responsibility in such fields as monetary, fiscal or exchange rate policy should occur. The federal government has a legitimate concern for ensuring minimum standards of social and economic welfare for all Canadians through such national programmes and institutions as the Bank of Canada, the unemployment insurance commission, the national employment service and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Ontario firmly supports the federal government, in principle and with tax revenue, in measures designed to facilitate income redistribution. Allocating and administering these intergovernmental transfers is and must remain one of the federal government's major regional responsibilities. However, while Ontario firmly believes in the validity of the present sharing arrangements for these intergovernmental transfers, it will be up to the provinces to

allocate these funds internally in the form and manner which they see best for improving their own economic base and furthering their regional development programme.

If the federal government's responsibilities are broad, relating to Canadians as a whole, so the regionalization employed should also be broad. For some purposes there will be only one effective region and that is the whole nation. In other cases, a regional grouping of provinces may be required.

What Ontario stresses most emphatically is that regional development inside Ontario is primarily a provincial matter and responsibility. Ontario is most anxious to co-operate with the federal government over a wide area where there is parallel jurisdiction under The British North America Act, but Ontario reserves the right to set its own policies and priorities concerning internal economic development.

The tremendous expansion in the public sector in the 20th century has largely been concentrated in highways, power developments, schools and educational centres, health and welfare services, water supply and sewage disposal. These are areas of provincial responsibility and jurisdiction. The provinces have come of age quickly and forcefully. The huge investment expenditures which must be made for attendant physical assets in these areas of responsibility must be effectively planned and co-ordinated as to economic timing and impact within both the overall structure of the provincial economy and its regional components. In Ontario's case, efforts to meet public needs have been handicapped by inadequate sources of revenue.

Ontario reaffirms its Prime Minister's stand that "the ultimate responsibility for the equitable distribution of economic opportunity within a province must rest with the government of that province" and not with the federal government. Thus, while Ontario affirms its belief in the soundness of the recently announced economic goals for Canada to 1970, Ontario must be free to apply the necessary policy and programmes designed to achieve those targets as they apply to Ontario, given the broad framework of federal policy mentioned previously.

Ontario is primarily concerned with promoting the growth of the provincial economy as a whole. Its regional development policies in themselves, then, become a secondary though vitally important aspect of

provincial growth policy generally. Ontario's development policy should be determined and operated within the province—for, by and with the various elements of the community. Ontario must be free in her regional development policy to avoid the dangers either of single-formula principles or of "solutions" which are imposed by outside authorities. Regional development problems in Ontario stem partly from pockets of low income, partly from the strains put upon our present municipal structure by rapid rural-urban shifts, and partly from resource-base problems. Just as there are differences in attitudes, needs and resources, both human and material, among the regions, so there will have to be different solutions.

To enhance productivity growth and expand income and employment in the province, Ontario must achieve effective co-ordination between provincial, municipal and regional authorities including a fundamental restructuring of local government. In this regard, specific regional development priorities may be upset if the federal government initiates programmes without prior consultation and agreement with Ontario, the result of which may have significant effects on Ontario's regional economic structure.

There are many examples of effective federal-provincial co-operation on programmes which affect provincial economic development, and we may affirm strongly that Ontario's relationships with most federal government departments are characterized by thorough co-operation and prior consultation on new programmes, as well as a mutual respect for each other's capabilities and responsibilities.

The federal government with its special responsibility for Canadian economic growth and its international treaty-making power was the relevant authority to deal with the United States concerning the automotive trade plan. However, the federal authorities should have explored more fully the avenues of consultation with Ontario prior to announcing the plan. Canada's automotive industry is largely concentrated in this province and, while Ontario may have much to gain in long-run benefits from the agreement, its impact on our industrial structure and labour force will bring about important short- and long-term dislocations. We feel that we should have been consulted extensively beforehand. Not only will the effects involve worker retraining, population shifts, hous-

ing and basic education, but also present and future industrial location and structure.

Ontario recommends recognition of the principle in federal-provincial economic relations that prior consultation take place with the provinces with regard to agreements, domestic or international, relating to a particular industry or group of industries. Ontario feels this principle is consistent with both federal responsibility for overall Canadian economic growth and provincial responsibility for the scope and direction of provincial growth. Ontario cannot subscribe to the illusion that Canadian productivity growth may be increased through measures which, intentionally or not, sap the productivity base of any partners in Confederation.

Similarly, in regional matters within a province, Ontario's position is that such programmes as ARDA or the ADA—that is a new programme—designated area programme must be the outgrowth of federal-provincial consultation. This feeling stems from the development priorities adopted by Ontario. Programmes and policies designed to ameliorate conditions of low income must, in our view, be adapted to fit a province's overall growth programme and not the other way around. After all, many of the problems of regional development become much more tractable against the background of a buoyant and growing economy. A misallocation of resources may occur if undue devotion to regional problems were to divert our attention from growth generally.

In this light, we view the recent suggestions of the federal government with regard to designated areas as raising two major issues.

First, the programme involves regional economic development within Ontario, and yet was developed without the extensive consultation and consent of the Ontario government.

Second, we in Ontario are not convinced of the economic rationale of the designated-area proposals. They are designed to attract new manufacturing and processing industries by means of substantial cash grants and tax incentives into areas that have been characterized by low non-farm family income levels or by persistently high unemployment rates, or both. Many of these designated areas in Canada, particularly those suggested for Ontario, may be unsuitable for the establishment of new manufacturing and processing firms.

Ontario believes that these firms may

siphon off economic resources in terms of skilled labour, entrepreneurship and ancillary services that could make a larger and more productive contribution to provincial output were they to locate in other more favourable growth centres. In short, Ontario believes the present ADA approach conflicts with the provincial economic objective of efficient overall growth.

Ontario also believes that there could be greater co-ordination among federal government policies which affect regional development within provinces. We believe that the area development administration could perform a most useful function if its energy were co-ordinated with ARDA and other federal agencies in the provision of technical assistance and advice to the provinces in their provincial regional development programmes.

While we are pleased with the recent announcement on the labour mobility programme, we believe there may be some inconsistency in its relationship to the designated-area programme. Ideally, such a programme should help labour to relocate from areas of low income opportunity and productivity to areas of greater economic opportunity and productivity. It would appear logical that any special assistance in addition to the national programme—in other words, grants rather than loans—should be directed to moving people from designated areas rather than into designated areas.

The economic council of Canada review stressed the vital importance of government assistance to labour mobility if its targets were to be met. We believe that the provision of relocation grants on a national scale is the type of programme required.

While much of the above has been critical, and deliberately so, there is much room for closer liaison between Ontario and the federal government. Ontario is most anxious to explore, and where possible extend the range of federal-provincial consultation and co-operation. We believe that the basis of economics is sound logic. An economic division of labour as between the federal and provincial governments dictates that each authority undertake to exploit the comparative advantage it possesses. In this case, comparative advantage has already been partially determined by, and to some degree already developed through, The British North America Act.

To achieve both federal and provincial

objectives the principles used in the exercise of economic authority should be stated clearly and unequivocally:

"The federal government must be the relevant authority to develop and implement national economic policies and programmes designed to optimize the growth of per caput national income.

"The provinces must be the relevant authority responsible for the design and implementation of policies affecting the optimal allocation of resources within their geographic areas. Ontario is of the opinion that ADA could perform a useful function if its energy were co-ordinated with ARDA and other federal agencies in the provision of technical assistance to the provinces in the development of provincial regional development programmes.

"Ontario believes that the federal government should provide financial assistance to the provinces for regional development purposes according to a formula which would help to narrow the gaps in Canadian living standards. Such intergovernmental transfers should leave the provinces free to allocate the funds in accordance with their own regional development policies."

Mr. Speaker, that was the position put. These matters, of course, are not yet complete. There are discussions still continuing in this area.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder if I could ask the hon. Prime Minister—and I appreciate very much getting clarification—the paper that he has just read, was that a paper presented by the representatives of the government of Ontario to a federal-provincial conference?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It was presented as a position in a conference of officials from various departments of both governments.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Prime Minister tell me, was this last year or—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No, this was May 31 last. As I explained in the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the federal-provincial conference was scheduled for May 31 and was not held for a variety of reasons. So, to deal with this one phase, certain officials from this government and from the government in Ottawa got together. The hon. leader of the Opposition was challenging me to put before this House some of the positions that we put before the federal government. This is a position we put before the federal government.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask then, sir: In view of this, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me first, as the hon. member for Sudbury pointed out, we understood the approach taken on federal-provincial conferences was that they had been secret. We appreciate now that these documents obviously are going to be made public. We assume therefore that this will be the government's approach. To follow through in logic the government will have representation, not only from government but I had hoped from Opposition at these conferences if they feel that they can publicize these documents that are presented to the federal-provincial conference. One of the criticisms, as I think the hon. Prime Minister has been aware, is that—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, the leader of the Opposition is making a speech.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry! Could I ask the hon. Prime Minister: One of the criticisms has been that the federal-provincial conferences have been secret and therefore there has been no debate on the floor of the Legislature and the public across Ontario is not informed.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am aware, of course, of what the hon. leader of the Opposition is saying. I am also aware of the difficulty in both respects. I am personally of the opinion that there are areas in which there could be less secrecy than there is now, but I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition I am one of 11 and my opinions do not necessarily predominate.

On the other hand, I would say that by the mere nature of some of these consultations I feel that there has to be some degree of disclosure. It is not a question of secrecy necessarily, because there are many press gathering at these conferences and many press meet there.

In fact I think the press security of it is a bit of a joke. Reporters are enterprising and the people from all across the country, from different provinces, are not too inclined to observe 100 per cent agreement on press security. However, I must say this, that anything that is decided at these conferences, it seems to me, will eventually have to be discussed and debated in this House in any event.

Let us take, for instance, the question of the amendment to The British North America Act. It does not matter what decision this government makes, it comes back here for debate. As a government, once again we must behave like a government and we must

take a position. We cannot wait to consult everybody. We have the responsibility of government, if we discharge it poorly we will be defeated. This is our system.

So we come back here with a position that we have taken and we put it before this House and if it is simply not acceptable, why the resolution we introduce would not have been supported by you and so on. But we had a full debate.

As a matter of fact I was going to mention that in my remarks, but I got sidetracked on various other things. In my opinion the debate we had dealing with the Constitution of Canada was one of the better debates that I have heard in this House since I have been here.

I note the hon. member for Sudbury says that he now has second thoughts about the position he took at that time. The point I make to the House is this: Regardless of the fact that the discussions we had as a group of 11 governments meeting together, regardless of the fact the press may not have been allowed to be in those meetings, eventually what was decided was subjected to just about as close scrutiny as anything I have seen across the country. If one reads the newspaper articles and editorial opinions from coast to coast, it was very intense and I might say, by the same token, it was very diverse. There were distinctly opposite positions held.

This really is what I would term a working paper, but it fills in the gap that the hon. member for Sudbury felt was there. He wanted to know what our position was. I had at hand a position taken as recently as May 18, outlining what we considered to be our position vis-à-vis the federal government in this one particular field, so I brought it forward for his edification.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this debate—

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Prime Minister mind! I think that he is as concerned as many of the rest of us are, that there are people who are suggesting and our papers suggest, that when the governments have their federal-provincial conference it is a fait accompli. We do not agree with them; I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that when he comes back we have a debate, for example, on the amendment to The British North America Act. If it is examined and the very fact that the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada is a Liberal does not necessarily mean that I must go along with whatever he says and so on, and similarly across the provinces. But I noticed the hon. Prime Minister mentioning

that there are areas of secrecy which he thinks are really unnecessary. He mentioned this working paper. I listened with considerable interest; a lot of thought has gone into it and it may lessen the difficulty where the government feels Ontario would move in on shared programmes and so on, in designated areas.

I think we get very informed debate in the House. There would be better debate in the House if it would be possible for some of these papers to be made available to the Opposition. As I understand, on this occasion, because of the hon. member for Sudbury, you decided that you would show this paper as an example of the kind of thing that goes on. I think the hon. Prime Minister said that this was the first time that this paper had ever been revealed.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am not certain of that, but I must tell the hon. member the history of this particular document. At one stage I considered bringing it in here before the orders of the day, but various events transpired and it did not happen. I would be very interested in exploring, during these long summer months when I have nothing to do, the possibility of arranging some form of procedure. This is why I do not like tight rules in the Legislature—and this is something else I was going to mention.

Various devices we have adopted in this House, where we have flexibility, have worked well. For instance, I could mention to you the way we handle the reports of select committees when they are put on the order paper and debated. Search as you will, you will find no justification or no rule that provides for this procedure; but this is an ad hoc arrangement that has now grown into something a little greater than that.

If you recall, upon occasion when there was no liquor legislation before the House, we used the device of taking the report of the liquor licence board and putting it upon the order paper to get an item of business on the order paper which could serve as the basis for a debate. Now perhaps we need to exercise our ingenuity and find some way that some of these matters dealing with federal-provincial relationships and the attitudes that this government might take, and is taking, would be open to debate. I would be very happy to see if we could not find some means of arranging for debates of this kind to take place—

Mr. Thompson: Before the event.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Pardon?

Mr. Thompson: Before the event, rather than after.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: These would be basic positions but I might say to you, in all frankness and honesty, there is very little in the statement that I read to you today that was not in the opening statement of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Speaker. He laid out before this House a very complete report—I believe it took some hours—but I have not checked this statement against his statement exactly. I think that I would be correct in saying that there is very little in what I have put on the record here this afternoon that is not contained in the statement that he made.

There may be some things that relate in particular to this one programme, which the federal government brought forth in more detail after his estimates were in, but I would be happy to attempt to arrange some method of debating. When you get down to the tax agreements I suppose that, while these decisions will be multilateral in one respect, in another respect they could be completely unilateral because the federal government could tax us within its own jurisdiction. It has a right to impose taxes on the people generally, and I think inevitably that it is its final right to decide where that tax money is going to go. For instance, in the whole area of equalization payments, special subsidies for certain areas and so on—while there may be a good deal of discussion beforehand—it will be inevitably and finally a bill of the Parliament of Canada that will decide that.

However, there are areas where these things can be debated and people can make their positions known. Perhaps this is another reason why we should not be too hasty in disposing of the debates that can take place on the Throne Speech and the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the question at hand. We are dealing, at this moment, with a motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means, which was amended by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Sudbury mentioned so many unrelated topics in his speech, and I was looking for a little bit of information, that now I have decided not to deal with them because they do not seem to be of as much consequence now as they did when he was saying them—a tribute to your oratory but not to your content.

The first item of the amendment is moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition as stated:

That this House regrets that the Budget

has failed to make adequate provision for the proper use of Ontario's financial resources as well as its human resources in that it has neglected to include action upon:

1. The encouragement, fostering and development of new industries throughout the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, by the time I am finished commenting on these various amendments, I am quite sure the hon. leader of the Opposition, and his friends over there will see the utter ridiculousness of this amendment and will agree with us that it should not have been put on the order paper. It should not have been made in the first place.

Now, sir, during this past year The Corporations Tax Act was amended to make our incentives coincide with those of the federal government in the field of encouragement to industry. The Ontario trade crusade, of course, was continued during this year. Eighteen sales missions are planned for this current year to carry the story of Ontario's secondary industry around the world. There will be 90 buyers brought into Ontario from abroad to observe for themselves the products that are made here.

This government will participate in eight international fairs. We have launched an international advertising programme. In 1964 there were 163 new branch plants located in Ontario and these 163 branch plants created 5,000 new jobs. There were 104 new manufacturing arrangements completed between people manufacturing here and people manufacturing in other countries, and 523 companies expanded production facilities. This all resulted in the creation of 87,000 new jobs in toto during 1964, so I think that we have done what you asked; we have encouraged, fostered and developed new industries throughout this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The second one provisions:

Neglected to include action upon the following:

2. Provision of proper educational facilities for training and retraining of workers in view of the challenge of automation.

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) laid before this House, his department has been completely reorganized and he has launched an on-the-job training programme.

Since the vocational training agreement was signed in 1961, this province has taken 64 per

cent of the total investment in new technical and vocational training facilities. In 1963-64, 51 per cent of all the unemployed persons in Canada, who were undertaking training, were enrolled here in Ontario. Of course, your amendment completely ignores everything that has been done in our vocational training centres, our institutes of technology and the expansion of composite schools throughout the province to bring technical training and retraining into areas that have never had it before. Certainly it completely ignores the Ontario institute for studies and education, which will examine the need for further changes in our educational system.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is completely unrealistic to say that we have not made provision for proper educational facilities.

Now, sir, the third one is that we have failed the assurance of prosperity to those who draw their incomes from our agricultural industry. Well, we have introduced into the House in this session The Milk Act, which is a complete revision of this very contentious problem and which appears to have been accepted very enthusiastically by some 87,000 milk producers in the province. We have introduced amendments to assist in farm marketing. We have provided assistance for the construction of farm labour residence, and this is very important, in dealing with seasonal employment for harvesting. We have established a meteorological service and this, of course, is also of increasing importance to our farm population.

We have amended The Workmen's Compensation Act, in order that it would apply and extend to farmers, and this was done with the intent of helping in the provision of farm labour.

The Opposition ignores completely, with this resolution, what we are doing in the Ontario food council, and I am not going to repeat it, but during the estimates of The Department of Agriculture, the hon. Minister (Mr. Stewart), I thought, produced quite an amazing story of what that council is at present doing.

The Opposition has ignored what we are doing in promoting the exports of our agricultural products abroad, and of course, it has ignored the policies we introduced last fall and which are being revised now to deal with the present drought situation. But if hon. members recall, we paid subsidies on hay and we provided subsidies to help the farmers in eastern Ontario to get their herds to the market, when they were short of water and feed. So, Mr. Speaker, I must suggest that this amendment does not really make much sense to me either.

"The problems faced by local government in 1965 have been disregarded." That is the next point made. Sir, I would simply say that in the Legislature this year, two major reports have been tabled. One was the report of the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto—the Goldenberg report—and I was very interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) on that report this morning. I express no opinion as to their validity, but at least he took a different point of view than the report does, and we will be very interested in looking at the comments that he made.

Of course, the final report of the select committee on The Municipal Act is now in and the committee has been appointed to examine that report with the greatest of care, with a view to rewriting The Municipal Act in order to incorporate those of its recommendations that appear to be feasible.

There are 37 major amendments that have been made to The Municipal Act. There have been amendments to The Assessment Act. We introduced what was referred to last night as a pile of junk, but I think that some people, from a municipal point of view, will think it is very important, and that is an experimental commuter train service for, not the Metropolitan Toronto area only, but from one side of Toronto across to the other.

Finally, as to problems faced by local government in 1965, at the present time we are assisting Welland and Lincoln counties in their studies, which we hope will lead to alterations in government. There is a study proceeding in Ottawa and in Carleton county. Another study is proceeding in Sault Ste. Marie. Another study is proceeding at the Lakehead, not to mention the Goldenberg report just completed. So it is really, without being facetious, quite ridiculous to say that we have failed to face the problems faced by local government in 1965.

Sir, the fifth comment is that we have failed to provide a comprehensive programme of development of the vast resources in the northern part of our province and fair and reasonable payments to mining municipalities. In The Department of Mines—I would say, in commenting very briefly indeed on this particular aspect of it—the airborne magnetometer surveys are being continued and I think that they have done a great deal to provide the basis upon which exploration can be made. The roads to resources programme is continuing in The Department of Highways. Our Department of Lands and Forests has done a great deal in improving the management of our forest resources and seeing that they are utilized properly.

In this regard, hon. members might like to hear of the following pulp mill expansions that have been announced since January 1, 1964: Abitibi at Smooth Rock Falls, \$13,000,000; Domtar at Red Rock Ontario, \$14.5 million; Domtar at Cornwall, Ontario, \$10,000,000; Great Lakes Paper at Fort William, \$31,000,000; KVP at Espanola, \$20,000,000; Provincial Paper Company, Port Arthur, \$8,000,000; Spruce Falls Company at Kapuskasing, \$20,000,000; Dryden Paper Company, Dryden, Ontario \$5,000,000.

Cochrane Enterprises in Cochrane has rebuilt its chip plant there and its plywood plant, costing \$1.5 million. Weldwood of Canada at Long Lac has built a new \$2,000,000 plywood plant. A.M.L. Plywood, Chapleau, has built a plant costing \$1,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, while these announcements have been made individually over this period of time, I must admit that I was very pleased myself when we gathered all these figures into one place, because I had never heard them recited just like that before. If anybody asks, "Is anything wrong with our forest industries?" he does not know what he is talking about.

Sir, the sixth point was the elimination of the serious danger arising from air pollution and water pollution in Ontario. The OWRC has been expanded considerably. I have not the figures here for what it has done, although these figures are in the record of this session and were put before the House, or for the number of municipalities in which plants have been built. The OWRC has been expanded in this past year with the appointment of four new assistant general managers. We have introduced in the last year a new policy for building water pipelines, in which we will build and finance the construction of the pipeline and sell the water from it on a user basis to those who want it. This is a very broad change in policy and I think one—I know full well—that will expand greatly as the years go on.

We have been co-operating with the international joint commission in studies of Great Lakes levels. I must say, Mr. Speaker, while I had something kind to say about the hon. member for Yorkview, a few minutes ago, when he said that the Kierans plan could have any effect on the drought in Ontario, I changed my mind. He mentioned the drought, and asked why we would not go ahead with the Kierans water diversion. These are the two problems we have that of course are completely unrelated. One is an internal water problem, within the boundaries of the province, and the other, of course, is a

much larger, much more complex, much more difficult problem, of how we are to deal with the water levels in the Great Lakes. I might say I have asked that this be put on the agenda and looked at during the next federal-provincial conference, in order merely that we can build the machinery of co-operation between the provinces, and that we can proceed with studies of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, in fighting water pollution in Ontario, we have a long way to go, but we have come a very long way too and what I have outlined here indicates just how far we have come. I think it is a complete answer to that particular portion of the amendment.

The final one, Mr. Speaker, is No. 7. It says:

The provision of leadership in the field of labour relations, the lack of which has resulted in harmful dislocation in the industrial sphere.

Mr. Speaker, what does the record show in this area? Between 1946 and 1959 the average yearly loss of manhours in industry from strikes and lockouts was 1.8 million manhours each year. Between 1960 and 1964 the average yearly loss of manhours declined to an average of 1.2 million manhours each year, a one-third reduction during a period in which our labour force was increasing mightily and the number of manhours worked in industry was increasing as well.

Mr. Speaker, without belabouring the point—after all it has been said here this afternoon—let us address our minds to the matter at hand and that is the question of the amendment upon which we are now to vote. As I have outlined the record here, I would hope that my hon. friends opposite would agree that as this session has unfolded since the Budget came in, while we might have had the excuse of ignorance before the estimates were presented when this amendment was made, now that they have heard the full story of the administration of the government and how it is being done, I am sure they will all agree with me that this was a nonsensical amendment in the first place.

Mr. Speaker: The Budget debate now being concluded, I shall put the main motion and the amendment before the House for a vote.

Mr. Allan moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

Mr. Thompson moves, seconded by Mr. Oliver, that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve

itself into the committee on ways and means be amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House regrets the Budget has failed to make adequate provision for the proper use of Ontario's financial resources as well as its human resources in that it has neglected to include action upon the following:

1. The encouragement, fostering and development of new industry throughout the province.
2. Provision of proper educational facilities for training and retraining of workers in view of the challenge of automation.
3. The assurance of prosperity to those who derive their income from our agricultural industries.
4. The problems faced by local governments in 1965.
5. A comprehensive programme of development of the vast resources in the northern part of our province and fair and reasonable payments to mining municipalities.
6. The elimination of the serious danger arising from air pollution and water pollution in Ontario.
7. The provision of leadership in the field of labour relations, the lack of which has resulted in harmful dislocation in the industrial sphere.

The House will vote first on the amendment to the motion moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

YEAS

Bryden
Bukator
Davison
Freeman
Gaunt
Gisbourn
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Paterson
Renwick
Singer
Sopha
Spence
Taylor

NAYS

Allan
Auld
Bales
Beckett
Boyer
Brown
Brunelle
Butler
Carruthers
Carton
Cecile
Cowling
Demers
Downer
Eagleson
Evans
Gomme

YEAS
Thompson
Worton
Young—19.

NAYS
Grossman
Guindon
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Scarborough East)
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Johnston
(Parry Sound)
Johnston
(Carleton)
Kerr
Lawrence
(Russell)
Lawrence
(St. George)
Letherby
Lewis
(Humber)
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McNeil
Olde
Peck
Pittock
Price
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Simonett
Spooner
Thrasher
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardrope
Welch
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yaremko—59.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the “ayes” are 19, the “nays” 59.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

All those in favour of the main motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means will please say “aye.”

All those opposed will please say “nay.”

In my opinion, the “ayes” have it.
I declare the main motion carried.

The House resolved itself into the committee of ways and means; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

Clerk of the House:

Resolved,

That there be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of this province a sum not exceeding \$1,468,410,200, to meet the supply to that extent granted to Her Majesty.

Resolution concurred in.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee on ways and means rise and report that it has come to a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee on ways and means begs to report it has come to a certain resolution.

Report agreed to.

ACT GRANTING CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal years ending the 31st day of March, 1965, and the 31st day of March, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves second reading of Bill No. 168, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Resolved the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before I wait upon His Honour, I would like to table the answers to questions Nos. 7, 19, 21, 22, 26, 37, 63, 115 and 116.

This leaves one question unanswered, 117, which was asked on Friday, June 18, and

there has not been time to make the necessary research.

The hon. Prime Minister tabled answers to questions as follows:

19. *Mr. Singer*—Inquiry of the Ministry—(a) Will the Ministry advise which official, either of The Attorney General's Department, or other legal official appointed by the province of Ontario, gave instructions that Vernon Wilcox continue to be confined at the Ontario hospital at Orillia on December 25, 1964; (b) The reason such order was given; (c) The reason that consideration as recommended by Dr. A. L. Rice, superintendent of the Ontario hospital at Orillia, was refused?

Answer by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart):

The Crown attorney at Toronto advised The Department of Health that the criminal code contemplated custody in a mental hospital and that if the accused were dangerous then he should be kept in strict custody. He gave no direction as to strict custody.

The Honourable Mr. Justice C. D. Stewart, chairman of the advisory committee on the detention of patients in The Department of Health held a hearing for the purpose of determining whether or not the offence alleged had actually been committed. He came to the conclusion that if the accused could be tried he would be acquitted and recommended that he be released on probation. In the result, Wilcox was placed in the care of his parents at his home on April 15 and is still there.

21. *Mr. Singer*—Inquiry of the Ministry—Will the Attorney General advise whether or not all procedures as set out in The Conservation Authorities Act and The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963 have been followed insofar as those provisions affect the expropriations carried out for the Conservation Dam known as the "Gordon W. Pittock Dam" and other properties required in connection therewith?

Answer by the hon. Attorney General:

According to the opinion of the law officers of The Department of the Attorney General, based on the documents and information supplied and made available by the Upper Thames River conservation authority, the procedures as set out in The Conservation Authorities Act and The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963 with regard to the expropriations carried out in respect of the conservation dam known as the Gordon W. Pittock dam and other properties required in

connection therewith were carried out with the following exceptions:

(a) No approval, in writing, of the Minister required by section 16 of The Conservation Authorities Act has been obtained.

(b) No substantial compliance with the provision of subsection 3 and 4 of section 25 of The Conservation Authorities Act has been carried out.

(c) No registration of an amending plan in accordance with the provisions of subsection 3 of section 4 of The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963 has yet been effected.

(d) Four registered owners expropriated did not receive notice required by section 5 of The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963, within the prescribed time limit.

Note:

The properties of three of the four owners abovementioned were inadvertently included in the expropriation plan and in one case the owner rather than the registered owner was served with notice. The latter case has subsequently been rectified.

22. *Mr. Singer*—Inquiry of the Ministry—Will the Attorney General advise whether or not all of the persons from whom land was expropriated as referred to in question 21 above have been given the necessary notice and information provided for in the Ontario statutes which authorize such expropriations or set out the manner in which compensation for such expropriation is to be determined?

Answer by the hon. Attorney General:

According to the legal opinion of the law officers of The Department of the Attorney General, based on the documents and information supplied and made available by the Upper Thames conservation authorities, the necessary notice in form 1 to The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963 was served upon all registered owners as required by section 5(1) of the Act save and except as indicated under (d) to question 21.

Note:

No uniformity has been found in the service of notices upon owners other than registered owners under the permissive provisions of sections 5 and 9 of The Expropriation Procedures Act, 1962-1963.

Adequate notices in respect of possession and of information pertaining to the settlement of compensation have been given to registered owners by the authority.

26. *Mr. Bryden*—Inquiry of the Ministry—1. In the current fiscal year how many

breeders received grants from the government's annual grant made to the Canadian thoroughbred horse society; 2. What breeders received in excess of \$1,000 in individual grants, and how much did each of them receive?

Answer by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan):

1. 156 (1964-65)

2. The Canadian thoroughbred horse society awarded to the following the amounts shown:

Armstrong Bros. Co. Ltd., \$2,225.25; Beasley, W. R. \$1,224.12; Bell, G. M. & Gardiner, C., \$1,016.75; Boylen, J. A., \$1,039.50; Boylen, Mrs. M. J., \$1,279.50; Conklin Farm Ltd., \$2,623.25; Gardiner, G. R., \$1,143.37; Gaul, W. A., \$1,254.25; Hardinge, Viscount, \$1,758.75; Mann, Mrs. C. C., \$1,405.75; McClelland, D. G., \$2,151.75; Pasquale, E. C., \$1,154.25; Sherwood, P. A., \$1,832.75; Smallwood, J. W., \$1,037.50; Smythe, C., \$1,204.12; Stafford Farms, \$2,055.00; Taylor, E. P., \$15,096.25; Tomlinson, J., \$1,339.75.

63. *Mr. Singer*—Inquiry of the Ministry—Will the Ministry advise:

1. Re each of the years 1963 and 1964, how many persons have been imprisoned in Ontario:

- (a) in lock-ups;
- (b) in reformatories;
- (c) in jails;
- (d) in training schools;
- (e) in other places of detention for periods greater than eight days;

who have later been released as a result of charges against them being withdrawn or dismissed at magistrate's courts, on preliminary hearings, at trial by a higher court, or on appeal;

- 2. Names of all such persons so detained;
- 3. The length of time for which all such persons were so detained;
- 4. (a) How many of such persons were held without bail for all or part of such detention; or (b) continued to be detained because they were unable to meet the bail requirements fixed in their particular case?

Answer by the hon. Attorney General:

The Department of the Attorney General has not been maintaining complete statistical data indicated in this question.

However, the Ontario police commission has been instructed to establish a "Statistics Section" within its organization. The appropriate statistical data referred to in this

question will be collected on a day-to-day basis for future reference and comparison.

115. *Mr. Bryden*—Inquiry of the Ministry—1. What was the cost of: (a) dinner, (b) liquor, (c) fashion show, (d) music and other entertainment, at the banquet held on Thursday, May 20, following the provincial conference for women sponsored by The Department of Economics and Development; 2. How many people, including invited guests, attended; 3. (a) What was the price of tickets, and (b) how many paid this price?

Answer by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall):

In common with many other Ontario industries, the women's and children's garment industry must look to the export markets for any appreciable increase in production over and above the normal expansion resulting from increases in population and rising standards of living.

It has long been realized that this industry needed to create a fashion image recognizable beyond the borders of Canada. A small fashion show aimed at the United States market was organized. The reception was so favourable that several firms were able to rapidly increase their exports to the United States and some entered the market for the first time.

In 1964, a small group of manufacturers, assisted by this department and the federal Department of Trade and Commerce, exhibited independently in the northeastern United States, and again, reception was favourable.

As a result of these successes, the industry approached the department requesting sponsorship of an industry-wide promotion.

In May, 1964, the women's advisory committee recommended that a fashion design awards competition together with a fashion show be undertaken.

To make the necessary new and unusual impact, the competition—limited to Canadian designers—involved judging designs inspired by Canadian paintings selected by the director of the Toronto art gallery.

The paintings were displayed in a special area of the gallery, and manufacturers and designers were invited to visit the display.

It was decided that the awards would be given the name of "EEDEE." This word stands for excellence of design and the letters were taken from the name of The Department of Economics and Development.

An independent jury was appointed to

judge the entries and to recommend awards. Judging took place during April, 1965, and the winning creations were shown and the "EEDÉE" awards presented at a dinner and fashion show held in the Royal York hotel, May 20, 1965, the date of the symposium held by the women's advisory committee when the theme was "Woman in the Economy."

Buyers from Europe, the Middle East the United Kingdom and the United States were brought to Toronto to attend the fashion show and examine the merchandise on display in the manufacturers' sample rooms in the Royal York hotel. These buyers represented the leading department stores and buying offices in their respective countries.

From May 20, 1965 to May 22, 1965, manufacturers of women's and children's garments displayed their products in sample rooms in the Royal York hotel.

The following statistics give an indication of the interest in this promotion:

FASHION DESIGN AWARDS COMPETITION

Number of manufacturers entering competition	64
Number of creations submitted	157
Number of creations nominated for final showing	80
Number of "EEDÉE" awards	24
Best of show award	1

BUYER'S PROGRAMME

Number of manufacturers exhibiting in sample rooms at the Royal York hotel May 20-22, 1965	74
Number of foreign buyers attending	67
Countries represented by the buyers	15
Number of languages used in conducting business	5

DINNER AND FASHION SHOW

Number of fashion editors attending	6
Number attending dinner and fashion show	850

Much interest was shown by the foreign buyers and many sample orders were placed with the manufacturers who exhibited in the sample rooms. Fur garments, high fashion dresses, women's sportswear and lingerie, children's wear, especially sportswear and protective clothing, aroused considerable enthusiasm and it was in these areas that the majority of sample orders were placed.

Several of the buyers evinced interest in additional merchandise such as giftware, toys, boys' and men's wear and arrangements were made for them to visit manufacturers of these products. Again, several substantial sample orders were placed.

A survey of manufacturers and foreign buyers is, at present, under way, and will not be completed for approximately four to six weeks. Twelve buyers heard from to date report \$140,000 of sample purchases. The full results of this survey should indicate clearly, the value of the promotion and the prospects for Ontario-based manufacturers of women's and children's clothing in the export markets of the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and the Middle East. It is estimated that the business transacted could reach \$1,000,000.

In the meantime, it is fair to state that the first Ontario fashion design awards competition, fashion show and buyer's programme was enthusiastically received by designers, manufacturers, and buyers alike and all groups learned much from the promotion.

The foreign representatives at the fashion show were so impressed that a number of them asked if the government would sponsor similar promotions in their countries. The department is now consulting the federal Department of Trade and Commerce to see whether an arrangement can be worked out for Ontario participation in Canada Weeks abroad.

A preliminary survey was made by the department as to the effectiveness of this promotion among the general public. At last count the fashion show had been reported in more than 100 daily and weekly newspapers in Ontario. Stories and pictures appeared in newspapers in eight provinces. This newspaper space would have cost about \$10,000 if purchased as advertising lineage. Instead, it was editorial content and was read by thousands of households.

A 30-minute programme about the fashion show, called "Take 30," was carried by the CBC—35 stations on microwave and 11 stations on delayed relay. CFTO—in Toronto—did a 30-minute show, nine other TV stations across the province showed "EEDÉE" fashion film on their news broadcasts, and radio stations throughout Ontario mentioned the "EEDÉE" awards on the news. Cost of this TV and radio space would amount to another \$10,000 if purchased as advertising lineage. There is no way of knowing how many thousands of people learned about the "EEDÉE" awards through this free publicity.

The competition inspired Ontario designers to design truly Canadian creations.

It stimulated interest in, and enhanced the reputation of Canadian fabrics and design both in Canada and abroad.

It encouraged manufacturers to set higher standards of workmanship.

It gave manufacturers a real opportunity to judge foreign interest in Canadian women's and children's clothing.

And, finally, it proved once again that well-designed, quality merchandise, which is competitively priced will find buyers in the major markets of the world.

Replies to questions:

1. (a) cost of dinner, \$5,100; (b) cost of liquor, \$1,608; (c) cost of fashion show, \$5,899; (d) music and entertainment—included in (c), \$550.

2. Number of people attending, 850.

3. (a) price of tickets, \$7.50; (b) number of paid admissions, 636, designers, manufacturers, buyers, women's advisory committee, head table, press, officials and staff, 214; 850.

116. *Mr. Sopha*—Inquiry of the Ministry—1.

What was the total cost of the dinner tendered to the Shahanshah of Iran. 2. (a) Were invitations sent to candidates of the Progressive-Conservative Party defeated at general elections in the province; (b) If so, how many; 3. (a) Were invitations sent to presidents and/or officers of local Progressive-Conservative associations; (b) If so, how many; 4. (a) Were invitations sent to Liberal and/or New Democratic Party candidates defeated at general elections in the province; (b) If so, how many; 5. (a) Were invitations sent to presidents and/or officers of local Liberal and/or New Democratic Party associations; (b) If so, how many.

Answer by the hon. Prime Minister:

In the latter part of May, 1965, at the invitation of the federal government of Canada, the Shahanshah of Iran, accompanied by the Empress Farah Pahlavi, was on a state visit to Canada.

As a consequence of official contacts and representations by The Department of State at Ottawa with his office here, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario acceded to the request of the government of Canada that hospitality be extended to this distinguished royal couple. On behalf of the people of Ontario this was done, during their stay in Toronto, to pay tribute to His Imperial Majesty Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi who, since his accession to the throne, has given new leadership to the Iranian nation.

The western democracies have important and interesting links with the nations of the Middle East and Africa, and the people of our province can take considerable satisfaction in the international reputation of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

More than 6,000 miles from Toronto on Iran's Dez River is the site of Iran's vast \$65 million hydro-electric station. It is a project which, under agreement, is being developed with the assistance of specialized Ontario Hydro personnel, for upon the 10-man Hydro team in Iran, headed by Donald Haig, formerly plant superintendent of our Nipigon River generating stations, was laid the responsibility of commissioning the 520,000 kilowatt Dez project, and for training young Iranians to operate it. Under the Shah's programme for the development of Iran, Ontario by invitation has been proud to play its part, which emphasizes that as Canadians we are accepting our responsibility to lend a helping hand in the cause of world peace and understanding.

No untoward action, therefore, should becloud in any way the goodwill we feel towards, and the respect we have for, the Iranian people whose nation, formerly the heart of the Persian empire—of great antiquity, oriental culture and military history—is keeping abreast of modern practices and the great potentialities which are of benefit to their country and its citizens.

(1) to (5): The dinner tendered to the Shahanshah by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario will be paid for, out of funds allotted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor's office, after the account is rendered to him and when settlement is made.

The Lieutenant-Governor is appointed by the Dominion government at Ottawa, acts upon the counsel of his provincial constitutional advisers, and in the discharge of the responsibilities of his high office represents the Governor General of Canada and, thus, Her Majesty the Queen.

His Honour would be unaware officially, and completely disinterested in, the political complexion and views of his invited guests, who it is said, constituted a cross-section of representative Canadian citizens across Ontario.

The detailed particulars sought under question 116 form no part of, and are not contained in, the records of the Lieutenant-Governor, as the official host, or of the government.

The hon. Prime Minister also tabled returns to questions No. 7 and 37—Sessional Papers Nos. 87 and 88.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I will now leave the House and wait upon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario entered the Chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed several bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles to the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed.

Bill No. 44, An Act to make uniform the powers of expropriation granted to universities.

Bill No. 66, An Act to amend The Public Service Works on Highways Act.

Bill No. 73, The Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1965.

Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Energy Act, 1964.

Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Gas and Oil Leases Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 85, An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 87, An Act to amend The Schools Administration Act.

Bill No. 88, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

Bill No. 89, An Act to amend The Separate Schools Act.

Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Secondary Schools and Boards of Education Act.

Bill No. 94, An Act to establish a foundation for the preservation of the burial place of John Graves Simcoe and his wife.

Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act.

Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The General Sessions Act.

Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Ontario Housing Corporation Act, 1964.

Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Sheridan Park Corporation Act, 1964.

Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Ontario Energy Board Act, 1964.

Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act.

Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Ophthalmic Dispensers Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.

Bill No. 109, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Bill No. 111, An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.

Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Partnerships Registration Act.

Bill No. 113, An Act to amend The Limited Partnerships Act.

Bill No. 114, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of the centennial centre of science and technology.

Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Bill No. 116, An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Bill No. 118, An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.

Bill No. 119, The Child Welfare Act, 1965.

Bill No. 120, An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

Bill No. 121, An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

Bill No. 122, An Act to amend The Securities Act.

Bill No. 123, An Act to amend The Police Act.

Bill No. 124, An Act to amend The Public Service Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Public Service, Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 126, An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act.

Bill No. 127, An Act to establish the Ontario institute for studies in education.

Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

Bill No. 129, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Corporations Tax Act.

Bill No. 131, An Act to amend The Logging Tax Act.

Bill No. 132, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 133, An Act to amend The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 134, An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.

Bill No. 135, The Milk Act, 1965.

Bill No. 136, An Act respecting medical services insurance.

Bill No. 137, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Meat Inspection Act (Ontario), 1962-1963.

Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Seed Potatoes Act.

Bill No. 140, An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill No. 142, An Act to provide for the establishment of regional detention centres.

Bill No. 143, The Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, 1965.

Bill No. 144, An Act to impose a tax on the consumers of tobacco.

Bill No. 146, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 147, An Act to provide for the establishment and operation of commuter services.

Bill No. 148, An Act to amend The University of Toronto Act, 1947.

Bill No. 149, The York University Act, 1965.

Bill No. 150, An Act respecting Lakehead University.

Bill No. 151, An Act to amend The Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 152, An Act to amend The University of Guelph Act.

Bill No. 153, An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.

Bill No. 154, An Act to amend The Children's Institutions Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 155, An Act to amend The Homes for Retarded Children Act, 1962-1963.

Bill No. 156, An Act to amend The Department of Public Welfare Act.

Bill No. 157, The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Bill No. 158, An Act respecting Université d'Ottawa.

Bill No. 160, An Act to authorize the raising of money on the credit of the consolidated revenue fund.

Bill No. 161, An Act to amend The Ontario Mental Health Foundation Act, 1960-1961.

Bill No. 162, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

Bill No. 163, An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Bill No. 164, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Bill No. 165, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, 1961-1962.

Bill No. 166, An Act to amend The Emergency Measures Act, 1962-1963.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario, in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government and humbly beg to present for Your Honour's acceptance a bill intituled, An Act granting to Her Majesty's certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1965 and March 31, 1966.

To this Act the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accept their benevolence and assent to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the province was then pleased to deliver the following gracious speech.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario, during this third session of the 27th Parliament, hon. members have diligently and conscientiously discharged their duties as the elected representatives of the people of Ontario. In your deliberations you have considered 168 public bills and 43 private bills. Of these, 177 bills have now received Royal assent.

In the Speech from the Throne, a very extensive legislative programme was outlined, encompassing education, resource development, social, health and welfare services, municipal development and the administration of justice. I am very pleased to note that hon. members have dealt with every item mentioned in that document and have also considered and passed several major Acts which were subsequently introduced to complete the comprehensive legislative programme submitted to the legislative assembly.

In the field of education, your recognition of this most vital responsibility of the province of Ontario is reflected in the estimates passed for both The Department of Education and The Department of University Affairs, and in the amendments to several

Acts. In particular, I should like to mention the establishment of colleges of applied arts and technology and the Ontario institute for studies in education. The bills respecting Lakehead University and the University of Ottawa represent important milestones in the development of our institutions of higher learning.

There have been presented to you economic goals for the province of Ontario, and on the realization of those goals all of the aggressive programmes now under way in The Departments of Economics and Development, Agriculture, Lands and Forests, Energy and Resources Management, Mines, and Tourism and Information will benefit industry and the people of Ontario as a whole. Of major significance was the passing of The Milk Act, which pioneers in a new approach to the marketing of milk in Canada.

Hon. members have been concerned with the challenge of providing progressive social, health and welfare services to the people of this province, commensurate with the tax revenues of the province and the existing financial arrangements with the federal government. During this session you have broken new ground in the legislation respecting penal reform, child welfare, industrial safety legislation, workmen's compensation, and medical services insurance. I congratulate hon. members on their continuing concern for the furthering of human rights in the province of Ontario as expressed in the amendment to The Ontario Human Rights Code introduced by my government.

The creation of an effective municipal system was fully examined by hon. members. You had occasion to study and debate the final report of the select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts. You have considered and passed several amendments to legislation respecting our municipalities. Hon. members also took a significant step forward, in the field of efficient transportation services, by passing an Act to establish a rail commuter service in the heavily congested areas between Burlington and Dunbarton. Highway and municipal road construction, together with extensive research studies, will be facilitated by the record gross appropriations for The Department of Highways approved by the Legislature.

Hon. members devoted considerable time to matters relating to the administration of justice. In addition to the fullest opportunities accorded for extensive and detailed discussion of the estimates of The Department of the Attorney General, you passed amendments to a large number of bills including, among

others, The Expropriation Procedures Act and The University Expropriation Powers Act. Four major reports—the report of the joint committee on legal aid, the first report of the Ontario law reform commission, the report of the committee on securities legislation, and the final report of the select committee on consumer credit—were received by the Attorney General and tabled in the House for the information of and review by hon. members.

This third session of the 27th provincial Parliament has been a lengthy one during which my government has provided every facility to hon. members to discharge their responsibilities and to fulfill their duties to their constituents. I congratulate all of you on the manner in which the debates on the legislation were conducted in the assembly and in committee. You have accomplished a great deal and I am sure that your dedication of purpose will be fully appreciated by the people whom you serve.

This session has been highlighted by several lengthy discussions of the highest quality on matters of public concern. I wish to commend the hon. members who, in taking part in these debates, expressed the varied views and sentiments of the people of this province to the end that legislative enactments, proposed by my government and passed by hon. members, will prove to be of inestimable benefit to the people of Ontario as a whole.

With a well-ordered economy, and revenues which result from that commendable condition of provincial affairs, you have been enabled to approve of a record budget for Ontario. In doing so, you have had every opportunity to scrutinize thoroughly, and have passed, the estimates of the several departments of government, providing for the requirements of the province whose people are served by an able and conscientious civil service which will continue to discharge its functions in the usual capable and efficient manner.

May divine providence guide you in the days to come.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of the legislative assembly, it is the will and pleasure of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor that this legislative assembly be prorogued and this legislative assembly is accordingly prorogued.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

The House prorogued at 5.20 o'clock p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

